



MEETING NOTES

PROJECT:	21685 I-70 West Vail Pass Auxiliary Lanes
PURPOSE:	Technical Team (TT) Meeting #4
DATE HELD:	April 4, 2018
LOCATION:	Town of Edwards, 0025 Mill Loft Road
ATTENDING:	<p>Joel Barnett, FHWA</p> <p>Martha Miller, Program Engineer, CDOT Region 3</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>Matt Klein, US Forest Service (by phone)</p> <p>Ben Gerdes, Eagle County</p> <p>Greg Hall, Town of Vail</p> <p>Dick Cleveland, Representing Vail Town Council</p> <p>Tracy Sakaguchi, Colorado Motor Carriers Association</p> <p>Kevin Sharkey, ECO Trails</p> <p>John Stavney, NWCCOG</p> <p>Michelle Cowardin, Colorado Parks & Wildlife</p> <p>Sam Massman, US Forest Service</p> <p>Siri Roman, Eagle River Water & Sanitation District</p> <p>Shannon Anderson, Bicycle Colorado</p> <p>Alison Wadey, Vail Chamber & Business Association</p> <p>Pete Wadden, Town of Vail</p> <p>Scott Jones, Colorado Snowmobile Association</p> <p>Don Connors, Consultant Project Manager, Amec Foster Wheeler/Wood</p> <p>Kara Swanson, Consultant Environmental Task Lead, David Evans and Associates</p> <p>Matt Figgs, CDOT Region 3</p> <p>JJ Wierema, Consultant Roadway Designer, Amec Foster Wheeler/Wood</p>
COPIES:	TT Members, PLT Members, Attendees

Action items are shown in bold italics

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

1. Introductions & Agenda Review

- a. John Kronholm did introductions, covered the agenda, and described actions taken since the last Technical Team (TT) meeting and gave an update to the schedule and where TT #4 falls along the Environmental Assessment (EA) schedule
 - i. TT #4 will be the last meeting until mid-late June, where the Project Team will bring a list of alternatives that will be further evaluated
 - ii. There are still three Issue Task Force (ITF) meetings upcoming (*ALIVE*, *SWEEP*, and *Historic 106*) prior to the development of the alternatives



- iii. The Project Team held an Emergency Services ITF with attendees from several agencies
 - 1. John summarized the important points of that discussion at that meeting. The Project Team received feedback on their recommendations for the final alternative as well as for during construction
- iv. John K also informed the team that further discussions on utilizing US 6 as a detour options were held with FHWA
 - 1. Per Federal standards (4f regulations), the Project Team would need to prove that it is feasible and prudent to use the US 6 alignment as it is a 4f facility. This option has been eliminated as there are feasible and prudent constructability options that would not use US 6 as a detour.
- v. Greg asked how the alternatives impact the future Advanced Guideway System (AGS) alignment? He felt this is a question the Project Team should pursue as the PEIS stated future projects can not preclude an alignment of the AGS
 - 1. John replied that the Project Team will do more research on this and make sure it is included in the alternative discussion
 - 2. Tracy added that the Floyd Hill TT discussed showing a future AGS alignment as part of their alternatives in order to show that each alternative does not preclude an alignment. She added that that Project Team is not studying the location of the AGS, but making sure it is not precluded in the alternative development

2. Core Values

- a. JJ reminded the TT group of the Core Values and that all design options should be screened through these Core Values

3. Design Challenges in East Vail

- a. JJ explained some of the initial design challenges that exist for the section of West Vail Pass in East Vail including the close proximity to residences, bridges, landslides, walls, and campground and trail access
 - i. The intent of the project is to start the new auxiliary lane at the Eastbound (EB) on-ramp at the Mile Marker (MM) 180 interchange.
 - ii. JJ showed an example template of the auxiliary lane in East Vail and the potential impacts from that sample alignment
 - 1. Greg stated that the Town of Vail has talked to CDOT about the safety of the EB on-ramp at the MM 180 interchange and asked if the merge area would be looked at or taken away with the addition of the auxiliary lane
 - a. Don replied that the auxiliary lane should take the merge away, improving the safety of this on-ramp merge (the on-ramp would feed directly into the auxiliary lane, removing the need for a merge area)
 - 2. Greg asked if Pitkin creek was identified crossing underneath I-70. There is trail parking and a trailhead there that will need to be



considered by the Project Team as this was not identified in the slide. There was another creek on a secondary slide that was not identified. **The Project Team will be sure to ID all natural resources/waterways in the alternative analysis**

