

I-70 Traffic and Revenue Study  
Project Leadership Team (PLT) Meeting #2  
Meeting Minutes  
May 29, 2013  
Golden, CO – Trail Ridge Conference Room

Handouts for the meeting included:

- Agenda
- Description of Minimum/Maximum Program Improvements and Non-Infrastructure Components
- Graphic/Map - depicting the Base Case – Minimum Program of Improvements.
- I-70 Traffic and Revenue study Project Leadership Team Members

### **Agenda Item 1 - Introductions**

1a. Ben Acimovic opened the Project Leadership Team's (PLT) second meeting with welcoming remarks and a request for self-introductions. The meeting was handed over to the facilitators. Joe Kracum (Parsons) started with a review of some ground rules and etiquette for the meetings. PLT meeting members are to be seated at the tables with other attendees seated around. PLT members are encouraged to be engaged and participate in discussions. Commit to listen. Let people speak, being open and honest. Avoid speculation, rumors etc. and express concerns in appropriate manner. Controversial points should be spoken respectfully, including body language. Maintain a willingness to understand.

1b. Joe reviewed the agenda and indicated that Item 3 *Critical Success Factors and Core Values* would be moved to the next PLT meeting. It was indicated that the one of the first steps was to agree upon the Minimum and Maximum improvements developed in the Record of Decision. Wendy Wallach (Parsons) Referring to the agenda for the meeting, Item #3 – Critical Success Factors and Core Values, will be discussed in greater detail at the next meeting in June 2013.

### **Agenda Item 2 Project-Context / Mission**

2a. Wendy reviewed the revised context statement with the group (see the attached Powerpoint). The last bullet on slide consolidates several items. While there was a suggestion to refer specifically to Clear Creek, the project team felt the project will affect everyone in the region. Topographic constraints affect the whole corridor.

Cindy Neely, of Clear Creek County, replied that the Context Statement written for project must consider where the project is to be constructed. Not sure of project boundaries or termini, three different termini have been referred to in Jefferson County, Clear Creek, and Summit. (Top bullet)

2b. Upon suggestions from the group, Ralph Trapani (Parsons) agreed to change the following:

- Revise the last bullet to say "All build scenarios WILL impact..." (instead of "may")
- Revise the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet – to say "multi-modal"
- Revise title to say "overview" instead of "Final Draft"

No one disagreed with the revisions to the Context Statement and Parsons will distribute the revised Statement by email for ratification by the PLT members.

### **Agenda Item 3 Core Values and Critical Success Factors**

3a. This item has been moved to the June PLT agenda. Wendy Wallach (Parsons) stated “Critical Success Factors and Core Values” will be the focus of the June meeting in order to have it ready for July and Berger. Cindy Neely stated the importance of determining these “up front” in the CSS process, Wendy Wallach and David Singer to work on these prior to the June Meeting.

### **Agenda Item 4 Improvement Packages**

4a. Wendy Wallach (Parsons) repeated a comment from the first PLT meeting “based on the last meeting the Preferred Alternative can mean 25 different things to different people”. Before this group can move forward we need to have concurrence on the Minimum/Maximum program. We want to have a good basis to work from when determining Core Values.

Wendy reviewed what is identified in the Record of Decision for the Minimum Program of Improvements, with the caveat that these may change based on changing conditions and direction from the Collaborative Effort group. The Min. Program consists of:

1. Non-infrastructure components –These are listed in the ROD and included on table in the handouts; these could consist of entire range of projects in the corridor, as part of the Minimum and Maximum Program.
2. Advanced Guideway System (AGS) – in place as part of both the min/max program.
3. Specific project improvements – This includes improved interchanges, 6 lane capacity in certain areas, bike lanes and frontage roads and specific locations and auxiliary lanes., These projects before “Other projects” happen or the Maximum Program is initiated..
4. Other projects – This includes curve safety improvements, operational improvements, additional capacity in select places, and a number of interchange improvements.

4b. Wendy Wallach (Parsons) asked if there were any questions regarding the Minimum Program of Improvements.

Cindy Neely (Clear Creek County) asked Melinda Urban (FHWA) if the third bore associated with –Eisenhower/Johnson tunnel in the Minimum Program is intended solely for transit or to accommodate automobile traffic as well. Melinda Urban (FHWA) answered that the ROD is not clear, the cost appendix included in the FEIS denotes that the tunnel is for AGS only, Brad Doyle (Parsons) reiterated that based on the cost estimates in the EIS, the cost of the tunnel does NOT include accommodating auto traffic in the Minimum Program.

Melinda will send out clarification regarding the third bore with the meeting minutes for PLT review.

Melinda provided the following explanation to CDOT on June 14, 2013:

After internal discussions at FHWA and review of the ROD, we concluded the I-70 Tier 1 PEIS did not decide on a third bore at EJMT as part of the minimum program of improvements. The Tier 1 only made three decisions- travel mode, general location, and capacity. There were several assumptions made that were needed in order to complete the comparative analysis of alternatives. There are also several options that are still on the table, which the Tier 1 did not eliminate or decide on. Section B.2.2 in the ROD states what Tier 2 decisions will still need to be made, such as design speed (55/65mph) and design for specific improvements, such as tunnels or interchange types. The Tier 1 did not decide whether a third bore at the EJMT was needed for the minimum program. Also, a third bore at the EJMT was not part of the specific highway improvements listed in the ROD. The ROD did specify a westbound auxiliary lane from Bakerville to EJMT.

