



## MEETING NOTES

<b>PROJECT:</b>	21685 I-70 West Vail Pass Auxiliary Lanes
<b>PURPOSE:</b>	Project Leadership Team Meeting #3
<b>DATE HELD:</b>	August 27, 2018
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Miller Ranch Community Center, 25 Mill Loft Road, Edwards, CO
<b>ATTENDING:</b>	Joel Barnett, FHWA Martha Miller, Program Engineer, CDOT Region 3 John Kronholm, Project Manager, CDOT Region 3 Karen Berdoulay, Resident Engineer, CDOT Region 3 David Cesark, Environmental Manager, CDOT Region 3 David Singer, CDOT Environmental Section Manager Randy McIntosh, CDOT Maintenance Patrick Chavez, Program Manager, CDOT HQ Drew Stewart, Design Team, CDOT Region 3 Matt Klein, US Forest Service (Late) Ben Gerdes, Eagle County Dick Cleveland, Representing Vail Town Council Tracy Sakaguchi, Colorado Motor Carriers Association Tom Gosiorowski, Summit County Don Connors, Wood Stacy Tschuor, David Evans & Associates Kara Swanson, Consultant Environmental Task Lead, David Evans and Associates
<b>COPIES:</b>	Attendees

### SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

#### 1. Introductions & Agenda

- a. Karen Berdoulay did introductions, covered the agenda, and described actions taken.
- b. Karen discussed past meetings of the PLT that covered:
  - i. Developing scope of the process
  - ii. Topics to cover in public meetings
  - iii. Developed screening criteria
- c. Karen stated the purpose of the meeting was to discuss and endorse the process.
  - i. Dick Cleveland discussed the public meeting scheduled in November and expected many people would not attend due to the timing. It would be worth considering a reschedule for December or January.
- d. Karen discussed other various groups that have been met with through the process (SWEEP, ALIVE, etc)

#### 2. Six Steps of CSS

- a. Kara introduced the steps of the Process
  - i. Define Outcomes
  - ii. Endorse the process
    1. TT meetings and PLTs are held to get endorsement.
    2. Purpose and Need statement identified
  - iii. Establish Criteria
    1. Multiple iterations to address stakeholders' needs and wants.



- iv. Develop alternatives and options
    - 1. Brainstorming from TT meetings
  - v. Evaluate, Select, and Refine Alternatives
    - 1. Where do we go from here?
    - 2. Next Steps
    - 3. Looking at environmental impacts
  - b. Dick identified a mistake in the teams labeling of Vail Pass recreation trail. It has been labeled as Tenmile Creek Recreation area which is incorrect. Kara said the team would look into it.
    - i. Karen thought it would be helpful to understand Level 1 vs Level 2 screening. Level 1 is a high level, big picture analysis meant to find fatal flaws in alternatives. Level 2 is a comparative analysis between alternatives that pass through Level 1 screening.
  - a. Kara introduced the success factor flow chart and mentioned that there was a request from stakeholders to add water quality- related Core Values. She asked how the PLT felt about adding additional language to the Critical Issues and Success Factors instead of editing the Core Values.
    - ii. Karen mentioned the difficulty in adding items late in during the CSS because the team does not want to backtrack or corrupt the process.
    - iii. Kara suggesting adding it to the critical issues in the environmental section.
      - 1. Dave Cesark supported the idea
      - 2. Karen mentioned that water quality is covered in the SWEEP MOU.
      - 3. Dick mentioned the importance of covering the water quality because it affects the entire valley, but feels it has been addressed.
  - b. Joel brought up that ITS systems is not an aesthetic issue and is already covered in the operations section.
    - iv. Martha mentioned that Greg Hall from TOV might have brought up that it could be in both sections in a previous PLT meeting.
    - v. Dick said the signs impact on aesthetics was brought up last meeting, and to consider removing it from the aesthetics section but note why it was removed.
  - c. Martha asked if a lot of representative were missing from the current meeting.
    - vi. Greg Hall and Matt Klein were not present (although Matt arrived late).
    - vii. Martha was concerned that this could cause backtracking if stakeholders were not getting a chance to voice their opinions.
  - d. Kara confirmed that there was consensus with discussed changes.
    - viii. No objections.
- 3. Public Meeting Plan**
- a. Kara discussed what the expectation is for the upcoming meetings
    - i. Martha asked if the team would not push the scheduled date past mid-December
    - ii. Martha noted that the ballot issues could affect the public meeting if it comes after the election.
    - iii. Martha stated that it is possible that only some of the initiatives could pass, and then added some background on the ballot initiatives:
      - 1. One initiative discusses spending money in a 3-year period and this will affect the CDOT staff workload.
      - 2. This project is included in that initiative
    - iv. Martha said she would not like it to be delayed into January.



- v. Dick mentioned that December is difficult due to Christmas time, which puts additional stress on a resort town like Vail. He suggested a compromise of mid-December
- vi. Tom said he thinks it is a good compromise, but people need the opportunity to comment on the project. Making the schedule date accessible for a large group of the public would cut down on the number of comments since the team could address more of the concerns directly at the meetings.
- vii. Dick thinks mid-December would get many second home owners in attendance.
- viii. Karen outlined the steps for the team moving forward ahead of the public meeting.
- ix. Tom asked if there could be a spring PLT meeting as an update before the NEPA process got started for the EA.
  - 1. Karen thought there could be a review of public comments for the PLT.
  - 2. Karen added that an update newsletter would be a good way to spread information.
- b. Karen reiterated that the project is on the ballot initiative list
  - 1. Martha added that it is on 2 of the ballot measures
    - a. Ballot 153 for \$255M
    - b. There is a second initiative that has project on for \$190M
  - 2. Martha said she is not sure how that would all pay out if both pass.
  - 3. Tom asked if there were different scopes for each initiative.
  - 4. Martha responded that because we are at conceptual design, it is very hard to project how the money would be spent.
    - a. Money may need to be spend on priority parts of the project.
    - b. Karen added that we are working to figure out what the priorities are. I.E. climbing lane in eastbound direction, curve corrections, etc.