



MEETING NOTES

PROJECT:	21685 I-70 West Vail Pass Auxiliary Lanes
PURPOSE:	SWEEP Issue Task Force (ITF) Meeting #1
DATE HELD:	May 16, 2018
LOCATION:	CDOT Gypsum Maintenance Yard, 10519 Highway 6, Gypsum, CO
ATTENDING:	<p>Joel Barnett, FHWA</p> <p>John Kronholm, Project Manager, CDOT Region 3</p> <p>Karen Berdoulay, Resident Engineer, CDOT Region 3</p> <p>David Cesark, Environmental Manager, CDOT Region 3</p> <p>Jennifer Klaetsch, Environmental Unit, CDOT Region 3</p> <p>Paula Durkin, Environmental Unit, CDOT Region 3</p> <p>Becky Pierce, Statewide Wetlands Program Manager CDOT</p> <p>Matt Klein, Realty Specialist US Forest Service</p> <p>Matt Grove, Fish Biologist US Forest Service</p> <p>Andy Herb, Alpine Eco</p> <p>Siri Roman, Eagle River Water & Sanitation District</p> <p>Bill Andree, Colorado Parks & Wildlife</p> <p>Caroline Byus, Leonard Rice Engineers, on behalf of Eagle River Water & Sanitation District</p> <p>Lisa Lloyd, EPA</p> <p>Seth Mason, Leonard Rice Engineers, on behalf of Eagle River Water & Sanitation District</p> <p>Pete Wadden, Town of Vail</p> <p>Bob Weaver, Leonard Rice Engineers, on behalf of Eagle River Water & Sanitation District</p> <p>Taylor Elm, Colorado Parks & Wildlife</p> <p>Don Connors, Consultant Project Manager, Wood</p> <p>John Loranger, Wood</p> <p>Kara Swanson, Consultant Environmental Task Lead, David Evans and Associates</p> <p>Matt Figgs, CDOT Region 3</p>
COPIES:	Attendees

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

(Please Note: Action items are shown in ***bold italics***.)

1. Introductions & Agenda

- a. John Kronholm did introductions, covered the agenda, and talked briefly about the purpose of today's meeting, which is to provide SWEEP (Stream and Wetland Ecological Enhancement Program) Issue Task Force (ITF) members with an understanding of the project to-date, gather feedback on existing conditions and the current Black Gore Creek Sediment Control Action Plan (SCAP), and to gather input on mitigation and protection opportunities.



2. Project Background and Overview

- a. John K discussed the background of the project including highlighting the I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), the recommendations from the PEIS (including stipulations in the SWEEP Memorandum of Understanding [MOU]), the Tier 2 NEPA process, and the past 2007 Environmental Assessment (EA) for the West Vail Pass area
 - i. He explained that this project is the Tier 2 NEPA process as it addresses site specific details for West Vail Pass, alignments, costs, and potential mitigation measures
 - ii. He also highlighted that the 2007 EA focused solely on safety, which the current Purpose & Need focuses on both safety and traffic operations.

3. CSS Process/ITF Responsibilities

- a. John K outlined the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process that the Project Team is following for this project and what stage the project is at in the process
 - i. The Project Team has gathered information from the Technical Team (TT) that is being considered for the development of alternatives that will then be screened through a two-level screening process
 - ii. He also highlighted the Core Values that the Project Team, in conjunction with the Project Leadership Team (PLT) and TT, have developed.
 - iii. Kara pointed the ITF group to the handout which included more details on the Core Values as well as the Success Factors.
- b. John K covered the roles and responsibilities of the various ITF groups which come directly from CDOT's CSS guidance.
 - i. He explained that the intent of an ITF is to focus on a specific issue and make recommendations back to the Project Team and TT.

4. Current Project

- a. John K discussed the limits of the West Vail Pass Auxiliary Lanes project (Mile Marker [MM] 180 to 190) and talked to some of the unique characteristics along the corridor.
 - i. The elevation of West Vail Pass summits at 10,603 feet
 - ii. There are several sections of steep grades which are at 7 to 7.4%
 - iii. There are areas of substandard roadway geometry with some compound curves that were designed for a 55 mph speed limit (the current speed limit is 65 mph).
 - iv. There are 23 different retaining walls totaling 23,515 linear feet
 - v. There are 16 bridges that make up 1.6 miles of the corridor
 - vi. The Vail Pass/Tenmile Canyon National Recreation Trail sits in the corridor. This paved bike trail gets 39,000 annual users with a peak daily count of 3,500 users