For modeling purposes, CDOT will model a third EJMT bore as part of the maximum program, because the Maximum Program does add capacity (third lane) to the EJMT.

4c. Protocol for meeting minutes will include initial review of DRAFT meeting minutes by project team, including CDOT and FHWA and then distribution of the draft minutes to the PLT. Wendy Wallach is the PLT coordinator and will be coordinating this.

4d. David Krutsinger (Alternate for Mark Imhoff, DTR) needed to leave for another meeting but provided update on the status of the AGS study underway:

There are four alternatives under consideration for the system, all of them have AGS and highway tunnels separate due to speed and fire suppression issues.

4e. Wendy Wallach (Parsons) continued with a review of the Minimum and Maximum Program graphics. The Maximum Program includes additional capacity and interchange improvements between Eisenhower Johnson Memorial Tunnels and Twin Tunnels, if deemed warranted by the Collaborative Effort. Tunnels at Floyd Hill and Dowd Canton are only included if a 65-mile per hour option is selected.

Wendy Wallach (Parsons) asked if there were any questions regarding the Maximum Program of Improvements.

Cindy Neely (Clear Creek County) clarified that the additional capacity between Mileposts 241 and 221 is not specified as lane "widening" as it is tightly constrained in that area and a "community lies there". The intent of the Max Program is to accommodate the same number of travelers as a six-lane highway in this section would accommodate.

Jack Morgan (Idaho Springs) had questions regarding the Minimum and Maximum Program graphics. He asked why Bakerville and Herman's Gulch are called "municipalities" since there is no supporting population. Cindy Neely also noted that MP 240 is the center of Idaho Springs – not Fall River Road.

Wendy Wallach (Parsons) responded to the concerns by reiterating that the map is not to scale and will NOT be used for analysis or design. Herman Gulch and Bakerville are called out because they are specifically identified in the Record of Decision's description of the preferred alternative in ROD. Melinda Urban suggested the team add Dowd Canyon and any other

“places” specified in the Preferred Alternative in the ROD. Wendy will add Dowd Canyon to the map and revise the map. Wendy will send out a revised map with meeting minutes and send as a draft.

Cindy Neely made a comment regarding Auxiliary Lanes in Min/Max table - Change from “Only in critical locations” to “only in specified location”

Also in the Min/Max table included in the handouts it states under “Transit” that the bus could be an “interim solution” before AGS. This is erroneous. Elena Wilken (CASTA) and others had understood that this was part of the Preferred Alternative. It is not specified in the ROD. Wendy Wallach (Parsons) confirmed that it is not specified in the ROD and will remove it from the table. She noted that Bus in Mixed Traffic is included as one of the Non-Infrastructure Components.

Cindy noted that decisions regarding tunnel/no tunnel will have enormous cost implications.

## **5. Open Discussion**

5a. Ben Acimovic (CDOT) talked briefly about the Traffic and Revenue Study Process. The Traffic and Revenue Study (T&R) is being conducted to evaluate the technical and financial feasibility of the recommendations included in the Record of Decision (ROD) for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. The study includes a two-tiered process, Level 1 and Level 2 Screening.

The Level 1 Study will use existing data to evaluate options selected in the ROD, the 2 and 3 lane reversible multi-modal express lane options under consideration by CDOT, as well as new options recommended by the Project Team, including the PLT. Level 1 Study recommendations will include identification of “Candidate Corridor options” to be carried forward for detailed analysis in Level 2.

Updated data will be used to perform Level 2 analyses that are more extensive, including modeling the remaining options. The T&R Study will conclude with the reporting of the Level 2 results and will include recommendations to advance options that best meet study objectives into Tier 2 analysis, including NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act). The process reduces the range of financially feasible options for improvements to I-70 to a set of Candidate Options that best meet the criteria based on the Core Values and the Critical Success Factors.

Wendy Wallach (Parsons) and Ralph Trapani (Parsons) will generate a graphic and a narrative with some uniform nomenclature to describe this process. This will be discussed in greater detail at the next meeting in June.

5b. Jack Morgan (Idaho Springs) expressed concern about the role of the PLT and whether technical issues (such as the detailed T and R process) should be discussed in depth at these meetings. Cindy Neely noted that the PLT should understand assumptions used for the study and although concepts may be confusing, the PLT needs to understand them.

Joe Kracum (Parsons) affirmed that we all will review the process and move towards consistency.

5c. Ralph Trapani (Parsons) stated that Parson is now under contract, making progress with CDOT and financials with Ernst and Young. This study will be closely coordinated with the AGS Study and the Interconnectivity Study.

5d. Nick Farber (HPTE) stated that T&R contract is not complete. HPTE contracts have been sent to State Controller's Office, which is very backlogged. There are 32 contracts ahead of this one.

5e. Next meeting will be June 26 (4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday of the month) – location to be determined – possibly in Silverthorne.