

I-70 Traffic and Revenue Study
Combined
Project Leadership Team (PLT) Meeting #5
Technical Team (TT) Meeting #2
Meeting Minutes
September 25, 2013
Lakewood, CO – Sheraton – Bergen Room

Handouts for the meeting included:

An information packet was sent to PLT & TT members on September 19 that included the following: Agenda; Chart with Core Values, Critical Issues, Critical Success Factors, and draft Performance Measures; and drafts of the tasks for each of the Issues Task Forces.

Welcome and Opening

Jim Bemelen (CDOT) opened the combined PLT and TT meeting with welcoming remarks and a request for self-introductions.

Agenda

Wendy Wallach (Parsons) summarized the items on the agenda for the I-70 Traffic & Revenue study.

Status of CSS and Review of Critical Success Factors and the Critical Issues

She then began with a review of the draft performance measures and explained how they will be used in the analysis. The team is following the I-70 Mountain Corridor (CSS) Context Sensitive Solutions process, they are beginning step 3 the— Establish Criteria, of the 6-step process. Agreement is needed from the PLT and TT on the Qualitative Performance Measures that will be used. The alternatives will be evaluated against these measures, in order to determine which alternatives have the best opportunity to meet the Critical Success Factors. The meeting today is to evaluate the Draft Qualitative Performance Measures for Level 1 screening and to gain feedback to attain ratification by the PLT.

Wendy reviewed the Core Values, the Critical Issues (CI) and Critical Success Factors (CSF) as background. Wendy reminded everyone that since many of the values and issues are inter-related so there will be some redundancy in the measures.

During the review of the Critical Success Factors and the Critical Issues with input from the PLT/TT the following are changes were made:

- Safety – Modify the CSF to read - ...emergency responders **to/from and through** the corridor...
- Mobility – no changes
- Constructability – no changes
- Sustainability – no changes
- Decision making Process – no changes
- Community (Local, Regional, Statewide) – no changes
- Historic Context – no changes

- Healthy Environment – no changes
- Fiscal Responsibility – no changes

Agenda Item 1 – Review, Edit, & Ratify Performance Measures

The Parsons Team (Joe and Wendy) presented the Draft Level 1 Screening of the Qualitative Performance Measures. Edits were made real time and are attached.

Safety:

Discussion:

- Regarding the first measure- Does the alternative meet minimum design standards (AASHTO, CDOT, etc) of cross section, curvature, sight distance and grades?

Cindy Neely, Clear Creek County (CCC) expressed concern that if we're not designing alternatives, how do we know what if it is meeting design standards? Brad Doyle (Parsons) stated that we are doing conceptual level design only in order to develop the cost estimate. At this point it is very "high-level" design so that we can screen. Cindy Neely (CCC) expressed concern saying how can there be a conceptual design for each alternative and yet the PLT has not seen or discussed the alternatives. Ralph Trapani (Parsons) said the PLT has seen (and ratified) the list of options that are being considered, he added that the Issues Task Forces (ITF) have a potential to add additional alternatives.

Cindy also was concerned that we may be determining the design by defining the performance measures and performing incremental analysis, while group may agree to each step, at the end of the process, it is possible an alternative may emerge that the group is not comfortable with because they have not seen it in its entirety. She added that she doesn't want it implied that each stakeholder would be in agreement to the design. Tim Mauck (CCC) reiterated the concern with the design. Tim expressed a desire to be involved in the conceptual design process because he is concerned with where this will lead.

Melinda Urban (FHWA) asked CCC if they are concerned that this Qualitative Performance Measure may be too specific.

Cindy Neely (CCC) answered "no" but it raises other concerns that she has explained. David Singer (CDOT) restated that the purpose of Level 1 is to keep analysis at a high level with Fatal flaw type of questions.

Ralph Trapani (Parsons) requested that CCC be involved in the Alternatives ITF. The Task Forces are just getting started and there is a kick off meeting for five of the ITF's following the PLT/TT meeting.

Ben Acimovic (CDOT) stated that the purpose of the Level 1 screening is to identify what will move forward at a basic level and that the Level 2 screening will be much more detailed and require more conversation.

The group discussed the additional Safety Measures. Nicolena Johnson (CC-EMS) – wants the performance measures to assess the safety for incident responders. Jill Scott (CDOT ITS)

wanted the Level 1 Performance Measures to address the potential to reduce crashes. As a result the following was added.

