



***I-70 Silverthorne/Dillon Interchange Project  
PLT Meeting Minutes***

10/21/2010, 1-3:30 PM  
Silverthorne Town Hall, Large Meeting Room

**Meeting Participants**

*PLT Members:*

Bill Linfield, Town of Silverthorne  
Bill Scheuerman, CDOT Resident Engineer  
Eric Holgerson, Dillon Public Works Director  
Peggy Long, Business Community  
R.A. Plummer, AECOM  
Scott McDaniel, CDOT West Program Engineer  
Steve Swanson, Blue River Watershed Group  
Tyler Weldon, CDOT PM  
Wendy Wallach, CDOT Environmental Lead

*Consultant Team Members:*

Alan Eckman, AECOM  
Megan Alderton, Intermountain Corporate Affairs  
Tom Schilling, Intermountain Corporate Affairs

**1. DISCUSSION**

R.A. Plummer began the meeting and briefly reviewed the purpose of the meeting and the meeting agenda.

**Old Business:**

R.A. reviewed action items from the September 27<sup>th</sup> PLT meeting and noted that September 27<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes and a revised Stakeholder Involvement Plan had been sent for PLT review. All PLT members said that they had reviewed the documents and agreed that both documents were satisfactory. The Initial Stakeholder Database was not sent out with the Stakeholder Involvement Plan. Megan Alderton promised to send the revised database for review the evening of October 21<sup>st</sup>. Bill Linfield provided Megan a contact for Qwest. Bill Scheuerman will send Megan a list of CDOT contacts for inclusion.

**Chartering Agreement:**

Tom Schilling provided an overview of the PLT Chartering Agreement, which was distributed to the PLT on Monday, October 18<sup>th</sup>. Wendy Wallach noted that she had some minor edits and



suggested that the first “possible” be removed from the goal referring to the Advanced Guideway System. The PLT agreed that the goal will now read: *To include, consider, or not preclude future transit improvements – including an Advanced Guideway System alignment and possible transit station.* Present PLT members signed a signature page for the PLT Chartering Agreement. Signatures from Thad Noll and Melinda Urban are pending.

**Project and Schedule Update:**

R.A. gave an overview of upcoming activities – including agency, business, and NGO meetings and elected official briefings – building up to the November 15<sup>th</sup> public open house. Tom explained that the intent of the outreach effort is to inform NGOs, the agencies, and the business community, and to listen to these entities and the public and hear their issues and input into criteria. Tom then provided an overview of the Launch Phase Meeting Schedule. Eric Holgerson noted that the meeting location on the meeting schedule document should be changed for the upcoming Dillon Town Council meeting.

Invitations to the business group and agency meetings were sent out on October 13<sup>th</sup>. Peggy Long mentioned that she did not recall having received an invitation to her business for the business meeting. Scott McDaniel suggested that the public involvement team do some follow up with invitees. Bill Linfield suggested Ryan Hyland, Silverthorne’s Assistant Town Manager, may send an e-mail version of the invitation to his business community contact list, as well as post the invitation to the town’s website – to which Ryan agreed. Eric offered to do the same for the Town of Dillon. Megan promised to send Eric and Ryan an electronic version of the postcard for distribution.

**Study Area:**

Alan Eckman provided an overview of the study area, which was revised to address mobility and access concerns presented by the PLT following the September 27<sup>th</sup> PLT meeting. The group agreed that the study area should be expanded on I-70 up to the crest of the hill west of the interchange to allow for a greater range of alternatives – including a split diamond.

**Evaluation Criteria Exercise:**

R.A. introduced the Evaluation Criteria Exercise, in which the PLT broke out into two small groups to review and provide project-specific input into the Context Sensitive Solutions Evaluation Criteria. (Notes from this exercise are included as an appendix to this document.) Following this exercise, the project team will revise the criteria to reflect the PLT’s input and will send the revised criteria out for comment prior to the next PLT meeting. R.A. noted that he would like to convene a conference call prior to the next PLT meeting to discuss the criteria and ensure that the criteria are 80-90 percent complete prior to the November 15<sup>th</sup> public open house.



