



1 Collaborative Effort (CE) Meeting and
2 I-70 Mountain Corridor 2020 Reassessment Meeting #10
3 December 16, 2020, 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM
4 Zoom Conference Call Video Meeting
5

6 **Overview**

7 These notes summarize the Collaborative Effort (CE) meeting held via video conference on December
8 16, 2020. This meeting focused on completion of the I-70 Mountain Corridor 2020 Reassessment Step 4
9 Work Plan and Step 5 Documentation. The presentation and revised CE Step 4 Work Plan are attached.

10 **Welcome and Introductions**

11 Greg Hall, CE Co-Chair, welcomed the group and congratulated them for getting to the final milestone in
12 the 2020 Reassessment. He conducted a roll call of the CE members and the alternates. The following CE
13 members and alternates were present:

- 14 • Randy Wheelock, Clear Creek County (CE Co-Chair)
- 15 • Greg Hall, Vail (CE Co-Chair)
- 16 • Amy Saxton, Clear Creek County (*alternate*)
- 17 • Ann Rajewski, Colorado Association of Transit Agencies (CASTA)
- 18 • Becky English, Sierra Club (*alternate*)
- 19 • Ben Gerdes, Eagle County (*alternate*)
- 20 • Brendan McGuire, Vail Resorts
- 21 • Brooke Davis, US Army Corps of Engineers
- 22 • Chris Linsmayer, Colorado Ski County USA
- 23 • Cindy Neely, Local Historic Preservation Representative
- 24 • Danny Katz, Colorado Public Interest Research Group (CoPIRG)
- 25 • David Krutsinger, CDOT, Division of Transit and Rail
- 26 • Dennis Royer, Sierra Club, Rocky Mountain Chapter
- 27 • Eva Wilson, local transit provider (Avon Mobility Director)
- 28 • Gary Frey, Colorado Trout Unlimited
- 29 • Holly Norton, Colorado State Historic Preservation Office
- 30 • Lauren Masias, Denver Metro Chamber (*alternate*)
- 31 • Margaret Bowes, I-70 Coalition
- 32 • Mary Jane Loevlie, local business representative (Idaho Springs)
- 33 • Matt Scherr, Eagle County
- 34 • Mike Hillman, Idaho Springs (Mayor)
- 35 • Mike Riggs, AGS/high-speed transit representative
- 36 • Paul Jesaitis, CDOT Region 1
- 37 • Shaun Cutting, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- 38 • Tracy Sakaguchi, Colorado Motor Carriers Association (*alternate*)
- 39 • Steve Durian, Jefferson County (*alternate*)



- 1 • Mike Keleman CDOT Region 1 (alternate)

2 CE member organizations whose primary or alternate members were not present included:

- 3 • CDOT Region 3 (staff members Karen Berdoulay and Rob Beck were present)
4 • City and County of Denver
5 • Colorado Passenger Rail Association
6 • Garfield County
7 • Summit County
8 • US Forest Service
9 • Headwaters Group, Sierra Club

10 Other meeting participants included State Representative Dylan Roberts, Vanessa Henderson, Neil
11 Ogden, Tamara Burke, Brian Hartman, Julie George, Karen Berdoulay, and Rob Beck, CDOT; Melinda
12 Urban, FHWA; Miller Hudson, interested party; Steve Coffin, Steve Coffin Strategies; Wendy Wallach,
13 Chris Primus, and Kira Olson, HDR; and Mandy Whorton, Peak Consulting Group.

14 Mr. Hall opened up the meeting to public comment. No comments were recorded.

15 Mr. Hall asked if there were any comments or edits to the September 30 or November 18 meeting notes
16 distributed in the meeting materials sent by Randy Wheelock on December 10, 2020. Cindy Neely said
17 the date of the meeting in the November 18 notes needed to be revised. Mandy Whorton stated that
18 the revised notes distributed on December 11 corrected this. Mr. Hall noted that the numbers of
19 meetings #7, #8, and #9 needed to be checked. Ms. Whorton stated she would check and correct as
20 needed. No other comments were received, and the group approved the meeting notes.

21 **CE Work Plan Review**

22 Mr. Hall went through the action items for the CE Work Plan, as summarized in the attached PowerPoint
23 presentation. He asked members to weigh in as they moved through the presentation with suggested
24 edits or concerns with any of the items. He noted silence would assume consensus.