- vii. West Vail Pass is the access point for the Vail Pass Winter Recreation area which saw 56,000 users in the 2016/17 winter season
 - viii. There are numerous wetlands and waters of the US in or near the corridor including Black Gore Creek. There is also considerable wildlife activity in the lower five miles of the corridor.
 - ix. There is a Sediment Control Action Plan for Black Gore Creek that another ITF will discuss implementing
 - x. The West Vail Pass corridor is subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as it is a nationally and exceptionally significant feature of the federal interstate system. West Vail Pass was one of the first highways to purposefully sculpt cut-and-fill slopes to fit in its unique setting, as well as being one of the first to use precast and cast-in-place segmental bridges.
 - xi. 80% of the project is within the White River National Forest
 - xii. 20% of the project runs through the residential portion of east Vail
 - xiii. The weather on the west side of the pass is a challenge as this side routinely sees more snow than the east side of the pass
- b. John K then covered the Purpose & Need of the project which is to improve the safety and traffic operations for both eastbound (EB) & westbound (WB) directions of West Vail Pass
- i. He highlighted several specific safety and traffic operations issues that exist on the pass that have necessitated this project
 - ii. Siri asked if there is an economic impact that has been determined for closures on I-70
 - 1. David replied that CDOT is using \$1 Million per hour of economic impact when I-70 is closed.
 - 2. John K stated that the original amount CDOT had used historically (\$800,000/hour of closure) was based on when mountain resorts were open. More work has gone into trying to determine an overall number that includes impacts to freight, drivers, and other businesses.
 - 3. Don added that there was over 200 hours of closure on Vail Pass over the past three years.
 - 4. Joel asked if all of those closures were during hours when resorts were open.
 - a. John K replied that CDOT hasn't determined that yet. More work could go into determining an exact economic impact closures on West Vail Pass has if it is deemed necessary.
- c. John K then talked about the Level of Service of Safety (LOSS), which compares West Vail Pass to all rural, mountainous 4-lane divided highways. The safety assessment that was completed for this project showed that every section of West Vail Pass has a moderate to high potential for crash reduction. Improvements made to the



corridor have the potential to significantly reduce crashes on the interstate as this section of highway is significantly worse than other similar sections.

- i. John K highlighted that I-70 on West Vail Pass sees about 22,000 vehicles per day
- ii. Joel asked how many miles of 4-lane divided highway were used statewide for a comparison.
 1. John K stated that it is all 4-lane divided highways in the state, but isn't sure how many miles that is.
 2. Joel then asked how many of those miles are above 9,000 feet in elevation.
 3. ***John K stated the Project Team can look at these requests and determine those numbers.***

5. SWEEP MOU and Implementation Matrix Review

- a. Becky presented on a brief history on the SWEEP effort which began in 2001. She added that she was one of the authors of the SWEEP MOU.
 - i. She stated that SWEEP is a program developed out of the PEIS to avoid or minimize environmental issues
 - ii. The SWEEP effort included biologists, hydrologists, water quality experts, community representatives, and other potentially-affected parties. Three major drainages were covered in the entire PEIS corridor.
 - iii. The parties (signatories) to the SWEEP MOU are CDOT, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Colorado Parks & Wildlife (CPW), the Forest Service (USFS), Clear Creek County, the Clear Creek Watershed Foundation, the Upper Clear Creek Watershed Association, and Colorado Trout Unlimited
 1. US Army Corps of Engineers representatives, EPA, the Colorado Watershed Association, and the Eagle River Watershed Association were all part of the effort as well but did not sign the MOU.
- b. Becky then talked about what is in the SWEEP MOU
 - i. It is an MOU that defined parties and their roles and responsibilities
 - ii. It identified and recommended appropriate mitigation strategies, applied to all parties (not just CDOT and FHWA) to allow all of the stakeholders to gather together and contribute to potential solutions on projects, and identified primary issues of concern (including water quality, natural habitat, and information)
 1. She highlighted that not all of the issues in water quality in the overall SWEEP MOU may come up as they had to do with mining and mine tailings
 2. Lisa asked for clarification on what the information gathering requirement in the MOU was about



