

PROJECT LEADERSHIP TEAM KICKOFF MEETING MINTUES

MEETING DATE: APRIL 24, 2013

I-70 TRAFFIC AND REVENUE STUDY

PROJECT NO: IM 070A-017

PROJECT CODE: 19455

1. Introductions and Agenda

- Jim Bemelen – CDOT conducted Traffic and Revenue training a few weeks ago. If anyone would like to have this training offered again, CDOT will setup another meeting to review the data.
- David Singer – reviewed agenda and purpose.
- Introductions and state what is important to you for this process
 - i. Ben Acimovic (CDOT) – Wants to determine the feasibility of this project.
 - ii. Ralph Trapani (PTG)– Develop a good data set for future efforts and determine needs of Clear Creek County and other stakeholders and core values.
 - iii. Melinda Urban (FHWA) – continued use of CSS and relationships.
 - iv. Angie Drum (CDOT) – General process of T&R on this corridor (recreation vs. commuting) and seeing if there is something the economical feasible and politically accepts.
 - v. Cindy Condon (Idaho Springs)– wants to see collaborative process continue.
 - vi. Nick Farber(CDOT/HPTE) – Is this a feasible project that can help the state.
 - vii. Tim Mauck (Clear Creek County) – How this project meshes with and incorporates the other studies, assumptions, and data so that good alternatives are developed and comparisons made to determine what is feasible in the corridor.
 - viii. Cindy Neely (Clear Creek county – Good CSS record and hope to see that continue, and determine what is a feasible a project. Hope this can merge all kinds of data from AGS and Peak Period Shoulder.
 - ix. Elena Wilkin (CASTA) – wants to know more about T&R to apply to other corridors and look for data driven decisions.

- x. Mark Imhoff (CDOT) – learn more and explore potential for transit for all alternatives.
- xi. Dick Bauman (CDOT) – can we find a financial and buildable project, acceptable to communities.
- xii. Scott Burton– JeffCo – learn more about the process.
- xiii. Eva Wilson-(Eagle County) – here to support the process and provide local input and determine where we go.
- xiv. Jim Bemelen(CDOT) – publically acceptable and financially feasible to pay for itself.
- xv. Tom Schilling (PTG team) – build a strong foundation for a partnership.
- xvi. Joe Kracum (PTG) – agreeable data set.
- xvii. Larry Sly (PTG team – work with team to develop a process that is financeable and feasible.
- xviii. Tom Hale (Georgetown) – highway to serve CCC and its communities and that it is not just a pass through corridor. Want to understand impacts of highway, construction, environment, and local access.
- xix. Kevin O’Malley (citizen observer)– no comment
- xx. David Krutsinger (CDOT)– no comment
- xxi. Tom Breslin(CCC) – interested in project.
- xxii. Bob Smith (CDOT) – more consensus and can we get something built.

2. Project Overview and Feasibility Study Results

- I-70 PEIS ROD was completed. Shortly thereafter, CDOT received an unsolicited proposal from Parsons. CDOT review and determined this proposal had merit. CDOT asked for comparable proposals. Two proposals were received. CDOT decided to move forward with T&R phase only with Parsons support.
 - i. Level 1 T&R – High level/Sketch Level
 - ii. Level 2 T&R – More in–depth study of costs and revenue
 - iii. Level3 T&R – Investment grade
- Broke level 1 &2 T&R into 2 stages
 - i. 1st stage will be Min and Max improvements as defined in the PEIS and ROD. Sketch level analysis first. If feasible, then these will advance into Level 2. Will include AGS rideshare as well.
 - ii. 2nd stage will look at others - 2 and 3 lane reversible system plus 2 other alternatives to be determined. Will get the tech team together to determine these other alternatives.
 - iii. If this is determined feasible, then would move into Tier 2 EIS and Tier 2 T&R

- iv. Ernst and Young will be doing financial analysis. Parsons doing engineering support. Soliciting for T&R consultant now and should have a selection under contract by July 2013.
- Is there flexibility to do more/less than 4 alternatives? CDOT budgeted for 4 alternatives but if we need to adjust, we can. May need more budget for the team to analyze.

3. PLT Overview and Responsibilities

- Working on Steps 1 and 2 at this point.
- Will develop the technical aspects once the rest of the team is on board. Want to develop Steps 1 and 2 to provide direction to the technical team.
- Reviewed checklist on how to start the project. We have representation from CDOT, FHWA, Consultants, and Communities.
- We have more than the 10-12 members present. Do we have the right PLT members established? Discussion:
 - i. What are the limits of the project? Jim B – C-470 to Silverthorne for study but impacts are beyond this.
 - ii. Eagle County needs to be on the PLT list.
 - iii. Ben A. to check with those that have not responded about their status.
 - iv. CASTA was involved in the collaborative effort and represented the transit agencies along the corridor. CASTA should be on the PLT.
 - v. What about environmental focus groups? Having them at the table makes sure we address their concerns. Jim B. – they need to be on the technical team to provide their input on technical aspects.
 - vi. Please send list of names for the technical team to David and Ben.
 - vii. Casey Tighe will be the JeffCo representative on the PLT.
- Role for the PLT – Lead the project, Champion the CSS, Enable decision making