Changes or Additions to Safety Performance Measure:

- New - Does the alternative provide protection for incident responders?
- New - Does the alternative have the potential to reduce crashes?

Mobility:

In review of the mobility measures, Joann Sorensen (CCC) asked if there was a Level 1 Performance Measure to address concern for mobility on the local road system. Art Ballah (CMCA) – would like the QPM to address mobility for all users and also for all users both on and off the interstate. As a result the following was added:

Changes or Additions to Mobility QPM:

- Does the alternative reduce travel times for long distance trips **for all users**?
- Does the alternative reduce the travel time for short distance **trips for all users both on and off the Interstate?**
- New – does the alternative provide for incident management?

Constructability

The group agreed to change the first Level 1 Performance Measure to read.... financially feasible with **minimal** funding.

Cindy Neely (CCC) questioned the relevance the third bullet- which reads “Is the Alternative technically feasible”. The group stated that any of the alternatives that we will be analyzing would be technically feasible and it would not be a differentiator in the analysis and the measure was removed.

A question was raised about O& M cost considerations, the way the questions are written it looks like only capital cost will be considered. Ralph Trapani (Parsons) responded that O&M is in the cost assumptions but agreed we should call it out separately.

Changes or Additions to Constructability Level 1 Performance Measure:

- New – Does the alternative have a positive impact on operations and maintenance?

Engineering Criteria and Aesthetic Guidelines

Discussion:

Cindy Neely (CCC) expressed concern that the Level 1 Performance Measure addresses engineering considerations more than aesthetics. Also the measure should specifically cite the I-70 Mountain Corridor specific engineering and aesthetic guidelines.

Changes or Additions to Engineering Criteria and Aesthetic Guidelines Level 1 Performance Measure:

- New – Does the alternative adhere to the I-70 CSS Mountain Corridor Guidelines and specific design criteria?

Sustainability

Discussion:

JoAnn Sorensen (CCC) expressed concern that the measure doesn't consider economic sustainability, only the sustainability of natural resources. Wendy pointed out that economic considerations are included in a different Core Value consideration and including it here will give it extra "weighting" The group discussed the issue as to whether protection was being duplicated. No change was made.

Someone from the group said that the Critical Issue of maintenance is not addressed at Level 1 so the group added a question about O&M.

Changes or Additions to Sustainability Performance Measure:

- New - Does the alternative protect existing natural resources?
- New - Does the alternative have the potential to improve operations and maintenance?

Decision Making Process

Discussion:

- Jill Scott (CDOT ITS) had a question about the Level 1 Performance Measure which reads "Does the alternative provide opportunities for enhancements (i.e. recreational, community, environmental)? She asked why operations are not called out as a consideration. Wendy and David stated that this question is only considering mitigation required for NEPA, which is more natural resource focused.
- Also the group pointed out that "Public Acceptance: is a Critical Issue but not captured in the measures, so the group added an additional Level 1 Performance Measure.

Changes or Additions to Decision Making Process QPM:

- New - Does the alternative have a minimal risk of public or political opposition?

Community

Discussion:

Cindy Neely (CCC) expressed concern that the Level 1 Performance Measure gives equal consideration to local, regional and state and that local should be emphasized because it is the local communities bearing most of the impacts. Wendy and David Singer (CDOT) said the

Performance Measure should consider all three levels as issues on the Corridor affect all three levels of stakeholders. The group modified the measure to address the question for all three levels.

Changes or Additions to Community Level 1 Performance Measure:

- Does the alternative have the potential to improve livability and vitality **locally, regionally, and statewide?**

Historic Context

Discussion: Cindy Neely correctly pointed out that all of the previous Level 1 Performance Measures which are also answered “yes/no” have the answer “yes” as a positive correlation with the alternative, as stated this one is opposite. The PLT/TT revised this Performance Measure to match the others.

Changes or Additions to Historic Context QPM:

- Does the alternative have the ability **to protect** Historic Districts and Landmarks?
- Does the alternative have opportunities for mitigation **and/or enhancement to historic districts and landmarks?**

Healthy Environment

Discussion:

Wendy referred to the previous discussion on Sustainability Measures where we considered whether additional weight was being added to environmental when it is already addressed in Sustainability (i.e.: *Does the alternative use existing natural resources efficiently to generate improvements in efficiency and mobility?*) The group rephrased the questions to have the answer “yes” as a positive correlation with the alternative. The PLT/TT is okay with leaving both in due to the level of concern for the environment throughout the corridor.