- iii. JJ also showed the concept of adding a 3rd lane could be done by constructing to the north so as not to push the interstate closer to the residences in East Vail
 1. This is just one concept and others could be considered, but it represents the initial thinking of Project Team
 2. JJ asked the TT for other considerations for East Vail
 - a. Greg pointed out there are a lot of springs coming out of the northern hillside that will need to be considered
- iv. JJ then spoke to the first major curves at the east end of East Vail. The EB bridge has substandard geometry, and both EB & Westbound (WB) directions have a high crash rate in that area.
 1. There is the potential to realign both of the bridges to improve the roadway geometry and build the bridges offline for constructability.
 2. There is also an option to realign the US 6 road underneath to shorten the span of the EB bridge
 3. JJ stated that this work could potentially be done within existing Right-of-Way (ROW) limits
 - a. Greg replied that the ROW of old highway 6 in this area may be the Town of Vail's and not CDOT's anymore, so there still would be ROW impacts with a realignment of this road
 - b. Greg asked where the path formally started compared to the roadway in relation to these structures and if this area will be considered as part of the 4f analysis?
 - i. John K replied that where the section of US 6 was deeded to Town of Vail could be where the start of that trail could start
 - ii. Sam stated the Forest Service considered the gate past the campground the start of the path
 - iii. Kara added that even a facility that is used for vehicular travel but is designated as a recreational path would be considered a 4f resource
 - iv. Joel stated that the Project Team will need to firmly establish these boundaries
 - v. The group discussed how exactly to determine this as it is not straightforward. **The Project Team will need to do more research to determine these limits**

4. Noise

- a. Kara stated that she had sent out the noise work plan for the TT's review ahead of the meeting. This work plan covers the noise study plan in far more detail than will be covered during this TT meeting



- i. The workplan has been approved by CDOT. It identified receptors for measurements that will be taken by the Project Team
 - ii. John K asked how it was determined where those measurements would be taken
 1. Kara replied that it is within 500 feet of interstate as beyond that the measurements do not help with the noise model
 - iii. The Project Team will take measurements after the snow melts later in the spring to create the noise model
 1. A preferred alternative can then be put into the model (as well as a no decision alternative) to see what noise impacts will result
- b. Kara covered how the Project Team will determine if an alternative has a noise impact
- i. Greg clarified that it would take an increase of 10 decibels (dBs) over the threshold to trigger impacts and potential mitigation
 - ii. Kara added that if an impact is determined, noise mitigation has to be determined to be reasonable and feasible. If it is determined to be both, a vote of the benefitting receptors who have a choice to approve or deny it will take place
 - iii. John Stavney asked if anecdotal opinions of the East Vail residents can be considered (especially if there is a big desire for noise mitigation) but the data doesn't back up the need for a study
 1. Kara replied from the FHWA standards, mitigation would not be required if data doesn't support the need for it
 2. Martha added that noise policies for CDOT have changed over the past few years. This project has triggered a noise study so it will be studied
 3. Greg asked if the noise study does not meet the 10 dB increase threshold with the current traffic volumes, could the Project Team compare projected traffic to the volumes outlined in the original I-70 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
 - a. Joel replied that the East Vail neighborhoods came after the interstate, therefore the threshold wouldn't be retroactive
 - b. Greg added that noise will be a big issue for East Vail residents as there is a large group of residents that will want mitigation
 - c. Martha stated that her suggestion will be to further research these considerations to make sure the right policies are being followed
 - d. Karen added that it is important that the Project Team knows the plan of action and gets buy-in from the TT so it is very clear what the requirements and thresholds will be based upon
 - e. ***Kara will dig into the old EIS to see how noise was covered.***
 - f. Joel added that the Project Team will not go back and revisit the noise levels for the 1974 EIS. The Project Team will look at noise levels currently and build the model off of today's levels and the projections from today