- a. Becky replied it was a big effort to gather information (mapping, best practices, etc.) to ensure future mistakes weren't made along the corridor.
- iii. Becky then stated that there is an implementation matrix that outlines the 3 issues of concerns with associated inputs, considerations, and outcomes for each phase of a project
 1. Kara referred the ITF group to one of the handouts which is a specific implementation matrix for this project
- iv. John K asked if there was an expectation to come up with a new SCAP for Black Gore Creek as many of the existing water quality features may be wiped out with this project
 1. Bob added that the SCAP was developed by a consultant to CDOT (Clear Creek Consultants), but that the SCAP was never fully implemented. It looked at sediment issues on the corridor (Zone 1), the problems that had occurred over time between the corridor & Black Gore Creek (Zone 2), and the impacts on Black Gore Creek (Zone 3). The SCAP only focused on sediment control on the interstate and had a recommended program of \$20M, and would never be fully completed without a large I-70 project.
 2. Eagle River Water & Sanitation District (ERWSD) and Eagle River Watershed Council did work to generate funds (\$1M) to do interim improvements to Zones 2 & 3.
 3. He added that the SCAP was a guide for these improvements, but was never finished. He stated that the sediment control and management strategy needs to be added in the planning/design of the project, not as an afterthought or as a later mitigation measure and encouraged the Project Team to address water quality issues that are problematic along I-70.
 - a. John K replied that the Project Team has the opportunity to make these improvements and will look at designing them into the roadway and not include them as an afterthought.

6. SWEEP Implementation Matrix Discussion

a. Water Quality

- i. John L stated that his goal was to ask the group for input on if the SCAP's recommendations met the objectives that were originally determined, what the costs and benefits were for each strategy, and what revisions may need to be added in the SCAP
- ii. **Sediment – Black Gore Creek SCAP**
 1. John L presented some background on the development on the Black Gore Creek SCAP and talked about some of the proposed recommendations that came out of the SCAP (4 implementation scenarios)



2. He covered the 4 implementation scenarios that came out of the SCAP
 - a. The Baseline-Existing Maintenance Program which basically maintained the amount of sediment removal that took place on the pass
 - b. The Enhanced Maintenance Program which did not add any new control structures, but added \$500k annually to enhance sediment removal
 - c. The Large Capital Construction & Enhanced Maintenance Program which included all of the elements of scenario #2 plus \$20M in capital improvement projects for sediment control structures
 - d. The Prioritized Capital Construction & Enhanced Maintenance Program which included all of the elements of scenario #2 plus \$4M in annual capital improvements
 3. John L talked about a few of the projects that had been completed since the completion of the SCAP. 67 permanent BMPs have been constructed since the 2002 implementation of the SCAP. He stated the Project Team will continue to look at what has been completed and what remaining items are not implemented.
 - a. He also added that CDOT has increased its annual maintenance budget by about \$250k per year
- iii. **303(d) Listing**
1. John L added that Black Gore Creek is listed under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act
 - a. Matt Grove added that Black Gore Creek is not listed for macroinvertebrates but it is monitored
 - b. Caroline added that one portion of Black Gore Creek is still listed as 303(d) for macroinvertebrates (the upper portion)
 - c. Matt G added that he didn't believe it was listed but is still on the M&E list. Siri added that the M&E list is still very important.
 - d. Karen asked for clarification for what the M&E list was
 - i. Matt G replied that it is a classification that isn't bad enough to be listed on 303(d), but does have pollutant concerns and is therefore monitored
- iv. Kara asked if there were any other questions for mitigation or implementation that needed to be covered by the ITF
1. Bill stated that some of the discussions surrounding the original SCAP was to add concrete barrier and additional paving to trap sediment and give a location for sediment to be cleaned, but this installation could be a barrier to wildlife trying to cross the



interstate. He added that the location of the sediment ponds is important too as those can attract wildlife. If they are on the interstate side of a wildlife fence, could draw animals to I-70