Changes or Additions to Healthy Environment Level 1 Performance Measure:

- Does the alternative have the potential to **avoid immitigable** environmental impacts?

Fiscal Responsibility

Discussion:

The group reviewed the Level 1 Performance Measures associated with this Core Value:

Regarding “*Does the alternative have the ability to be financially self sustaining?*” Cindy Neely (CCC) asked if an alternative does not meet the Level 1 criteria would it “drop dead” and not be able to move past Level 1 since this is a traffic and revenue study she thought the PLT agreed if an alternative couldn’t pay for itself it was screened out. Wendy Wallach said she did remember

this discussion. Since the modeling and analysis will be an iterative process, it may not be eliminated at first level due to just this Performance Measure. .

Ralph Trapani (Parsons) discussed cost and revenue as far as modifying an alternative. As we go through the Level 1 revenue analysis, we may be able to “tease out” revenue options that may sustain the alternative. Ralph restated that the fact is that it would need to pay for itself. The team would Evaluate the outcome if answer is “no”, what is needed to make a “yes”?

Melinda Urban (FHWA) asked if we are referring to ...financially self-sustaining for construction only or after it's built too? She stated a need to capture operations and maintenance. Wendy said O&M is assessed separately.

Changes or Additions to Fiscal Responsibility Performance Measure:

- Does the alternative have the ability to be financially self-sustaining in terms of capital and operations and maintenance costs with minimal public funding?

General Discussion

Wendy asked if there were any questions. Cindy Neely (CCC) asked if there was a certain number or a set threshold of yes/no's at Level 1, which would determine elimination. For an example-- If there were 5 no's would an alternative be kicked out? Jim Bemelen (CDOT) clarified that results will be looked at as a group and assessed relative to each other. . However, overall if there is no funding – why would we continue to look at it? David Singer (CDOT) stated that CDOT would make an informed decision after the group discusses.

Wendy asked of the group felt that they could ratify the Level 1 measures at this meeting so that we can stay on schedule. The group generally agreed to ratify the measures but felt they needed additional info on the process. Cindy Neely (CCC) would like to know the application of measures and how the Performance Measures will be used.

Wendy responded that Ralph will discuss the “Work Flow Process” which will provide additional detail.

Melinda Urban (FHWA) asked to make sure the Screening Process is expressly included in the Meeting Minutes that are distributed. This is being written and will be included as an addendum

BREAK

Agenda Item 2 – Process Flow Chart:

Ralph Trapani (Parsons) described the Level 1 Workflow Process and each of the components, the flow, and responsibilities of each group.

Agenda Item 3 – Finalize ITF Roles, Responsibilities, and Tasks

Joe Kracum (Parsons) presented the Issues Task Force categories including methodologies and membership rosters.

Cindy Neely (CCC) had questions regarding how to proceed with ITF's, she felt that the PLT was not as involved as they should be. The CSS guidance states that the PLT will help in development and application of the process. Ralph briefly summarized the ITF process completed to date and clarified that today is a "kick-off" meeting with some of the groups. We will discuss background of project and issue and no decisions will be made. There are plenty of opportunities to refine groups or refine membership.

Also regarding the meeting this afternoon with combined ITF's and what is the charge to estimating group with four (4) different estimating task forces.

Joe Kracum (Parsons) explained that the group will look at cost estimating assumptions associated with each category and who is represented for each task force. Aside from the combined (Roadway, Transit, Tunnel, & Structures) Cost Estimating ITF, there is a meeting of the Alternatives ITF, their purpose is to verify the alternatives and see if other alternative should be included

Cindy Neely (CCC) expressed concern about not just having people in each task force but making sure that people who need to be there are there. Ralph Trapani (Parsons) explained that people were given the opportunity to sign up based on their own skill set and interest in the individual task force categories. Cindy Neely (CCC) would like place holders for each county to be in each ITF category. Ralph Trapani (Parsons) stated that the group may have a basic set of questions and may add to it. The purpose is to present ideas and work through them.

Parsons stated efforts have recently started and that they contacted counties and individuals with invitations to participate and Draft ITF descriptions to determine who the best person is to represent their individual groups' interests and also who has time available for meetings.

Dan Gibbs (Summit) stated they received materials preceding this meeting and Eva Wilson (Eagle County) added that they did as well, but are so short staffed relying on PLT for input opportunities.