25 Ms. Neely observed that the Work Plan should be reformatted for consistency. She noted this was not a
26 comment or concern about the content but reformatting to present action items for each task would
27 make tracking progress easier. She suggested lettered sub-bullets be labeled as action items and
28 rephrased as needed. Ms. Whorton said she would reformat accordingly after the meeting. The group
29 proceeded to review each of the Work Plan tasks to clarify scope and responsibilities/assignments.

30 **Corridor Demand and Capacity Model**

31 The group reviewed and agreed with #1 and the action items for the subcommittee (noted as lettered
32 bullets but revised to label as action items). Ms. Neely said that she would organize the subcommittee
33 and had received word from Vanessa Henderson that CDOT and HDR were able to rearrange tasks and
34 budgets in the 2020 Reassessment consultant contract to allow Chris Primus to participate in a meeting
35 with the subcommittee and provide background on the travel demand modeling and capacity goals.
36 David Krutsinger suggested that Erik Sabina, CDOT's subject matter expert on travel demand modeling,
37 would be a good addition to the meeting. (This would also further item #2 to coordinate with CDOT



1 DTD.) Ms. Neely asked anyone with interest to submit questions to her and/or let her know if they
2 wanted to participate in the meeting with Mr. Primus.

3 Subcommittee members include Mr. Neely, Mr. Hall, Randy Wheelock, Eva Wilson, and Tracy Sakaguchi.

4 **CSS Process Review**

5 Ms. Neely noted that action items were needed to clarify this task. The group discussed several ways
6 that the CSS process could be tracked better and reported out to the CE. The following action items
7 were added:

8 **Action Item:** PLT members should ensure lessons learned are considered at the end of projects,
9 consistent with the CSS Step 6 process to review and document lessons learned.

10 **Action Item:** For ongoing projects in the corridor, PLT members should report out at CE meetings how
11 the CSS process is working, especially for large projects. This would be a standing agenda item for future
12 CE meetings.

13 **Environmental Review**

14 The group did not have anything to add to the action items. Amy Saxton offered to organize the
15 subcommittee and its first meeting; the group agreed to discuss leadership of the subcommittee at the
16 meeting. In addition to Ms. Saxton, members that committed to serve on this CE subcommittee included
17 Ms. Neely, Gary Frey, and Becky English. Mr. Hall stated that someone from the Town of Vail would
18 participate on this subcommittee as well. Tamara Burke agreed to be the CDOT liaison with the
19 subcommittee and to coordinate with CDOT specialists as needed to support the action items.

20 Mr. Hall asked how the subcommittee could get help from CDOT in going back through the documents.
21 Ms. Henderson said that Ms. Burke could help but it would likely be a heavy lift so she will need help.
22 Ms. Saxton said she would help with the lift.

23 Mr. Hall also noted that when the Co-Chairs met with CDOT Director Lew, they requested that the CDOT
24 Mountain Corridor Environmental Manager position be filled quickly. They also stressed the importance
25 of this position in supporting the CE and progress on corridor improvements.

26 **Outreach and Communication**

27 There were no changes or additions to the action items listed. Margaret Bowes stated that the I-70
28 Coalition engaged GBSM to do a fairly extensive campaign in summer and fall 2018, and this could be a
29 start on collateral materials identified for the first action item. While the materials are comprehensive
30 related to the Preferred Alternative, some additions would be needed for talking points on the CE and
31 its role.

32 Ms. Bowes agreed to lead this subcommittee. Ms. Saxton, Ms. Sakaguchi, Mary Jane Lovelie, and Danny
33 Katz volunteered to serve on this subcommittee. Chris Linsmayer said he would attend the first call to
34 see how it developed.



- 1 Ms. Whorton asked if Denver needed to be represented. Mr. Katz responded that the work of the
- 2 subcommittee will help get Denver engaged but more progress needed to be made on the
- 3 communication materials before meaningful Front Range engagement was likely.



1 **Transit**

2 Ms. Neely said that this goal was for micro transit generally, not just for the vehicles in the MEXLs. Ms.
3 Bowes said that Bustang and Snowstang needed to be called out separately or with a slash as they serve
4 different purposes. She also commented that “travel lanes” should be changed to “general purpose
5 lanes” in the second action item because MEXL is already in that sentence.

6 Ms. Bowes asked for clarification on why the #5(ii) action item regarding Bustang/Snowstang expansion
7 and coordination with rural transit agencies was included. Mr. Krutsinger responded that the current
8 funding for rural transit is a fixed pie so there is sensitivity about funding. He suggested changing the
9 wording to be more positive, changing “expansion does not...” to “in a way that also supports local
10 transit.” The group endorsed this change.

