



Sustainability Working Group Meeting Minutes

**August 4, 2008
2:30 pm – 4:30 pm
CDOT Golden Residency
425 Corporate Circle**

Attendees

Harry Dale	Clear Creek County
Eva Wilson	Eagle County
Michelle Halstead	CDOT
Amy Kennedy	HDR
Than Noll	Summit County
Monica Pavlik	FHWA
Ann Rajewski	CASTA
Bill Scheuerman	CDOT
Mary Jo Vobejda	CH2M Hill

Meeting Minutes

1. Amy Kennedy welcomed the Working Group (WG) attendees and briefly reviewed the agenda. Amy noted that the meeting materials will be posted on the website as well as any materials that members submit. She will act as the group's point of contact and primary facilitator which includes follow-up on requests and action items from the group. Amy noted that sustainability is an over arching core value from the CSS Corridor Team and by virtue of its nature could not be pinpointed to a single activity or action; sustainability is the responsibility of many entities and the WG may want to identify opportunities to partner in working toward this core value.
2. Amy suggested that the group consider if they might want outside speakers or other resources made available and indicated that while the CSS team was eager to have the WG contribute to the Guidance Manual, to a large extent the WG meetings and outcomes will be directed by the WG itself. She then asked each member to introduce themselves, the entity that they were representing at the meeting, and what sustainability in the I-70 Mountain Corridor meant to them.
3. The answers to the sustainability question included:
 - a. Leaving the corridor better than it is today and being aware of the long term consequences of our actions in regard to future generations.
 - b. Managing growth and development and learning from current corridor activities such as Eagle County's sustainability initiative.
 - c. Making decisions that stand the test of time.
 - d. Identifying measures and tactics related to sustainability that can be included in the CSS Guidance Manual.



- e. Considering the connectivity of resources and how systems are interdependent.
 - f. Consideration of environmental impacts over time.
 - g. Establishing flexibility in the decision making framework to allow for adjustment in response to changing environs.
 - h. Determining if the current processes are sustainable; ie the current rate of use of commodities.
 - i. Maintaining mobility.
4. The group discussed both agenda item “Working Group Goals, Outcomes, and Actions” and “Sustainability’s Role in the CSS Guidance Manual” in tandem.
 5. Bill Scheuerman indicated that it might not be possible to have a set of criteria for sustainability but sustainability goals and measures to improve alternatives in relation to each of the core values could be implemented.
 6. Harry noted a desire to define each core value first – for instance, how much mobility is desired? Then determine if this is sustainable over time acknowledging that goals/plans could change over time. He stated that there will need to be a goal for the outcome to be judged against in order to determine if sustainability is being achieved.
 7. The group felt a good starting point would be to gather existing community plans including the material that has already been collected as part of both the PEIS and the CSS efforts.
 8. Eva Wilson highlighted some of the issues that are prevalent in Eagle County: affordable housing, preservation of land, and transportation. Amy indicated that it would be helpful for Eva or Sara Fisher to share the county’s sustainability initiative with the group. This type of planning provides a basis that can be incorporated into transportation decision making.
 9. The WG acknowledged that community values change over time and will therefore cause change in the sustainability measures or goals.
 10. Monica Pavlik noted that mobility goals could be matched with land use plans instead of setting Level of Service goals.
 11. The WG touched on the connection between transportation and growth. They felt the role of transportation in growth will need to be examined as a part of the WG’s agenda. The group also wanted to provide opportunity for the outcome of the WG to be re-visited in the future, along with any metrics that are developed, to determine if they are still applicable or need to be revised.
 12. Sustainability of the infrastructure was also mentioned as a consideration.
 13. The group kept returning to the topic of how the outcome of this WG could be dynamic and responsive to future needs. There was agreement that there would need to be some sort of check-in or entity that helped implement not only sustainability goals but the CSS Guidance Manual. The group also agreed that many of the strategies or measures go beyond CDOT and FHWA’s jurisdiction or control. There are a broad range of entities including regulatory agencies, local governments, and users that affect sustainability in the corridor. The WG could lead and initiate the conversation about how the process could continue once the WG wraps up.



14. Michelle Halstead referenced the DRCOG measures of performance document as an example for the WG. She also noted that DROCG was having a speaker in October that will be addressing sustainability and that the group might want to piggy back on this opportunity. She will provide additional information on the event.
15. The WG also spent part of the meeting discussing and agreeing that sustainability must be examined on a corridor wide basis. That limiting future studies to the physical extent of the impact does not support incorporation of sustainability into the process. Key examples were wildlife movement and habitat connectivity, watershed issues, and growth. Again, the attendees expressed a need for a corridor-wide body, whose purpose included “guardianship” of the core values.
16. Thad Noll offered the example of a LEED checklist for buildings in Summit County noting that a similar approach could be taken in regards to sustainability measures of success. This idea appealed to the group and several other members had similar examples. They briefly discussed how it could be set up as a point system and be broad enough to allow the Project Leadership Team for each project to customize the list and the desired point level.
17. After the above discussion the WG suggested additional individuals that might be good members of the WG: corridor legislator, state legislator, governor’s office representative, DRCOG, and NWCOG. Amy will follow up with the members about these suggestions.
18. The group set the next meeting for Thursday, September 4, 2008 from 1:00 – 3:00 pm at the Golden Residency. The October meeting may or may not be the first Thursday.

Action Items:

- Gather existing community plans starting with the material that has already been collected as part of both the PEIS and the CSS efforts.
- Work with Eva to identify a time/method to best share Eagle County’s sustainability initiative with the WG.
- Include a discussion on transportation’s role, or lack there of, in controlling growth on a future meeting agenda.
- Obtain DRCOG measures of performance document as an example for the WG.
- DROCG is having a speaker in October that will be addressing sustainability and that the group might want to piggy back on this opportunity. Michelle will provide additional information on the event.
- Amy follow up with the members about membership suggestions.