**Next Meeting (NOTE NEW LOCATION AND DAY OF THE WEEK):**

The next PLT meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 10<sup>th</sup>, from 1-3:30 p.m. at the Summit County Library North Branch, 651 Center Dr., Silverthorne.

**2. ACTION ITEMS**

- Tom will revise the PLT Chartering Agreement.
- Megan will send the revised Initial Stakeholder List.
- Bill Scheuerman will send Megan a list of CDOT contacts for the Initial Stakeholder List.
- Megan will send electronic business community meeting invitations to Ryan and Eric.
- Ryan and Eric will send e-mails to business contacts notifying them of the business meeting, and will also post the meeting to town websites.
- AECOM will expand the study area to the crest of the hill.
- The project team will send revised criteria for PLT review, and will schedule a conference call to discuss the criteria prior to the November PLT meeting.
- Megan and Tom will get signatures from Melinda and Thad for the PLT Chartering Agreement.
- Tom will change the address for the Dillon Town Council meeting on the Launch Phase Meeting Schedule to: Ptarmigan Best Western, 652 Lake Dillon Dr, Dillon.
- The following documents will be uploaded to the FTP site:
  - PLT Roster
  - Finalized Stakeholder Involvement Plan and Initial Stakeholder List
  - PLT Charter
  - Finalized minutes from the 9-27 PLT meeting
  - Finalized minutes from the 10-21 PLT meeting (by 10-28)

*Minutes prepared by: M. Alderton, 10/22/10*

*Last Rev: 10/22/10*

## ACTION ITEM UPDATE

(From 10-21-10 PLT Meeting)

ACTION ITEM	Responsible	Status	Comments
Tom Schilling will revise the PLT Chartering Agreement.	Tom Schilling	Complete	The Chartering Agreement has been finalized and posted to the SharePoint site.
Megan Alderton will send the revised stakeholder list.	Megan Alderton	Complete	Sent 10-21 (PM)
Bill Scheuerman will provide Megan Alderton a list of CDOT stakeholder contacts.	Bill Scheuerman	Outstanding	
Megan Alderton will send the electronic Business Community Meeting invitations to Ryan Hyland and Eric Holgerson.	Megan Alderton	Complete	Sent 10-22-10
AECOM will expand the study area to the crest of the hill.	Alan Eckman	Complete	
The project team will send revised criteria for PLT review.	Project Team	Complete	Revised criteria (based on criteria exercise performed at 10-21 PLT meeting) were sent to the PLT with draft minutes 10-27. New criteria will be e-mailed by 11-8 for discussion 11-10.
InterMountain will obtain signatures from Melinda Urban and Thad Noll.	Megan Alderton and Tom Schilling	Complete	Obtained 10-28
Tom Schilling will send the PLT notification of the address change for the 11-10 PLT Meeting.	Tom Schilling	Complete	The 11-10 meeting will be held at the Ptarmigan Best Western, 652 Lake Dillon Dr., Dillon.
The following documents will be uploaded to the SharePoint site: PLT roster, finalized PLT Chartering Agreement, finalized Stakeholder Involvement Plan and Initial Stakeholder List, Meeting Minutes.	Megan Alderton	Complete	Uploaded 10-29

I-70 Silverthorne/Dillon Interchange Project  
 Project Leadership Team Initial Criteria Recommendations  
 October 21, 2010

Feasibility-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?
<b>Sustainability</b>	
<del>A.</del> <u>Is the alternative compatible with local sustainability plans?</u>	A. (YES/NO)
<del>B.</del> <u>A.</u> <u>Is the alternative compatible with the State of Colorado Climate Action Plan?</u>	B. (YES/NO)
<del>C.</del> <u>B.</u> <u>Does this alternative preserve future transportation options?</u>	C. (YES/NO)
<b>Safety</b>	
A. Can this idea improve safety?	A. (YES/NO)