- a. John K added that CDOT Maintenance needs to weigh in on those locations and how easy they will be to access and clean
 - b. John L stated the Project Team can work with the ITF group during design to make sure these different concerns are all balanced and considered
2. Siri stated that CDOT Maintenance manages snow much differently than how it was done in 2002 when the SCAP was completed. The Project Team should look at how it is operated now and update the recommendations of the old SCAP
 3. Seth asked if it is worth working with CDOT Maintenance to look at the operational recommendations in the SCAP and add onto those old recommendations with new practices and new technologies
 - a. John L agreed that there is an opportunity to do this
 - b. John M added that CDOT Maintenance uses technology in their application of product on the roads, so there is some opportunity to look at this. Maintenance doesn't want to waste material under their new practices
 - c. John L stated that the Project Team is still in early development of work on this issue and will reach out to the ITF members as questions arise
 4. Siri added that in her perspective, on the scale of a \$500M project, spending money to update the SCAP within the limits of the project is very worth it as a whole new look should be given to the corridor
 - a. Bob concurred with this recommendation
 - b. Jen also concurred as just an update to the 2002 SCAP would not be relevant with a large change to the corridor as part of this project. She added that Maintenance will need to be at the table for this effort
 5. Seth asked for the timeline for construction of this project
 - a. John K replied that there is no identified construction funding at this time, only money for EA effort. The EA is expected to be completed in early 2020. The project is on a potential ballot measure list for \$225M which would allow the project to move into design and some phase of construction in a few years.
 - b. Seth asked that if there is significant uncertainty on when or if this project gets done, would be worth just an update to the SCAP and not re-doing it. If there is a high chance it will be constructed in the next 5-10 years, it would be best to do a new SCAP now



- c. Karen added that if the Project Team gets design funds to get to FIR (CDOT's 30% design level), it would make sense to do a new SCAP, even if construction funding isn't identified yet. CDOT has identified this project as one of the top 5 projects in the state. Several potential funding scenarios exist that will continue to develop in the upcoming future.
6. Bob asked how the identification of the alternative for this project works with the Tier 1 PEIS as it has already identified a 3rd lane
 - a. Karen replied that the TT is working through this question right now and whether there are multiple alternatives or if there are only design options for 1 alternative (adding a 3rd lane). The Project Team and FHWA are working closely to develop this. She added that the Project Team hasn't looked at the level of effort for generating new reports (such as a new SCAP) but is looking to the ITF groups for guidance
7. Siri added that a new water quality management plan needs to be generated for the whole corridor including the Black Lakes and not just Black Gore Creek
 - a. Bob stated that certain areas on the corridor were difficult to determine how to install mitigation measures that could be maintained, so the alternatives for sediment control were limited by the footprint of the highway. The strategy for managing sediment and keeping it from leaving the roadway should be looked at as alternatives are developed so that the same issue doesn't arise with a new footprint.
 - i. Karen replied that the Project Team is looking at screening criteria for sediment control and maintenance, so all of the Core Values will be considered as alternatives are scored.
 - ii. John K added that there may be opportunities to improve maintenance access as the alternatives and design progress for this project. They can be determined in conjunction with design and not installed as an afterthought
 - iii. Karen highlighted the schedule the Project Team handed out to the ITF group. The refinement of the preferred recommended alternative would be the time the Project Team starts to dive into the details of looking at specific improvements and will look to the ITF for guidance on these.
8. Bob asked what the Level 1 screening will cover
 - a. Kara stated that the Project Team is still determining the alternatives right now that will be screened, but the Level 1 criteria will be applied to the alternatives. Design options



will also be determined later and compared to the Core Values

- b. John stated that once the preferred alternative is identified, the mitigation measures will be looked at through the different ITF groups
- c. Bob asked if the impacts for each alternatives would be the same or not
 - i. Kara replied that not necessarily, it depends on what alternatives come out and are screened
- d. Siri asked if an alternative to focus on fixing geometry and widening shoulders while keeping I-70 as a 4-lane interstate could be its own alternative
 - i. Karen replied it could be an option. The Project Team is discussing whether to approach this in light of the PEIS as the TIER 1 decision recommended adding the 3rd lane. The Project Team is looking at whether going back and changing the recommended improvement from the PEIS should be considered as an alternative as this is a Tier 2 decision to the PEIS's Record of Decision. This could also be a standalone phase of a larger project
 - ii. Siri asked for clarification on the difference between the Tier 1 and Tier 2 effort
 - iii. Joel stated that the Tier 1 effort defined a recommended suite of improvements for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Tier 2 projects would be built upon that and may not implement the Tier 1 decision, but those projects can't preclude the Tier 1 decision
 - iv. Lisa stated the Project Team could segment the project to have different solutions in different areas to try and minimize impacts
- 9. Seth asked what the SWEEP ITF will help the Project Team accomplish with this meeting today
 - a. Kara stated that the intent of this meeting is to provide the SWEEP ITF group with the project background and then gather information to consider in moving forward with the project

b. Natural Habitat

i. Wetlands Protection

- 1. Andy talked about the wetlands work the Project Team is planning on accomplishing as a part of the project. The Project Team is working with the CDOT Region 3 Environmental unit, the Colorado Natural Heritage Program (which completed general wetland and



fen mapping within 500 feet of the edge of interstate, but not outside of the Right-Of-Way), Colorado Parks and Wildlife, as well as using the data set from PEIS. He asked the ITF group for more data or information they may have that was not listed.