Melinda Urban stated that because of all the flooding areas and people affected that there are those who still want to participate but are not able to attend the meeting. Keeping the train moving is still important.

The PLT agreed that ratification of the ITF's could be made by email within the next few weeks.

Agenda Item 4 – Issue Task Force (ITF) Introduction

Joe Kracum (Parsons) began going through each of the ITFs and the responsibilities of each ITF. The Chairperson will be the point-of-contact and will also guide the responsibilities of the group.

As previously discussed, two ITF groups meeting this afternoon are: Alternatives ITF and the Cost Estimating ITF. The Cost Estimating ITF is divided into 4 sub-groups that will have the

opportunity to meet separately based on their specific charge. The sub-groups are: Transit, Roadway, Structures, and Tunnels. The Cost Estimating ITF will meet together to start and sub-groups may meet together as needed.

Ben Acimovic (CDOT) stressed that each ITF will be transparent about what is discussed in each of their meetings. The ITFs are open to input and comments. Meetings will move around as needed and are meant to be fluid and dynamic.

Transit ITF Review

JoAnn Sorensen (CCC) stated that a representative from Clear Creek County should be included, as it does not have a transit authority like in Summit and Eagle Counties. She asked whom or how would the system be governed. Wendy answered right now there is no transit governance; the PEIS suggested this be studied more Council of Governments. Joanne said it suggested the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) should be at the table for this group. Summit County made a request made to put the I-70 Coalition on each of the ITFs.

Roadway ITF Review

Cindy Neely (CCC) asked what design concept is being established for each alternative and to what extent will these alternatives help determine costs.

Cindy would like to issue a charge: define design concepts that will be used for each alternative and be able to demonstrate and explain to the PLT. The I-70 Coalition should be added to the membership roster.

Structures ITF Review

Joe briefly reviewed the ITF goals. Both Clear Creek County and USFS remarked on the need to address wildlife movement. This group will be closely coordinated with the ALIVE Task force. There was a suggestion to prepare a design concept for each alternative considered for review by this group.

The I-70 Coalition should be added to the membership roster.

Tunnels ITF Review

Joe explained the methodology, which includes costing, based on review of cross-sections and considerations for north or south side tunnel options. Specific consideration will be given to an additional bore at Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnels, where geology is not favorable and tunnel is constrained on either side

The I-70 Coalition should be added to the membership roster.

After the formal presentation was completed, the group discussed the ITF approach in general. All together there are 14 ITF groups. Some may meet only twice. Kick offs are occurring this month. Alternatives and Cost Estimating groups are to meet later today.

Cindy Neely would like a copy of the listing of the ITF groups and participants to be sent with meeting minutes.

The Project Team mentioned that a number of the ITF's which have not convened yet and membership has not been finalized including the Mitigation, ALIVE, Historic and SWEEP Issue Task Forces. These meetings should be scheduled in the near future.

Mitigation ITF Review

Cindy Neely (CCC) stated that in her experience CSS highways have cost more. Experience on national level. Ralph Trapani suggested that was not his experience.

Ralph Trapani (Parsons) –stated that 2 conceptual designs will be presented, one designed with I 70 aesthetic guidelines and one without. This would allow the PLT/TT and ITF's to better understand the costs and technical issues.

Ralph asked Brad Doyle to elaborate how the Aesthetic guidelines are getting incorporated into the Alternative Development process. Brad Doyle explained that the CSS criteria are “overlaid” onto each of the alternatives and “ areas” that cannot initially meet the criteria are re-examined to look at how guidelines can be integrated through design exemptions.

Permitting ITF

The Issue Task Force will help establish a list of permits and approvals that will likely be needed if one of the Alternatives is forwarded for additional study. This group will also advise the other teams on to what extent if any; the alternative complies with the Record of Decision for I-70 Mountain Corridor. After Level 2 screening is complete, they will help identify issues and processes to move ahead with NEPA studies.

Cindy Neely requested that Idaho Springs be added to permitting agencies. The I70 Coalition also needs to be added to the list.

SWEEP ITF

This group or a similar profile has convened on a number of occasions, as they were signatories on a Programmatic Agreement with a process in place to protect water resources along the Corridor. This group will also help determine that the cost estimates for water quality protection are accurate. The group suggested the following editorial suggestions to the presentation. Clear Creek County suggested edits (clarifications) to the membership roster:

- First bullet – remove “this” before SWEEP recommendations
- Clarify that SWEEP doesn't actually permit activities.