- g. Kara added the Project Team's noise specialist will be heavily involved with the process.
- h. Greg stated the I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic EIS (PEIS) wanted to address "taking care of past sins" with the initial construction of the interstate and improve upon past environmental impacts in any future projects
- i. John S stated that this is going to be a very big topic as this project continues to be in the public more and the Project Team needs a solid plan on how this will be handled
- j. Martha asked if there are any projects on the I-70 corridor that have been successful using federal funds to construct noise mitigation where the thresholds are not met
 - i. The TT did not have any examples of this scenario
- k. David asked if the noise study will make projections into the future for consideration
 - i. Joel responded that those projections will be made using an established methodology.
 - ii. Kara added the Project Team has a traffic engineer that will determine those traffic projections (based on current volumes and growth factors) and feed those to the noise specialists (i.e. noise specialists will not do traffic projections)
- l. Kara added that it is good for the Project Team to know what was done as part of the original EIS and any other noise studies that have been completed with noise studies. FHWA concurred to this approach

5. Trail

- a. JJ presented some statistics on the trail usage on the Vail Pass trail from fall 2014 to fall 2015
 - i. There were about 40,000 bikes total, and 3,500 bikes/day on peak usage days in the summer
 - 1. Greg asked if the counter was on the actual trail or on US 6 while it was still the roadway
 - 2. Kara replied it was on the trail at MM 185.3 which is close to where the trail crosses under I-70 on the old 20 feet wide section
- b. JJ talked about the guidelines from the Crest of the Rockies trail segment
 - i. He reminded the group that this project is not a trail project and the scope of work is not to improve the trail, but it will be reconstructed where it is impacted by the roadway construction
- c. JJ covered some different trail design criteria parameters from AASHTO (the American Associate of State Highway & Transportation Officials)
 - i. He added it will be difficult to hit the maximum grade requirements as the maximum existing grade on the trail is over 10% currently vs a 5% maximum in the AASHTO design requirements



- d. JJ spoke to the two main sections of the trail for the purposes of this meeting. The lower section of trail is the old US 6 and is 20 feet wide, while the upper section of trail refers to the section that is 10 feet wide
- e. The lower trail will be impacted in some locations, but not very much (especially since using US 6 as a detour was eliminated due to 4f considerations). JJ showed one such area of impact and gave an example of how the Project Team could mitigate the impacts prior to roadway construction and ensure the trail is open during construction
 - i. Greg asked if any mitigation would be built back to 20 feet wide
 - ii. JJ replied that the Project Team will be looking at this, and 4f requirements state the trail would need to go back as good as or better than it was, so it probably will be 20 feet wide
 - iii. John S asked how the section of trail under the bridge will be handled during construction
 - 1. Sam added that the Two Elks trail will need to be looked at for this same consideration as it also crosses under a bridge
 - 2. John K added the Project Team's intent is to minimize closures of trail
 - 3. Matt Figgs added that as the future structure type is still unknown, the exact impacts to the trail is unknown, but Project Team will look at this in design
 - 4. Greg added that the old US 6 does get used for heavy tows or emergency access, so it needs to stay at 20 feet wide
- f. JJ then focused on the upper section of trail. It varies from attached to the interstate to on the sideslope to totally separated from the interstate. Not all of the upper trail will be impacted by roadway widening, but most of it will be
 - i. JJ presented 5 different examples of what could be done to the upper trail where it is impacted
 - 1. Place adjacent to I-70
 - a. This is not a popular design idea
 - b. Dick added that this makes it subject to washout and there will be significant sand and water treatment that will be needed with this option
 - c. Martha added that the sand and drainage considerations will be needed to be evaluated for the entire corridor
 - d. Karen stated that this is a con for long term maintenance
 - e. John S added that a pro for this option would be that it could help in the collection of traction sand, although it is not the best option for bikers. Another positive would be the smaller environmental footprint
 - i. Karen added that sediment collection could be improved with a paved section next to the interstate, but it could present an unsafe situation for bikers.
 - f. Dick added that the current segment of trail adjacent to I-70 is used by breakdown vehicles so a concrete barrier would be necessary