- a. He explained the work completed by the Project Team to date as well as the identified work that will take place in the future. Field work will start this July to map wetlands. That mapping will be done both by field work and by aerial mapping. The Project Team will be conservative in its look and will include more areas in the mapping limits than potentially needed. When permits need to be pulled for design and construction in the future, those limits will then be further refined.
 - b. Fens will also be mapped and more closely examined.
2. Andy then presented some of the wetlands criteria on the implementation matrix that the Project Team will be attempting to answer
- a. He stated whether the project is subject to the US Army Corps of Engineers Merger Agreement is still being determined. Although the US Army Corp of Engineers was not at this SWEEP ITF, the Project Team is still working with them
 - b. Lisa stated that in light of the Trump Administration's effort to streamline the NEPA process, she recommends that all of the information needed for a permit or for the merger agreement should be complied so the Project Team doesn't have to go back and re-do work. Involve the US Army Corps of Engineers early on so their requirements don't impact the selection of the preferred alternative
 - i. Andy added that the US Army Corps of Engineers' and NEPA's definition of environment is different, so the Project Team will make sure they are included
 - c. Becky added that the US Army Corp of Engineers doesn't decided whether the project will enter into a merger agreement; it will be FHWA (with concurrence of CDOT). The merger agreement is being re-written right now after EPA and the US Fish & Wildlife Service conduct a final review. She stated that other state DOTs use the merger agreement much more than CDOT does, but CDOT should look at using it more, especially when there is more than one alternative or one alternative with many design options. It will prevent the Project Team from having to back track
 - i. Andy added that depending on the alternative, a permit may not even be needed.



- ii. Kara added that further conversations will be needed to determine the potential future permit strategy for this project
- iii. Andy said the Project Team is taking the conservative approach by assuming an individual permit is needed right now and can always not go down that route if it is determined that the permit is not needed.
 - 1. The goal of the Project Team would be to avoid wetlands first, minimize impacts second, then mitigate lastly. He added that the ITF group could provide the Project Team data on wetland sites that have been degraded and could be restored as part of this project
- d. Matt G asked if the Project Team's survey will include any potential realignment of the bike path
 - i. Andy replied that yes it will
 - ii. Kara added that the original study limits may not go down all the way to the creek, so if any design options impact areas outside of the original limits, the Project Team will need to go back out to re-map
- e. Paula stated that there are many areas below Black Lakes that have a lot of sediment in that should be looked at. These could be good potential mitigation areas for the project
 - i. Bill asked how that could be considered mitigation as that is fixing an old problem from the original construction of the interstate
- 3. Bob asked if this project will require an amendment to the Highway Easement Deed FHWA has with the Forest Service
 - a. Karen added the Project Team doesn't know at this time.
 - b. Don added the road probably will stay inside boundaries of easement, but bike path may not.
 - c. Bob wanted the Project Team to look at whether the highway was in a Special Use Permit or in an easement
 - i. ***The Project Team will confirm whether I-70 sits in an easement or under a Special Use Permit***
- ii. **Aquatic Special Status Species**
 - 1. Matt G talked about the list of Threatened & Endangered aquatic species the Forest Service has identified as a potential to be in the project limits