11 The group discussed whether a Transit subcommittee was needed. Mr. Krutsinger suggested that micro
12 transit would fit well with the TDM subcommittee and that one committee would be more efficient. Mr.
13 Wheelock agreed and said micro-transit fit well with CDOT goals and is consistent with what the Co-
14 Chairs heard in the meeting with CDOT Director Lew. Mr. Hall asked if adding transit to the TDM
15 subcommittee was too much? Ms. Bowes said that micro transit is well covered under TDM work of the
16 I-70 Coalition. Additionally, because work for AGS would be covered by the AGS subcommittee, the
17 group agreed another Transit subcommittee was not needed. Ms. English stated that local micro-transit
18 business opportunities for public transit & ride systems will naturally develop as AGS station plans firm
19 up.

20 **Travel Demand Management (TDM)**

21 Ms. Bowes stated that the I-70 Coalition has a TDM work plan, and Trevor Handy is a part-time staffer
22 with the Coalition charged with its implementation. She said she would welcome CE participation in
23 implementing the Coalition’s work plan. While the I-70 Coalition has a TDM work plan that overlaps with
24 many of the CE interests, Ms. Bowes said the Coalition does not have bandwidth to take on all of the
25 items in the CE Work Plan, especially related to the Corridor Management approaches in task #7 such as
26 parking and congestion pricing. Ms. Bowes said she could give a brief presentation on the Coalition work
27 plan and how they are focusing their efforts at the next CE meeting.

28 The group discussed whether a CE subcommittee separate from the Coalition TDM committee was
29 needed. After discussion, the group agreed that CE members should join the Coalition committee, and a
30 new subcommittee could be formed in the future if needed. Mr. Krutsinger offered that CDOT DTR/OIM
31 can lend support / subject matter experts to the committee; he said staff would likely be Rachel Bolin
32 (OIM) and a member of the Bustang/Bus Ops team.

33 Based on discussion about transit representation on the TDM subcommittee, Eva Wilson, Tracy
34 McDonald, and Ann Rajewski were suggested to join the Coalition TDM committee. Ms. Bowes stated
35 that she would have Mr. Tandy would reach out to interested CE members. The group also agreed that
36 the next CE meeting will include a presentation on the Coalition’s TDM work, including the integration of
37 CE members to that committee.



1 **Corridor Management Approaches**

2 Ms. Bowes requested that the acronym BMP (best management practice) be defined. No other
3 comments were received on the action items (other than formatting, which applies globally to the CE
4 Work Plan). No subcommittee was assigned for this task but the I-70 Coalition could likely serve as a
5 clearinghouse of BMPs as they are developed.

6 **Technology and Traveler Information**

7 Ms. Bowes said that the #9b goal should be moved under the title non-infrastructure work plan item, as
8 this is a CE goal that applies to all non-infrastructure items. All agreed. Ms. Whorton asked for
9 clarification on where the item should be moved, and Ms. Neely stated it should be moved as a
10 preamble to the non-infrastructure elements as the overarching goal. Ms. Whorton thanked her for the
11 clarification and said she would revise in the CE Work Plan.

12 **AGS**

13 Ms. Bowes noted that the AGS subcommittee had already met and endorsed the tasks listed in the CE
14 Work Plan. Ms. Lovelie asked if there was a need to add timeframes to the AGS tasks? Mr. Wheelock
15 said he did not think this was necessary for two reasons. First, the Work Plan is aspirational at this point,
16 and more work is needed before the CE can confirm the ability to achieve timelines. He said adding
17 timeframes now would put people on the spot to endorse timelines in the document that may not be
18 achievable. Mr. Hall agreed and added that the meeting with Director Lew emphasized the need to be
19 clear about what is achievable in a ten-year timeframe; right now, AGS does not fit into that plan.
20 Second, Mr. Wheelock stated that although the subcommittee has already begun work, the Work Plan
21 sets the right direction, and the subcommittee is carrying forward action on the Work Plan under this
22 direction. There were no other comments on the AGS tasks or action items.

23 Subcommittee members include Mr. Wheelock (who organized the first meeting), Ms. Bowes, Ms.
24 Wilson, Mr. Krutsinger, Mr. Katz, Ms. English, Ms. Lovelie, Mike Riggs, and Dennis Royer. A report out of
25 the first meeting of the AGS subcommittee occurred later in the agenda.