- c. Greg asked if the Project Team talked about the trail with the Emergency Service ITF, especially in regards to their rescue for users down the slope on the 10 foot section of the trail, and if there was a preference on width for their access
 - i. John K replied the Project Team did discuss the trail being potentially used as a detour (which has sense been eliminated from consideration), but this question was not brought up with that ITF
- d. Scott added that there is a significant amount of traffic that mistakenly uses the MM 190 off-ramp (especially recreation users), so terminating a 3rd lane at the off ramp may add to the confusion
 - i. John S added that as that section is still uphill and trucks would be in that lane, the Project Team should consider taking the 3rd lane under the underpass (similar to WB I-70 at Floyd Hill). The same issue wouldn't exist for the WB direction at the bottom of the corridor at MM 180, but it needs to be evaluated here
- e. Pete asked how close the toe of slope comes to Gore Creek
 - i. JJ wasn't sure as it was too early in design to determine this. A wall may be needed at that toe to keep the fill out of the creek
- f. Karen added that from past experience, it is hard to revegetate those steep slopes
- g. Sam added that it is more desirable the further away a user gets from the road as it leads to a more enjoyable experience
- h. Michelle added the impacts to wildlife will need to be looked at as this is not a wilderness experience for the user, so the Team shouldn't feel the need to push the trail too far to the south
- i. Greg added there could be an option to hold the south edge of the interstate and widen entirely to the north, reducing any impacts to the trail at all
- j. John S added that there are sections of the fill slopes that have never revegetated due to traction sand and there are gullies and washouts down sections of the existing slope. The goal should be to eliminate areas of revegetation where possible to prevent this in the future state
 - i. Karen replied that the Project Team wants a better drainage and traction sand collection system, so the need to revegetate wouldn't be a fatal flaw
- k. Sam asked if this option would help with traction sand removal
 - i. Karen added her goal is to get a traction sand capture system closer to the interstate so the trail would not be needed for sand removal



- ii. Greg added that a lot of sand does get thrown far away from road, so containment right at road may not capture all the sand and secondary containment may be needed
- 3. Use of Retaining Walls
 - a. There are various possibilities on the location of the trail in this option (notch trail into sideslope, retain fillslope from widening and leave trail in place, etc.)
 - b. John S added that having a wall next to the trail gives a negative biker experience (similar to Glenwood Canyon)
 - i. Martha added that this option is also a safety concern with a narrow width and handlebars next to walls
 - ii. The TT group discussed the closeness of the walls in Glenwood Canyon and how that would not be safe and feel uncomfortable on West Vail Pass (especially with the very steep grades). A wider path or a shoulder with more separation from a wall would be needed.
 - 1. The steep grades on West Vail Pass lead to high speeds downhill. That direction of travel would be closest to the potential wall. This could result in a fast rider passing others by moving into the riding space of the slow moving uphill rider
 - iii. Dick added that there is a segment between Grand Junction and Fruita where there is a wall adjacent to a new trail. There is more separation and a better user feel than Glenwood Canyon, but it is still not a great user experience
 - iv. Greg asked if the Team could install a mid-slope wall
 - 1. JJ replied it is possible and could be looked at
 - v. Scott added that snow removal next to the walls needs to be considered as this could be very difficult. Width would be needed for plowing and snow storage.
 - c. Michelle added that a wall option may be an impedance to wildlife passage
- 4. North or South of Black Gore Creek (2 options discussed together)
 - a. This option would relocate the trail closer to the bottom of the valley and close to Black Gore Creek
 - b. John S stated this is a bigger disturbance to existing green areas
 - c. Pete added that although it is a better user experience, it would have a bigger impact to the creek. If this option is selected, the Team might as well move it to the south side of the creek to make it the best user experience. He thought



- any option next to the creek would impact it negatively as users will go down to it, let dog investigate it, etc.
- d. Greg added that while the Project Team wouldn't want to impact riparian area, it could enhance it in ways with this option
 - e. Michelle added that Colorado Parks & Wildlife (CPW) would want to further evaluate the wildlife impacts from this option. It would not just be for disturbance of pristine areas, but for impacting movement of animals in area
 - f. John S added that it would be worth for the Project Team to look at if the benefits of improving the riparian habitat by sand removal and if it would be a big enough benefit to the creek that it would outweigh negative impacts by moving the trail closer to the creek
 - i. Greg stated that there are sections of sand that are significantly impacting the creek so this may be a good evaluation to perform
 - ii. He also stated that a best alignment may need to cross the creek in a couple of places as the design is done as the Project Team may not be able to just pick one side of the creek and stay on it
 - iii. John K replied that this will need to be looked at during the alternative development
 - g. Siri added that the Project Team needs to make design decisions keeping the Core Values in mind. This consideration is critical as it may not be possible to come up with just one answer for the whole corridor, but it might be a combination of options. These specific design locations should be developed with those Core Values in mind
 - h. Sam asked if the Project Team would add a Purpose & Need statement for the bike path as it could help steer design decisions for the path. He also encouraged the Project Team to see what zone of the Forest Plan this path falls under and what the Forest Plan describes as goals for this area if the relocation gets outside existing ROW lines.
 - i. John K informed the group that as this is not a trail project, a separate Purpose & Need will not be developed, but the Core Values will be used to weigh the pros and cons of the design options for sections of trail impacted by interstate widening
 - i. Joel added that the trail will not be an alternative to meet the Purpose & Need of the Environmental Assessment (EA) document, it will be a net benefit that comes out of the result of adding a 3rd lane (a mitigation as a result of work that meets the Purpose & Need)
 - i. He added that the Team doesn't want to run into fatal flaws when determining the trail realignment, and needs to make sure this meets Core Values and not