Paul Winkle from Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Phyllis Adams UCCWA, Gary Frey– Colorado Trout Unlimited, DAvid Holm – CC Watershed Foundation need needs to be added to newest distribution

ALIVE ITF

Ralph Trapani said we have reviewed some of the prior recommendations from the PEIS and the team understands the necessity of mitigating impacts to wildlife passage. This ITF will help update PEIS cost data.

Cindy remarked that this group has been working together since the development of Programmatic Agreement and should be familiar with h task and tools. David Singer (CDOT) added that lots of ground work has already been completed and may benefit other ITF groups. The following edits and additions were suggested to the membership roster:

Ty Peterson from Colorado Parks and Wildlife needs to be added to newest distribution. JoAnn Sorensen's email needs to be filled in; the CPW representative should be Janet George.

Historic ITF

Wendy Wallach reviewed the goals of the Historic ITF and asked the group given where we are in the study. It is early in the process and data required for detailed analysis will not be available nor it is required this early. The group felt it could be beneficial to have the data available if we need it and likely it would help with cost estimates.

The following edit was suggested for the goals: Define Area of Potential Effect.

Other edits include:

Wendy Wallach (Parsons) addressed the membership; Wendy will review the 106 Programmatic Agreement and identify signatories to include in the membership roster. Cindy Neely requested that membership be limited to the counties affected. Summit County requested to attend.

Traffic Operations & Maintenance ITF

After review of the goals for this ITF, Cindy Neely asked how the differences in O&M for options considered will be identified. Will costs for active passive management and temporary type of fixes such as Peak Period Shoulder Lanes? The group suggested the following edits:

Add the following to the goals: Define the various levels of management and their costs Jefferson County and Summit County should be added to the membership roster.

Tolling ITF

No changes to goals were suggested at this time.

The following representatives should be invited to the ITF: Danny Katz from CoPirg, representatives from Colorado Ski Country and/or Vail, and Idaho Springs.

Traffic Modeling ITF

After review of the ITF goals, Cindy Neely (CCC) asked what “network assumptions” are?. The PLT would like to understand and review of all assumptions for the model. A suggestion was made to produce a report to the PLT summarizing the Traffic Modeling information in terms so all can understand.

Al Racciatti (Louis Berger) responded that elements in modeling include – existing vs. future conditions, build vs. no build,, number of lanes, speed etc.. . Al agreed that the information, maps tables, graphs etc. should be in terms that can be easily understood.

Edits to the ITF goals include:

Delete Friday/Monday...from bullet item.

Phil Buckland, DRCOG, Vail Resorts, CO Ski Country should be included in the membership roster.

Finance ITF

After initial review of the ITF goals, Joe Kracum (Parsons) stated that Finance is a very large component of the study and suggested that the PLT/TT mull this over a little more than just today. Phil Armstrong (Parsons) along with Ernst & Young developed the structure of these criteria.

Melinda Urban (FHWA) inquired if the large analysis effort will be performed for each alternative. Ralph Trapani (Parsons) responded that a lot of these items will be considered for each option.

Al Raccatti (Louis Berger) replied that the purpose was to set basic parameters for financial model. Cindy Neely (CCC) expressed similar concerns to those she had with the Traffic Modeling ITF, i.e. that the Finance ITF will be difficult to understand. The acronym “VFM” – Value for money must be spelled out.

Joe Kracum (Parsons) suggested using the same wording as the Traffic Modeling ITF groups that information gathered will be in a basic language or layman terms that will be understood by all. Melinda Urban (FHWA) suggested to Cindy Neely (CCC) to also take advantage of webinars that are available to get better acquainted with terms and concepts in the Finance area.

Wrap Up

The PLT and TT both agreed that they would rather ratify the QPM by e-mail than schedule a special meeting. There may be additional items that may come up in the afternoon meeting of the ITF today (9-25-13) that may be added to the e-mail for the PLT/TT to ratify.

Agenda Item 5 – Next Meetings

The 4th Wednesday schedule the PLT/TT has been working with, conflicts with upcoming holidays in November and December. The following dates should be reserved:

December 5, 2013 (Thursday) 1:00 – 4:00 pm

January 22, 2014 (Wednesday) – This will be a joint meeting between PLT/TT/ITF groups.

Meeting adjourned.