26 **Highway Elements**

27 Mr. Hall stated that the CE felt progress had been made on the highway elements and the appropriate
28 level of effort had been placed on this component of the Preferred Alternative. However, he noted that
29 there are outstanding items related to the review of CSS and environmental impacts and commitments.

30 Ms. Neely asked if the language in the CE Work Plan should include reference to the clarifications on the
31 six-lane capacity in Step 3? Mr. Hall said that since Step 3 is part of the Reassessment report currently, it
32 is already documented so would not need to be added here. Ms. Neely agreed but said that it could be
33 added in the same way as the environmental and CSS work plan items are referenced. Ms. Whorton
34 suggested adding “and the clarifications from Step 3 on six lane highway capacity” after the CSS and
35 environmental Work Plan items. The group agreed.



1 **Wrap Up**

2 Mr. Wheelock reiterated that getting through the 2020 Reassessment had been a great accomplishment
3 for the CE. He said he was thrilled with the outcome and thanked all the members for their participation.
4 Ms. Henderson also stated that the process had gone really well, and she had enjoyed working through
5 the 2020 Reassessment Work Plan with the CE.

6 **Step 5**

7 Wendy Wallach reviewed the schedule and said the schedule had been ambitious, and due to the work
8 of the CE, it was accomplished. She reiterated praise for the CE on the accomplishment.

9 Ms. Wallach said that the final documentation was the last step but all the hard work had been done.
10 The first three steps had been completed and documented. Today's meeting completed the Step 4 and
11 refinements to the Work Plan.

12 Ms. Whorton asked if anyone had feedback on the Step 5 documentation summary. Ms. Neely said she
13 thought the summary was outstanding and captured the outcomes and intent of the work done over the
14 past year well. Mr. Coffin agreed that the summary was well done. Ms. Neely suggested a minor change
15 to the way CDOT and FHWA were described as potentially separate from rather than part of the CE. Ms.
16 Whorton said she would revise those descriptions. Mr. Linsmayer requested that the summary be
17 provided in Word format for comment. Ms. Whorton stated that both the revised work plan and
18 summary document could be provided in Word format.

19 Ms. Bowes asked about the Preferred Alternative tracking sheet. She said it seems to be included twice
20 and asked why and what the difference was with the versions? Ms. Henderson explained that one is a
21 condensed version with some of the columns hidden so that the work plan was more readable. The
22 other is the full Excel spreadsheet. Ms. Bowes asked how the Preferred Alternative tracking sheet would
23 be updated. Ms. Henderson said the full sheet lives on the website, and Ms. Burke will update as
24 projects are completed.

25 Mr. Hall thanked everyone for their hard work on the Reassessment. Ms. Henderson again
26 complimented the group's effort and said she really appreciated their work.

27 **Co-Chairs Meeting with CDOT Executive Director**

28 Mr. Wheelock said that Mr. Hall, Steve Coffin, and he met with CDOT Director Shoshana Lew along with
29 CDOT Region 1 Director, Paul Jesaitis, and CDOT Chief Engineer, Steve Harrelson, to share the results of
30 the Reassessment. He said CDOT was clear that its focus is on the 10-year work plan and what can be
31 done in that timeframe. Director Lew talked about projects in the corridor, including commitment to
32 micro transit, Floyd Hill, and other past and ongoing projects. Mr. Wheelock said he felt CDOT was
33 clearly committed to the corridor, and all involved in the meeting recognize funding limitations will be
34 factors for prioritizing future improvements. They agreed to set regular meetings to check in as CE Work
35 Plan progresses. He asked if any of the others at the meeting had anything to add. Mr. Hall and Mr.
36 Coffin did not.



1 Mr. Jesaitis said he agreed that the meeting was a robust discussion about next steps for transit. He said
2 CDOT would like to try to do some things in the next 5 years that move the needle on other modes. He
3 said projects in the current 10-year plan are not funded beyond 5 years (i.e., years 6-10). He said CDOT
4 appreciates the CE efforts and looks forward to continued partnership with the CE.

5 Mr. Katz asked how the work that the CE is doing and planning now could support action in the future
6 when we do have funding without requiring a lot of rework in the future? Mr. Wheelock said this was a
7 good consideration. The 10 year plan doesn't solve all the problems, and even it is not fully funded. He
8 said the CE needs to be sensitive to CDOT's position with funding and will need to communicate so that
9 the subcommittees don't get out in front of what can realistically be done and not committing to
10 timelines that will cause work to be lost or need to be redone. Mr. Hall summarized the sentiment of the
11 meeting that "dollars are limited so don't waste them."

