

# I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

## ALTERNATIVES TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

▶ **Meeting**    *Wednesday, Sept. 25, 2013*    ▶ **Time:**    *1:00 – 3:00 pm*  
Date:

▶ **Meeting**    *Sheraton Hotel – Bergen Room, Lakewood Colorado*  
Place:

▶ Al Racciatti	Louis Berger	▶ David Singer	CDOT	▶ Margaret Bowes	I-70 Coalition
▶ Melinda Urban	FHWA	▶ David Krutsinger	CDOT-Transit	▶ Randy Parker	USFS
Joe Kracum	Parsons	Paul Nikolai	Parsons	Ben Acimovic	CDOT
Angie Drumm	CDOT	Phil Buckland	Clear Creek County	Scott Thomas	
Jim Bemelen	CDOT	Ralph Trapani	Parsons	Wendy Wallach	Parsons

Technical Issue/Challenge	Solution	Client Benefits
1.		
2.		

Meeting Notes
<b>New Business</b>
<p><b>Topic #1 – Modeling Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Al Racciatti (Louis Berger) gave a quick overview of how the alternatives get evaluated from a financial perspective to determine if an alternative can pay for itself. The technical side how the alternative is designed would not be a driving force in the evaluation. Randy (USFS) asked if modeling would have tolling time slots included – meaning peak time and off-peak considerations, the model will</li> <li>○ Paul (Parsons) asked if the modeling takes into account traffic lost to other corridors such as SH 287 and if negative impacts to those corridors will also be a modeling factor. Al said other corridors and anticipated higher maintenance costs to those corridors would be a modeled condition.</li> </ul>

# I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

## Meeting Notes

### Topic #2 – Current Alternatives

#### A: Min / Max 55 -65

- The discussion on this Alternative included questioning whether or not this concept should be modified by the Task Force to simplify it based on engineering requirements. Jim Bemelen (CDOT) asked if it made sense to evaluate an option of 55 mph for the entire corridor. He added that the current condition already exceeds 55 mph and he is not sure it makes sense. Paul (Parsons) asked if the modeling takes into account traffic lost to other corridors such as SH 287 and if negative impacts to those corridors will also be a modeling factor. Al said other corridors and anticipated higher maintenance costs to those corridors would be a modeled condition. The discussion focused on modifying this alternative to evaluate a 65 mph option for the entire corridor and a second option that held 65 mph where it was easily engineered. This same option would then evaluate 55 mph sections where the canyon terrain dictated that design speed. The group felt this was the correct way to go.
- 

#### B: Tolling all Existing Lanes

- i. Conversation centered on if the T & R Study should consider as an alternative the tolling of all existing lanes of I-70. Many opinions were stated for and against this. Discussion centered on if this was legal and included within the State Statutes of Colorado or if it would be allowed by FHWA requirements. Most thought this was not a viable alternative but would be a good baseline to compare the other alternatives to.
- ii. Melinda (FHWA) was asked what the requirement would be for tolling the existing Eisenhower / Johnson tunnels. The initial reaction was that a 3<sup>rd</sup> bore could be tolled but the existing 2 tunnels could not. Wendy (Parsons) and Melinda (FHWA) both confirmed that a 3<sup>rd</sup> bore of the EJMT was not part of the PEIS and ROD but is included in the evaluation in case it is needed..
- iii. Action Items included obtaining the Colorado statutes regarding tolling of existing facilities to clarify the issue. FHWA will provide the Task Force with a procedure for developing a process acceptable to the FHWA to toll existing facilities.

#### C: Reversible Express Lane

- i. Many of the members were not familiar with this option. Members of the I-70 Coalition suggested that a presentation be made to bring Task Force members up to speed. It was decided at the end of the meeting that a short presentation would be prepared and shown at the next Coalition meeting, and the Alternatives Task Force would meet afterwards.

#### D: No Action Alternative

- i. It was agreed that there needs to be an evaluation process for a No Action alternative.

E: CDOT clarified that the Task Force should anticipate that the final list of will likely be different than those discussed at this meeting.

### Topic #3 – New Alternatives

A: Ben (CDOT) requested development of a process to assess any potential new alternatives brought forward for evaluation. This should include a vetting process would need to be established to screen new alternatives to verify if they qualified for full analysis.

- iv. Discussion from the group was that any new alternatives would have to meet the Core Values adopted by the Project Leadership Team (PLT).

# I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

## Meeting Notes

- v. It is anticipated that any new alternatives may be modified versions of existing Alternatives. The new alternative would be looked as an Option of an existing alternative.

### Topic #4 – AGS System Integration

- A: Phil (Clear Creek County Commissioner) wanted to know how the traffic modeling would take into account traffic numbers projected on I-70 if a transit system was on the corridor. David Krutsinger (CDOT-Division of Transit and Rail) was then pulled into the discussion. David K. confirmed that traffic modeling would take into account anticipated car trips removed by either an AGS system and a BRT system.
- B: David K. also stressed that the AGS systems typically eliminate single passenger car trips, not multiple, so the removal of car trips from an AGS system should not be over emphasized.
- C: One of Phil's concerns was how the AGS gets evaluated via the Level 1 and 2 screening and making sure it's evaluated correctly. David K. pointed out that another study is being conducted parallel to this T & R Study evaluating the AGS option identified in the PEIS. The Task Force agreed that the AGS study findings needs to be included in this evaluation.
  - o

### Topic #5 – Logical Termini of Project

- A: Margaret (I-70 Coalition) mentioned that the western termini of the project is currently at the I-70 and SH 9 Interchange in Silverthorne. She thought this should be looked at and compared to an option to extend the study to the next interchange west. This is the I-70 and SH 9 Interchange in Frisco. She thought that because that interchange already has a transit stop associated with it, the connection to the BRT would be more functional.

### Topic #6 – Finalization of Alternatives

- A: Jim (CDOT) stated that the Task Force needs to be cognizant of having too many alternatives to evaluate.
- B: Any additional alternatives need to be brought forward within 2 to 3 weeks. A place holder is being provided within the matrices for the project for additional alternatives and that will be kept in place.
  - o

### 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: Pau Nikolai - Parsons Date: 10-8-13

**Next Meeting:** 3:00 pm & October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2013 at Summit County Library, 651 Center Circle, Silverthorne, Colorado

