

# I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

## ALIVE TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

▶ **Meeting Date:** *Dec 18, 2013*      ▶ **Time:** *2:00 –4:00 pm*  
▶ **Meeting Place:** *Homestead Conference Room, CDOT – Golden, Colorado*

▶ **Distribution / Attendees ( ^):**

▶ <i>Paul Nikolai</i> <i>Parsons</i>	▶ <i>Wendy Wallach</i> <i>Parsons</i>	▶ <i>David Singer</i> <i>CDOT R1 Envir. Mngr</i>
▶ <i>Michelle Cowardin, CPW</i>	▶ <i>Alison Michael</i> <i>US FWS</i>	▶ <i>Jeff Peterson</i> <i>CDOT - Wildlife</i>
<i>Adam Springer</i> <i>Clear Creek Cty Planning</i>	<i>Paige Singer</i> <i>KMW</i>	<i>Elissa Knox</i> <i>CPW</i>
<i>Francesca Tordenato</i> <i>CDOT R1 Enviornmental</i>	<i>Julia Kintsch</i> <i>ECO- resolutions</i>	<i>Brock McCormick</i> <i>USFS</i>
<i>Jen Babbington</i> <i>Parsons</i>	<i>Julia Barker</i> <i>Parsons</i>	<i>Lance Carpenter</i> <i>CPW</i>

	Technical Issue/Challenge	Solution	Client Benefits
1.	Review identification of mitigation for critical species and provide conservative costs for crossings associated with all alternatives under consideration.	Utilize ITF to review proposed crossings for target species.	Ensure money is adequate to mitigate wildlife crossings.
2.	Ensure no “double-counting of mitigation costs” with mitigation proposed by SWEEP ITF.	Coordinate closely with SWEEP ITF.	Accurate evaluation for study.

### Meeting Notes

#### New Business

**Topic #1 – Team Introductions**

- David Singer kicked off the meeting. The group did introductions and then David recapped the project for the group, because there were some new faces. He asked if there were any questions and no one responded.

**Topic #2 Review of Proposed Crossings**

A: Paul then said what we had been working on from the last meeting. Julia Kintsch had been working with the Parsons Team to review LIZ recommendations and make changes to accommodate target species and to work with each of the Alternatives.

- The ITF received handouts which detailed the proposed crossing locations, width and length and Julia K and Julia P walked the group through the recommendations. Highlights of that

# I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY

## ISSUES TASK FORCES

### Meeting Notes

conversation included suggested changes to some of the proposed crossings based field staff expertise. A summarized list of suggestions follows. The suggestions were recorded by staff on graphics and addressed for a future round of review.

- Regarding crossing at Bakerville, this is a difficult zone, Julia K recommended a large overpass at Dry Gulch, however, there is a population of sheep, so the ITF wants an overpass instead of underpass. Francesa (CDOT) was not sure that topography can accommodate an overpass and there will be a competing resources there is a fen near here. Julia thinks a lot of these will be difficult to accommodate.
- Someone asked what is the timeframe is for construction . David said we are just at the beginning of the study and haven't even selected an alternative but then we may need to go back through NEPA.
- Someone asked if there is an alternative that look at elevating the entire alignment. Brock said we should elevate it between Herman Gulch and Dry Gulch.
- The group reviewed Herman Gulch exit, so there may have some type multiuse path. Julia suggests we combine on and of ramps on west side and animal uses contained on the east side. Paul clarified she is talking about a Loop Ramp, Paul said radius is very large. She said it could be done at different location. The group recommendation was to find an alternate location closer to MP 218. Brock added that it is broad where the avalanche chute comes down there is an earth berm right there.
- Paul asked if the group was concerned about animals on the loop ramps? Julia K said we need to guide animals away from them. An attendee said there is a need to accommodate boreal toads, this would be a desired location to accommodate them. In Herman Gulch, boreal toads occur on both sides.
- At 219.4, at Watrous Gulch area, this is also an aquatic location. Julia K said an initial recommendation from report based on where existing chain stations, maybe from 219 to 220 putting a wildlife bridge. P Parsons selected a very narrow crossing for just Big Horn Sheep. Julia Kintsch said we need to accommodate multiple species here and widen it. An additional overpass could be added around MP 220 and in-between as an alternate location in Watrous Gulch between 218 and 219. Around 221.8 where there is a fill slope, one idea is to have large underpass. Paul said this is where we are right next to Clear Creek and we may consider an elevated roadway, just past Bakerville exit.
- Brock asked what the ideal width is. Julia K. said needs field verification but we definitely need to shorten structure and make it 230 wide for overpass and 335 feet wide for a landscaped overpass. Paul said we need to look at lighting. The CPW representative said if we have to

# I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

## Meeting Notes

reduce cost may want to look for different options because 335 feet wide is very, very costly.

Julia K. said we may decide we don't need it but she would like to consider it at 220.1. Brock said would there be an option so you could lower the roadway and make the overpass a cut and cover thing and keep overpass on grade.

- Ty asked what goes into making the recommendation between underpass and overpass. Julia said looking at target species and having variability. He asked if they previously considered areas where higher incidents of Animal Vehicle Collisions (AVC) occurred. Julia said that was a consideration, they also looked at observations of where alive and dead animals were. Paige added there were criteria beside AVCS. Julia showed map of AVC data collected. She said in general on I-70 AVCs are lower because animals aren't attempting to cross.
- At MP 223.5, the roadway is 150 feet away from creek. Right now there is a long bridge that is all pavement and currently not a lot of wildlife observations. Julia K wants to know if a multiuse structure would accommodate big horn sheep. Francesca said she thinks the camera here was only monitoring for a month. She thinks we may need to monitor for longer. Someone commented since there is already a structure here we may be able to prioritize. Someone asked if there were sheep that made it to south side; the only species they saw was fox. Brock said what does bridge tie into? He doesn't want to recommend it just because there is an existing structure. He added, if there weren't a bridge here is this was a place we would recommend for a bridge? Julia said this may be determined to how frequently we should have animal crossings.

### Topic #3 – Next Steps

- When the group had reviewed one-third of the recommendations, David S suggested that we reconvene; people do it individually or generally “bless” the methodology and let the team keep going. General consensus was that with some additional information the group could come prepared to another meeting by end of January. They would then have homework. Additional information that they requested be assimilated is information from original recommendations including AVCs, camera data, topography. A map should also be produced which shows all of the information associated with each location.

○

### Action Item Register – See Below.

These notes are an interpretation of discussions held. Please provide any additions or corrections to the originator within seven days of the date signed, otherwise they will be assumed correct as written.

► Prepared By: Wendy Wallach- Parsons

Date: 1-20-14

**Next Meeting:** January TBD