Concept-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?
<b>Sustainability</b>	
<del>A.</del> <u>How compatible is the alternative with local sustainability plans?</u>	A. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
<del>B.</del> <u>A.</u> <u>How compatible is the alternative with the State of Colorado Climate Action Plan?</u>	B. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
<del>C.</del> <u>B.</u> <u>How well does this alternative reduce maintenance costs?</u>	C. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
<del>C.</del> <u>What is the capital cost of this alternative?</u>	D. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (LOW/MEDIUM/HIGH)
<del>D.</del> <u>How well can the alternative integrate best management practices?</u>	
<b>Safety</b>	
A. How well does the alternative reduce the number of or improve <u>higher than expected crashhazardous</u> locations?	A. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
<del>B.</del> <u>How well does alternative follow current design standards?</u>	B. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
<del>C.</del> <u>How well does the alternative maintain a safe work environment for maintenance employees? Group 1</u>	

Detailed-Level Evaluation	
Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?
<b>Sustainability</b>	
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation.	A. Capital cost of the alternative (\$)
The sustainability criteria will help determine how well an alternative creates a solution for today that does not diminish resources for future generations.	<del>B.</del> <u>Operations and maintenance costs of the alternative (\$)</u>
	<del>C.</del> <u>Is it possible to use phasing of project to increase longevity of existing infrastructure?</u>
	<del>D.</del> <u>Will phasing result in better utilization of fiscal resources?</u>
	<del>E.</del> <u>Use of recycled resources (concrete)</u>
	<del>B.</del> <u>F.</u> <u>Energy use</u>
<b>Safety</b>	
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation.	A. Number of improved high-accident locations
The safety criteria will help determine how well an alternative is able to enhance safety in the I-70 Mountain Corridor.	<del>B.</del> <u>Number of ALIVE MOU recommendations implemented</u>
	<del>C.</del> <u>Number of bike/ped conflict points</u>
	<del>B.</del> <u>D.</u> <u>How does it work in inclement weather?</u>
	<del>C.</del> <u>Number of improved rock slide and avalanche areas</u>

I-70 Silverthorne/Dillon Interchange Project  
 Project Leadership Team Initial Criteria Recommendations  
 October 21, 2010

Feasibility-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?
<b>Healthy Environment</b>	
A. Can adverse environmental impacts be avoided, minimized, or mitigated?	A. (YES/NO)
B. Can impacts to irreplaceable natural resources (e.g., wetlands, fens or Gold Medal Fisheries) be avoided?	B. (YES/NO)
B-C. Can BMPs be accommodated?	

Concept-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?
<b>Healthy Environment</b>	
D. How well does the alternative reduce conflict points? Group 1	
A. How well can adverse environmental impacts be avoided, minimized, or mitigated?	a. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
B. How well can adverse environmental impacts be minimized?	b. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
C. How well can adverse environmental impacts be mitigated?	c. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
D-B. How well does the alternative minimize right of way requirements built within the existing right-of-way?	d. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (YES/SOMEWHAT/NO)
E-C. How well does the alternative address water quality contribute toward local watershed initiatives?	e. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
F-D. How well does the alternative contribute toward the SWEEP MOU goals?	f. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
E. How well does the alternative contribute toward the ALIVE MOU goals?	g. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
F. How well does the alternative avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to wetlands?	