contrast with the Forest Plan, but it is not the Purpose & Need of this project

- j. John S added that there is a lot of work that has been done independently by groups such as the Forest Service and ERWSD to improve the health of the creek, and this project's design options will be weighed against those local efforts
- k. Scott added that the Forest Plan appears to show the trail as designated for motorized use
- l. Greg added that as recreation is an economic driver, the environmental impacts can't be the only thing considered in the alignment of the trail, especially with the apparent Forest Service designation of the use of this area
- m. John S asked if moving the trail would be a selling point and could open up recreation opportunities with a better user experience and then could open up more winter use of the trail
 - i. Pete added that added recreation would be a larger environmental impact
 - ii. Sam added that a changed use pattern could impact lynx in the area
- n. Shannon stated that she feels this option could be a beautiful user experience
- o. Michelle asked if flooding of the trail could take place in this option
 - i. JJ replied that flooding and damage to the trail and debris lodging under potential bridges could all occur
 - ii. Don added a bridge could be designed to clear flood elevations, and bridges may be cheaper than large and long walls.
 - iii. John K added that the cost of walls will be a big consideration
- p. JJ added that placing the trail next to the creek may make it harder to chase the grade back to the existing trails tie-ins, maybe even increasing the amount of disturbance from this option

6. Recreation

- a. Kara showed a slide identifying the recreation resources in the corridor. At the past TT meeting, FHWA mentioned that recreation resources need to be looked at for impacts and mitigation as part of the NEPA process
 - i. She added that the old US 6 is considered a historic resource in addition to a recreational facility
 - 1. More research is going into this as it was a transportation facility. It is an identified historic 4f resources and the Project Team is still determining if it is a recreational 4f facility.
 - 2. Kevin asked if the trail could be relocated if it was a historic 4f facility but not a recreational 4f facility



- a. Kara replied it is easier to relocate if it is just a historical 4f facility than if it was a 4f recreational facility
3. Sam asked if the trail is designated as a recreational facility as part of the Vail Pass recreational area, then would it automatically be a 4f recreation facility. ***Sam will send the boundaries of this designated recreational area to the Project Team for their review.***
- b. Kara discussed what 4f designations require of a project impacting those resources as shown in the slides for this section.
 - i. She also covered the definitions of feasible and prudent in regards to the relocation of a 4f facility and how those definitions helped guide the Project Team to eliminate the use of old US 6 as a detour
 - ii. There will be a historic 4f evaluation of I-70 as that is considered historic as well
- c. John K asked group if there was any other discussion wanted in regards to recreation as part of this TT meeting
 - i. Scott stated he has appreciated CDOT's and Forest Service's field meeting to discuss recreation further. He would like to see images of potential impacts of the 3rd lane at the top of the pass
 - ii. Sam added that the primary portal to recreation on Vail Pass is at the MM 190 interchange and the Forest Service, CDOT, and ERWSD share these facilities for roadway users, rest area users, and recreation users.
 1. Users of the winter recreation area has doubled in past few years to 50,000 users and the Forest Service has seen some similarities to the growth and use of the Hanging Lake exit and trailhead in Glenwood Canyon. He stated there are opportunities for this project to design parking areas and traffic flow for the recreation and rest area that will be an improvement
 2. John S added that the recreation use of Vail Pass from Redcliff using Shrine Pass road is a big economic benefit to the Town of Redcliff and should be considered. This town doesn't have many economic drivers, but the winter use of the pass is one of their bigger drivers
 - iii. Scott said users have stated that the recreational use of the pass was not thought out when the original alignment of I-70 was constructed. This could be an opportunity to improve upon mistakes of the past
 - iv. John S added that there are areas that hunters park (mostly on the east side of Vail Pass, but some on west side too) and it is a significant recreation use that should be considered
 1. Greg added that those areas that are good for parking would be good staging areas in construction and then could be improved upon for safer parking for hunters
 2. John S added that State Patrol (CSP) doesn't enforce parking restrictions for those hunters
 3. Joel added that FHWA does not approve of vehicles parking off of and accessing recreation via the interstate



