



REVISED MEETING NOTES

PROJECT:	21685 I-70 West Vail Pass Auxiliary Lanes
PURPOSE:	Section 106 Issue Task Force Meeting #2
DATE HELD:	October 30, 2019
LOCATION:	Conference Call
ATTENDING:	John Kronholm, Karen Berdoulay, Lisa Schoch, Dan Jepson (CDOT) Stephanie Gibson (FHWA) Jason O'Brien (SHPO) Chris Kulick (Town of Breckenridge) Dianna Litvak (Mead & Hunt) Kara Swanson (David Evans and Associates, Inc.)
COPIES:	Attendees and all Section 106 ITF members

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

1. Project Update

- a. Kara provided a project update using a presentation. (see PowerPoint)

2. Historic Section 106 Review/Update

- a. Sent out the determination of eligibility and finding of effects documentation to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and consulting parties (Lisa listed out consulting parties).
- b. SHPO concurred with determination of an adverse effect to the Vail Pass historic district. We will likely submit additional information as it become available regarding visual impacts and mitigation. Jason- visual impacts would be really good information for additional potential mitigation for historic. The latest submittal for consulting parties was on October 16. The 30 day review period will be up in mid-November.
- c. Lisa will be notifying the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) of adverse effect finding.

3. Mitigation Discussion

- a. Lisa stated that the completed Vail Pass context study will be included as mitigation for the adverse effects and that we will be doing a supplement to the Programmatic Agreement (PA) for mitigation. It's essentially a mini-Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and we still have to notify ACHP. This was the approach the Twin Tunnels projects used.
- b. Jason stated that he isn't familiar with the supplement process. Lisa said that the idea is that it's like an MOA- identifying additional or new mitigation. It still gets circulated to the consulting parties. It's a way to consistently tie each Mountain Corridor project back to the original PA.
- c. Another creative mitigation approach was mentioned- the Twin Tunnels projects also tried a radio broadcast about the history of an area. The I-70 Mountain Corridor



Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) Tier 1 mitigation included context, etc. and we've completed most of the upfront mitigation. Tier 2 mitigation wasn't defined in the PEIS/Record of Decision (ROD).

- d. The question of should we discuss other mitigation measures given this is such an important resource was asked and if CDOT has other ideas for mitigation. Lisa stated that we talked about the design and construction piece and how we design the project to fit with the original intent of the roadway design. The Vail Pass Context Study outlines what contributes to the corridor context and fulfills the requirements for mitigation but could do more during final design regarding aesthetics.
- e. John- it seems like the visual and historic mitigation are directly related. Lisa- yes, for example, designing/constructing understated bridges that mimic the original intent/design.
- f. Dianna- in the PA supplement, how would this be codified? Lisa said the Twin Tunnels PA supplement was a good example. We will want to make sure the PA supplement doesn't expire before construction. Will want to implement those elements in a timely fashion, but we need to know a little more about what we're doing in order to capture it in agreement.
- g. Crest of the Rockies aesthetics guidelines need to be incorporated into the mitigation.

4. Visual Resources Discussion

- a. Kara presented proposed impact locations. Stephanie and Jason said they look good. Lisa explained the new visual guidelines and the Area of Visual Effect (AVE) vs. Area of Potential Effect (APE). The intent is to use the data from the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) but it does not replace anything in Section 106.

5. Archaeology Update

- a. The work that was done in 2007 on a previous iteration of the project is going to be used for our submittal. Tom Fuller and Lindsey Johansson are good with that approach, based on Dan's conversations with them.
- b. Updated file search and went out in the field on October 17th to look at previously recorded sites, at least two of which were destroyed during original interstate construction in the 1970's. Only one eligible site- the Vail Pass Camp at the rest area, which won't be impacted during construction. Requesting concurrence with a finding of "No Historic Properties Affected"- CDOT will submit everything next week to SHPO.

6. Project Schedule

- a. Jason asked if the public outreach for the Environmental Assessment (EA) was also being used as the public outreach for the Section 106 process. Lisa and Stephanie clarified that typically the consulting party outreach serves as the public outreach for CDOT projects. There will be an additional opportunity to highlight some of the findings at the final public meeting. The Vail Pass highway segment is the primary



historic resource- people are catching up with the idea that transportation resources can be historic.

- b. Kara to work with Lisa and Dianna on times that work to meet with Will to incorporate historic considerations into the Visual Impact Assessment.
- c. Lisa- CDOT has completed visual assessments in the past that have looked at viewsheds, but have not used official VIA data before to help inform the Section 106 mitigation With Glenwood and Vail – how do you identify those components with the historic process? Region 1 did consultation on US 6 and SH 119 for the tunnel, but that project is a little different because it's narrower and the viewsheds aren't as expansive. Was helpful to show the pertinent viewsheds- what can you see? The VIA became a tool to help inform 106. How does the historic corridor relate to the visual assessment? The VIA identifies user groups- drivers, trail users, residents, etc. Some user groups may not related to the historic portion and the VIA includes more information than just those areas related to historic resources.