Detailed-Level Evaluation	
Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?
<b>Healthy Environment</b>	
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation.	
The healthy environment criteria will help determine how well an alternative is able to preserve, restore, and enhance natural resources and ecosystems.	
The healthy environment criteria are a proxy for the overall goal of avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts. For example, a significant increase in acres of new right-of-way impacted indicates that more biological resources may be impacted. These impacts could be mitigated, however, if a solution provides the same access and mobility with significantly fewer acres of new right-of-way. This may be a solution that minimizes or even avoids impacts to biological resources. Some measures, such as hours of LOS C per day, indicate environmental goals for improved noise levels.	
	<b>Biological Resources</b> A. Acres of riparian habitat disturbed B. Total acres of new right-of-way. Of the new right-of-way: • Number of acres of impact to indicator species habitat • Number of acres of native vegetation • Number of acres of 6f • Number of acres of 4f • Number of acres of already disturbed land • Number of acres of wetlands C. Number of ALIVE MOU recommendations implemented  <b>Air Quality</b> A. Hours of delay at signalized intersections B. Fuel savings? Group 1 A-C. Pounds of nox? Group 1  <b>Noise</b> A. Hours of LOS C per day A-B. Number of sensitive

Formatted: List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering

I-70 Silverthorne/Dillon Interchange Project  
 Project Leadership Team Initial Criteria Recommendations  
 October 21, 2010

Feasibility-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?

Concept-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?
<p><u>G. How well does the alternative avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to the Gold Medal Fisheries?</u></p> <p><u>H. How does it affect recreational resources?</u></p> <p><u>I. How well can adverse community impacts avoided/mitigated?</u></p>	

Detailed-Level Evaluation	
Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?
	<p><u>receptors impacted?</u></p> <p><u>Mine Waste</u>  <u>A. Cubic yards of disturbed mine waste</u></p> <p><u>Threatened and Endangered Species</u>  <u>A. Number of acres of T&amp;E habitat and fishery?</u>  <u>A-B. Does it change wildlife migration patterns?</u>  <u>B-C. Number of new habitat connections</u></p> <p><u>Water Resources</u>  <u>A. Number of SWEEP MOU goals advanced</u>  <u>B. Enough space to accommodate water quality features? Group 1</u>  <u>C. Does it improve sediment control?</u>  <u>A. —</u></p> <p><u>Wetlands</u>  <u>D. Number of acres of wetlands impacted (Straight Creek and Blue River quality of wetlands to be noted).</u>  <u>A. —</u></p> <p><u>Recreation Resources</u>  <u>A. Number of acres of recreation resources impacts. Including:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of acres of 4f</li> <li>• Number of acres of 6f</li> <li>• Number of acres of publicly owned lands</li> <li>• Number of acres of</li> </ul> </p>

DRAFT



Formatted: No bullets or numbering  
 Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25"

I-70 Silverthorne/Dillon Interchange Project  
 Project Leadership Team Initial Criteria Recommendations  
 October 21, 2010

Feasibility-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?
<b>Historic Context</b>	
A. Can impacts to <u>historic resource</u> <u>tribal and archaeological resources</u> be avoided, minimized, or mitigated?	A. (YES/NO)
<b>Communities</b>	
A. Is the alternative compatible with local land use plans? B. Does the alternative disproportionately impact low-income or minority communities? C. Does the alternative have adverse effects on local businesses? D. Does the alternative serve as a gateway to the area, providing good identity for local communities? A-E. Does the alternative have support from the business community?	A. (YES/NO)

Concept-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?
<b>Historic Context</b>	
B. How well can impacts to <u>tribal and archaeological resources</u> be avoided, minimized, or mitigated? A. How well does the alternative support the <u>communities' investments in and goals for historic resources</u> ?	A. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)  B. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
B. How compatible is the alternative with adopted <u>heritage tourism plans</u> ?	
<b>Communities</b>	
A. What is the level of community support? B. How compatible is the alternative with adopted local land use plans? B-C. How compatible is the alternative with local <u>comprehensive plans</u> ? C-D. Are impacts to <u>community resources</u> irresolvable?	A. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)  B. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)