- v. Michelle stated that the Forest Service should decide if they want to improve recreational areas on the pass, increasing users of this area, and if the resource can handle the increased use
 - 1. Sam replied that the Forest Service doesn't know what their standpoint on this is yet. The Forest Service doesn't want to lose parking and would like to improve the flow of traffic between recreation users and rest area users, but Sam didn't feel the Forest Service is at the point to make a determination as to how they'd like to see the recreation use of this area change
 - 2. Karen added that the Project Team's challenge for this project is that there is a stated Purpose & Need for the project, and although there are issues all around the project that the project will touch, there are constraints as to what this project can accomplish. These other improvements could be accomplished either via a parallel project or future projects
 - a. Greg added there are opportunities with strategic construction staging areas that could be cleaned up and translated into recreation opportunities
 - b. John K replied this is a good point as temporary construction impacts will need to be evaluated as part of the NEPA process
- vi. Scott stated that for the overall magnitude of cost of the project, a small investment of funding to the interchange could make vast recreation impacts
- vii. John S asked if the Forest Service could use the opportunity of this project to look for additional parking opportunities or study the parking flows or change how users access the forest
 - 1. Sam replied it could be looked at and the Forest Service will have to determine if this is a priority, especially if there is an opportunity to include improvements as part of this project. They could do user studies in the area similar to what is taking place at the Maroon Bells

7. Next Steps

- a. Greg asked if the Project Team would consider planning a field trip to the pass to look at specific issues, especially as alternatives are developed
 - i. The Project Team replied that this is a good idea and should be considered
- b. John K added that there are 3 ITFs upcoming and the Project Team is not planning to present to the TT until the Level 1 alternative screening (before alternatives are ranked).
 - i. Karen added there will be a second stage of alternative screening where those alternatives are ranked, then Project Team will go back to TT after the Level 2 screening
- c. Greg asked how involved CDOT Maintenance has been with the process and how the Project Team has been receiving their input
 - i. John K added that although they work for CDOT, they are a major stakeholder as they maintain the pass. The Project Team has invited them to



- be a part of TT and has independently reached out to talk to them and receive their input
- d. Tracy asked if alternatives will include designs on runaway truck ramps and any potential improvements on those
 - i. John K replied that there will be design options presented, but the preferred alternative will not be a final design. The Project Team has received a lot of feedback on the issues at those ramps and they will be covered as part of the alternatives and design option discussions
 - ii. Kara added that the EA will address how the existing ramps would be impacted and locations of potential ramps would be part of the EA document
 - e. Michelle asked if the Project Team has a master calendar that could be shared especially with the upcoming ITFs, and if CPW could have access to that
 - i. ***The Project Team replied that they will look at what can be done to make sure whole group has all of the upcoming meetings on their calendars***
 - f. Karen asked the group if there were any other topics the Project Team should vet with the TT prior to developing the alternatives
 - i. John S stated that tunneling should be considered as it hasn't really been discussed at the TT meetings. Not just shorter segments of tunnels, but big picture opportunities to eliminate the pass (in whole or in portion) with a tunnel. There could be big benefits to safety and maintenance costs with a long tunnel
 1. John K replied that there was a big picture study with the original Vail Pass EIS that included tunneling options. Those options were eliminated due to the wilderness boundaries in this area
 2. Kara added that the PEIS looked at areas of tunneling and that Vail Pass was not considered
 3. Greg asked if a developer or contractor proposed building a tunnel from Dowd Junction to MM 184 (or somewhere else just East of the Town of Vail) would the Project Team not preclude building that tunnel with the preferred alternative. These discussions have taken place in the past so they could be a real possibility in the future in his opinion
 - a. John K stated that the Project Team would handle this just like on any other project with private development opportunities and it would not be considered as part of the alternative development
 - ii. Sam asked if wildlife crossings (and specifically an overpass) will be discussed
 1. John stated the last study identified the best location of that overpass at MM 192.3 (outside project limits), but the ALIVE ITF will discuss wildlife permeability
 2. Michelle concurred with John's comment