- a. He added that the Greenback Cutthroat Trout doesn't exist in the Black Gore Creek watershed (the Greenback in the creek is not a genetically pure species)
2. Kara showed the questions from the implementation matrix that the Project Team will work through
 - a. Matt G spoke to some potential outcomes
 - i. This project is not a good candidate for enhancing the recovery effort, but the Team will work with CPW
 - ii. Fish barriers do exist and could be looked at for enhancement or removals if necessary
 - iii. Black Gore Creek primarily is full of non-native fish species or brook trout
 - b. Bill added that there are fish barriers for Pitkin and Booth Creeks, but CPW would potentially look at sites of future recovery and would like to keep the barriers in place
3. Andy presented the recommendations for the aquatic connectivity that were originally established in the ALIVE Linkage Interference Zone (LIZ) report. These recommendations are site specific along the corridor and were discussed among the ITF group.
 - a. Matt G stated that any work that has to do with fish passage has to go through the Forest Service's hydrologist for 100-year flood elevations
 - b. Bill added that CPW wouldn't want to remove any barriers (even ones that exist naturally) as it is tougher to put one in than it is to later pull one out. This would allow for sections of creek to do future habitat recovery efforts
4. Bill stated that the unknown tributary at MM 183 may be Timber Creek
 - a. John K hasn't found this location in the field and isn't sure why CDOT would install a culvert for the creek underneath a bridge
 - b. Matt G stated this may not be Timber Creek (as it shows up later on the list); it could be part of the sediment basin
 - c. ***John K will try to find this location and send pictures to members of SWEEP ITF for their review on the ALIVE recommendation***

iii. Aquatic Species Recreation

1. Kara talked about the question on the implementation matrix for recreation regarding aquatic species
 - a. Bill stated that the Gold Medal Water designation is below the project limits, so the project wouldn't have a special designation segment within the limits



2. Bob asked how the use of Black Lakes for fishing applies to this matrix (as ERWSD does a lot of stocking of those lakes via agreement with the Department of Natural Resources & CPW). He stated that the accumulation of sediment in those lakes has been problematic over time and remains an issue of concern. The sediment control measures that are implemented with the project should include protection of Black Lakes too
3. Bill added that restoring vehicle access to Black Lakes #2 would be beneficial as well to provide more recreation access
 - a. John K stated that this may be an issue between CPW and the USFS & ERWSD and may not be a part of this project. This project will only mitigate those recreational facilities that are impacted and not provide additional access or parking

c. Information (Research Needs)

- i. Kara showed the questions from the implementation matrix for this category that the Project Team will need to answer
 1. Seth asked why the first question is limited to aquatic vegetation
 - a. Andy replied that this probably relates to wetland vegetation
 - b. Matt G added that there is a lot of data on macroinvertebrates and fisheries, so missing areas would include vegetation
 - c. Andy asked if anyone in group had data on magnesium chloride and sand impacts on aquatic vegetation
 - i. Seth replied there is research from CU on this that the Project Team may be able to obtain
 2. Matt G said that there is not much published literature on the effect of mag-chloride on aquatic bugs. This should be considered as CDOT has been using more mag-chloride and less sand without knowing the effects on aquatic life. The Forest Service has seen a slight decrease in bug populations over the past 5 years. Abandoning sand because of sediment issues may not be the best solution because of the potential effects of the mag-chloride
 - a. Seth added there is an effort with Eagle River Watershed to answer the second question right now. He recommended the Project Team to go back to Clear Creek Consultants to get the data that was generated with the original studies and asked if it could be shared with ERWSD
 - b. Bob added that he felt CDOT collected data on monitoring requirements for Black Gore Creek in addition to what Clear Creek Consultants did
 - c. Jen added that monitoring is ongoing but nothing additional outside MS4 areas is taking place and Black Gore Creek is not designated as MS4



- d. Bob stated that the ERWSD collects macroinvertebrates and water chemistry data above mouth of Black Gore Creek and on Main Gore Creek and has seen that macroinvertebrates scores are significantly lower in Black Gore Creek than at those other locations. He feels the reason for those lower scores is due to lower bug densities from sediment impacts and mag-chloride. He can share the data with the Project Team.
 - i. Siri stated that there is a Black Gore Creek steering committee that is looking at starting to sample bugs
 - ii. Bob said he would greatly appreciate the opportunity to review the data that is used to establish the baseline criteria of the health of Black Gore Creek.
- 3. Seth asked how the Project Team will answer the matrix implementation questions
 - a. Kara replied that the questions were for entire I-70 Mountain Corridor. The Project Team needs to ask if the particular questions are applicable first, and then if they are, is there an opportunity to gather data to answer the question
 - b. Seth added that there is an opportunity to coordinate with other groups that are asking similar questions
 - c. Andy said that there is a good opportunity for data sharing with this project
 - d. Kara added there are some concurrent efforts that members of ITF can work together on
 - e. Siri stated that it may be good to have a member of the Project Team present at the Black Gore Creek steering committee
 - f. ***SWEEP ITF Members agreed to share data/information as it is collected***

d. Design Options

- i. John K stated that the bike path design options are complicated with all of the pros and cons to weigh with user experience, safety, aquatic/riparian impacts, wildlife impacts, etc.
 - 1. The Project Team would like to do another ITF specific to the bike path and have varying stakeholders provide input on where this relocated path could go. The Project Team will set this up at a later date and reach out to the necessary stakeholders
- ii. Don talked about several design options that the Project Team has talked through with the TT including the roadway template width, construction phasing, and trail relocation options