Detailed-Level Evaluation	
Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?
	streams
<b>Historic Context</b>	
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation.  The historic context criteria will help determine how well an alternative contributes to and is compatible with the human-made past that creates the corridor's sense of place and is the foundation of the corridor's character.	A. Number of potentially eligible historic properties impacted B. Number of <u>tribal resources impacted</u> A-C. Number of <u>archaeological resources impacted</u>
<b>Communities</b>	
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation.  The criteria related to communities will help determine how well an alternative respects the individuality of communities and promotes their viability.	A. How well does this alternative support current and ongoing economic investments in the community? (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)  B. How well is this alternative supported by the community? (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)  C. Number of <u>businesses directly/indirectly impacted Group 1</u>  D. Number of <u>homes</u>

Comment [TS1]: Group 2 removed 2 as well

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering

I-70 Silverthorne/Dillon Interchange Project  
 Project Leadership Team Initial Criteria Recommendations  
 October 21, 2010

Feasibility-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?
<b>Mobility and Accessibility</b>	
A. Does the alternative improve mobility?	A. (YES/NO)
B. Is this alternative compatible with the existing and planned transportation system?	B. (YES/NO)
C. Does this alternative provide access for local trips?	C. (YES/NO)
D. Does this alternative provide for regional mobility?	D. (YES/NO)
<u>A. Does this alternative improve multi-modal connectivity? Group 1</u>	
<b>Aesthetics</b>	
No specific aesthetics criteria are used to evaluate alternatives at the feasibility level.	

Concept-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?
<b>Mobility and Accessibility</b>	
<del>A-B.</del> How well does the alternative improve mobility?	A. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
<del>B-C.</del> How well does the alternative <u>eliminate barriers to non-motorized mobility</u> <u>address off-highway local access traffic</u> ?	B. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
<del>C-D.</del> How well does the alternative address cut-through traffic?	C. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
<del>How well does the alternative promote efficient freight movement?</del>	D. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)
<u>E. How well does the alternative accommodate existing/future transit?</u>	
<u>F. How well does the alternative accommodate bike/ped (multi-modal) mobility?</u>	
<b>Aesthetics</b>	
A. How consistent is the alternative with the <u>I-70 CSS</u> Aesthetic Guidance?	A. <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> (GOOD/FAIR/POOR)

Detailed-Level Evaluation	
Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?
	<u>directly/indirectly impacted Group 1</u>
<b>Mobility and Accessibility</b>	
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure very specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation.	<u>A. Projected LOS/ADT for US 6, SH 9 and I-70 and average peak-hour speed</u>
The mobility and accessibility criteria will help determine how well an alternative addresses local, regional, and national travel while providing reliable, efficient interconnectivity between systems and communities.	<u>B-A. Projected ADT at key locations</u>
	<u>C-B. Projected number of person trips on alternate modes</u>
	<u>D-C. Projected number of new transit route miles</u>
	<u>D. Conflict points between bike/ped and vehicle traffic</u>
	<u>E. Potential for enhanced bike/ped usage?</u>
	<u>F. How well are Summit Stage/local transit service and stops accommodated?</u>
	<u>G. How many access points are hindered or eliminated?</u>
	<u>E-H. How much shorter are ramp backups than existing or no-build conditions? Projected number of person trips across the Continental Divide</u>
<b>Aesthetics</b>	
Detailed-Level Criteria Measures will measure specific items, will be quantitative more than qualitative, and will help	A. How well does this alternative support the goals of the Aesthetic Guidance?

Comment [TS2]: Group 1 left in; Group 2 cut it

I-70 Silverthorne/Dillon Interchange Project  
 Project Leadership Team Initial Criteria Recommendations  
 October 21, 2010

Feasibility-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?



Concept-Level Evaluation	
Criteria	How could we measure it?



Detailed-Level Evaluation	
Criteria Measures	How could we measure it?
further support and answer the criteria questions asked during the Concept-Level Evaluation.  The aesthetics criteria will help determine whether an alternative was inspired by the surroundings, protects scenic integrity, and incorporates the context of the I-70 Mountain Corridor.	(GOOD/FAIR/POOR)

DRAFT