4. Context Statement

- I-70 Draft context statement for the T&R is taken from the I-70 context statement and is provided in the handouts. Discussion:
 - i. A lot of space given to funding problem. If project goes from C-470 to Silverthorne, the 4th paragraph is not specific enough to respecting unique communities and natural environment in a tight mountain corridor. It does not define this context and is too general.
 - ii. Somewhere we need to include multi-modal. Insert in Paragraph 4 to address multi-modal transportation.
 - iii. This appears to be about the context of the road, not the context about where the road sits.

- iv. Project needs to fit the context, not context fitting project. Cindy N will provide draft language to David S for consideration.

5. Critical Success Factors

- Goals
 - i. Goals can be a number of things. What do we want our goals to be?
 - ii. Think about drivers, issues, concerns, and opportunities. Think about it in the context of other projects.
 - iii. Ability to finance solutions
 - iv. Provide a multi-modal solution
 - v. Need to find a Balance – how do we move the most people through the corridor with the least number of impacts? Maximize capacity while minimizing impacts.
 - vi. Get a robust and defensible data collection set – providing consistency and reliability.
 - vii. Determine consistency with data that is being collected by other studies and determine need to reconcile.
 - viii. Need to have a realistic picture of all the options – What funding would you have to have in place? Would it pay for itself? If they cannot, then the project may not advance.
 - ix. Roadmap for the next steps.
 - x. All studies will be based upon assumptions. Need agreement on assumptions, T&R, and cost for doing the project.
 - xi. What do you do if the facility is almost financially feasible – for example it generated 80% of the money it needs. CDOT and PLT would have to understand where the other 20% would come from. What is the best physical solution?
 - xii. Identify all risks – finance, community, construction, acceptability, environmental, political. Adhere to the ROD.
 - xiii. Need a user standpoint as well as stakeholder support.
 - xiv. The PEIS identified a lot of latent demand. Need to get the professionals involved that can put a number to this. What are the options to allow this demand to use this corridor?
 - xv. Leverage what the statewide plan is doing for economic development. What is the impact of the return for the additional use?
- Draft Core Values
 - i. Core Values need to be compared against the preferred alternative, which has consensus.

- ii. It would be great to have a picture of the “financeability” that also meets the stakeholder consensus. Solution needs to have general support in the corridor.
- iii. A number of the critical success factors can be used in this section.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

- Technical team
 - i. The tech team will convene more often. If they get stuck, then the PLT convenes to help out. Need some level of peer review and validations.
 - ii. Who from a technical perspective should be involved – Environmental groups? DRCOG?
 - iii. Need some traffic expertise – CDOT Traffic Engineer. Obtain local traffic demand data.
 - iv. Need a modeler such as Eric S. with CDOT. Model needs to consider latent and pent up demand.
 - v. Forest Service, Parks and Wildlife, ALIVE, SWEEP, Section 106 representatives.
 - 1. Remember to stay high level at this point. Need to accommodate in our cost estimate so we can do it right. Need the whole list of assumptions in the ROD checked and updated.
 - vi. Should we have a CDOT cost estimator on the team – No, just check in with the group as needed.
 - vii. Team needs to understand the local traffic movement. The T&R firms have plans and thoughts on how to capture this data.
 - viii. Need an issue task force to tackle P3 delivery concepts.
 - ix. Need to have technical team stay high level but then have focused. Use issue task force meetings to address details.
 - x. Bring in experts to brief the main topics. The technical team would evaluate, pick the criteria. Tech team would have the expertise to evaluate all the issues as a whole and bring in experts as needed.
 - xi. Other groups to consider for technical team includes Ski industry, Trucking industry, Emergency providers
 - xii. A member of the I-70 Coalition Technical Team (Thad Knol?)

7. Operating Guidelines

- Make agenda and minutes available quickly
- Taking lessons learned from previous efforts to determine what can help this project
- Open discussion of assumptions, options, and risks
- Transparency was a benefit on Twin Tunnels

- Identify concerns early on
- A Website has not yet been setup for T&R. PLT would like to get a website setup.
- Keep track of criteria and document

8. Conclusions / Next Steps

- Draft schedule presented but need to get T&R firm on board before finalizing the schedule.
- Meeting schedule
 - i. Week #4, Wednesday afternoon
 - ii. Will rotate meeting location throughout the corridor
 - iii. Next meeting to discuss understanding of Minimum and Maximum program and presentation of the Parsons plan
 - iv. Next meeting May 29th, 1:00 PM in Golden