7. Schedule and Next Steps

- a. John K presented the overall EA schedule. He highlighted the EA is expected to be completed in early 2020, the preferred recommended alternative will be identified in the fall of 2018, and alternative refinements and environmental reports will take place from fall 2018 to mid-2019.
 - i. If design funds are obtained by CDOT, an effort towards FIR will be taken, but the project can't progress past FIR until the EA is signed.
 - ii. Kara added that the Project Team will come back to this ITF group in the early fall after the preferred recommended alternative is identified.
 - iii. Karen stated that as part of the EA process, the commitment to re-do the SCAP could be agreed upon, but that would need to take place after the recommended alternative is identified. She doesn't feel the work needs to take place right now, but the Project Team could commit to doing it
 1. Bob asked when the Project Team would start doing more detailed design work
 - a. Karen replied design funding is needed first, but that it wouldn't start until early 2019 at the earliest
 2. Bob asked what level of design is done when the preferred alternative is recommended
 - a. Karen replied it would be very high level (i.e. 5-10%). She added the Project Team will make sure to have the right timing for redoing the SCAP to make sure it makes sense
 - b. John K added the limits of disturbance for design and construction need to be established with the EA, and the proposed mitigations will needed to be looked at as well
 - c. Kara said the design is going to be an iterative process with the different ITF groups
- b. Siri asked if some specific metrics for preserving or enhancing water quality as part of the project could be added to the Success Factors (this could also be done for other Core Values like safety, etc.). Stipulations could be added to the project that would require measurements in the future that if the metrics aren't met, it would trigger a set of required actions by CDOT
 - i. Karen replied that she wasn't sure if CDOT had done this broader commitment on other projects and would want to look more into this.
 - ii. Joel stated that he felt Success Factors don't measure 10 years down the road, but are meant to look at what is designed. It is not typically within the scope of work to tie future metrics to projects
 - iii. Bob disagreed with this view as agencies like Forest Service & US Army Corp of Engineers often require follow up monitoring after large projects to make sure metrics have been met and then required follow up mitigation if those metrics aren't met



- iv. Paula added it depends on the permit type and who writes EA. The Forest Service is not writing the EA for this project as in the examples given
 - v. Kara added that it is tricky when trying to determine this in an EA. The Project Team could commit to something like producing a new SCAP but not necessarily future metrics
 - vi. Joel felt that the Success Factors are for the CSS work on the EA, not a measure for after construction
 - vii. Bill responded that he felt this would go against the MOUs signed as part of the PEIS. If construction takes place and the stream gets worse, the SWEEP MOU wouldn't have been met
 - 1. Joel felt that concern would be better identified in an MOU rather than in the Success Factors
 - viii. John K asked the group to table this discussion and allow the Project Team to look further into it and then discuss at next SWEEP ITF. He did ask for some specific measurements that could be considered to be included in some metric that CDOT would look into.
 - 1. The group discussed that reading through the SWEEP MOU to see what is included in that document would help the ITF group determined potential measurements
 - 2. ***Kara will send the SWEEP MOU to the ITF***
 - ix. Bob added Enhanced Environment is one of the Core Values and encouraged the Project Team the stand behind that Core Values
 - 1. John K added he felt this effort would be part of the Success Factors, but would more likely be a part of a permit or an MOU
 - x. Matt G said that since the Forest Service isn't doing the NEPA, the EA process will be a bit different than the stipulations that they would typically outline. His hope is that the Project Team will put the effort to maintain or improve sediment removal efforts
 - 1. If the efforts are not improved or maintained, he felt it may kick this EA to an EIS, but it doesn't appear the Project Team desires to go down that road.
 - xi. Kara said that when the design options are being reviewed, the Core Values will be used extensively in looking at the options
 - xii. Joel added that FHWA's expectation is that the NEPA and CSS process is strictly followed for this project. He felt that this is a good project and the process is being followed with good stakeholder involvement so far.
- c. Karen thanked the group for their time and effort and contributions to today's meeting.