12 CE Protocols and Meetings

13 Meetings

14
15 The CE has traditionally met for full-day workshops twice per year. The group discussed meeting
16 frequency and duration. After some discussion, the group agreed that three meetings per year of less
17 than 4 to 6 hours would be more productive. Holly Norton suggested that the video format used
18 through the Reassessment had proved to be efficient and should be considered for future meetings. The
19 subcommittees will meet more frequently and will develop schedules based on the work plan tasks and
20 member availability. Ms. Neely suggested the 2021 schedule should include a meeting at the end of
21 February to check in on the Work Plan and allow the subcommittees some time to organize. The group
22 agreed and set the next meeting for February 24 from 9 am to 11 am.

23 All agreed that in 2021, meetings would be in February, May, and September. Future years, meetings
24 would be in January, May, and September. Miller Hudson requested that the full mailing list receive
25 notifications of subcommittee meetings.

26 Suggested Revision to the CE Operating Protocols (regarding subcommittees)

27 Steve Coffin said that the CE Reassessment subcommittees have a different role than the working
28 groups envisioned in the CE Operating Protocols. He read suggested changes to the protocols below.

29 **10. ~~Subcommittees Working Groups and Support for Stakeholder Groups~~**

30 As necessary, subcommittees may be formally created by the CE ~~group~~ to address ~~specific special~~
31 topics in greater detail. ~~These subcommittees are advisory bodies to the CE. They will research or~~
32 ~~explore a designated issue and come to the CE with recommendations for the full CE to consider~~
33 ~~and act on as appropriate. Each subcommittee will appoint a chair from a CE member organization~~
34 ~~and will develop a scope of the issue to be researched or explored. That scope will be presented to~~
35 ~~the CE for its consensus approval prior to the commencement of its work. The same principles that~~
36 ~~guide the CE in its work (operating by consensus, no formal voting, staying true to the~~
37 ~~collaborative framework and approach, etc.) apply to each subcommittee in its operations.~~

38
39 Each member organization of the CE ~~and its alternate~~ may participate in these ~~subcommittees and~~
40 ~~may bring in subject matter expertise from their organizations as needed~~ ~~Working Groups~~. ~~With~~
41 ~~the consensus of the CE, these subcommittees may also include non-CE members when the CE~~
42 ~~has determined that expertise outside the membership of the CE is needed.~~ These ~~subcommittees~~



1 ~~groups~~ may be also formed in conjunction with the CSS process, particularly when broader
2 participation may be helpful. ~~In addition, f~~ If resources make this possible, facilitation or agenda
3 building support may be offered to subcommittees ~~stakeholder groups~~ to promote coordinated,
4 informed and representative discussions by all members.

5 There were no comments, and all agreed to revision.

6 AGS Subcommittee Meeting

7 Mr. Wheelock reviewed the first AGS subcommittee meeting. He noted the group got through lots of
8 topics in a dense agenda. The subcommittee agreed to meet every two weeks as they were getting
9 established. There is a lot of energy and enthusiasm for this subcommittee. Mr. Hall added that the
10 meeting agenda was very well organized and got through a lot of topics because Mr. Wheelock did a
11 great job keeping the discussion organized and focused on the Work Plan action items.

12 Wrap Up and Action Items

13 Mr. Wheelock noted that this is Ms. Henderson's last meeting. He extended thanks to her on behalf of
14 the CE for her support, not just in the CE Reassessment process but in being a bridge to CDOT. He said
15 she would be missed. Ms. Henderson said she enjoyed her time working with the CE and would stay
16 engaged if she could.

17 Mr. Hall noted that CDOT Region 3 did not officially participate as neither the primary member (Mike
18 Goolsby) or alternate (Dave Cezak) were in attendance.

19 Ms. Lovelie thanked the Co-Chairs for the collaborative process and for keeping the CE going.

20 Action Items

- 21 - Schedule meeting to review corridor capacity goals with Mr. Primus, HDR (January 2021) (Ms. Neely
22 and Ms. Henderson)
- 23 - Invite Erik Sabina to the capacity goal meeting (Ms. Henderson/Ms. Burke)
- 24 - Submit questions to Ms. Neeley and/or participate in the meeting with Mr. Primus (all CE members)
- 25 - Reformat the CE Work Plan with consistent action items and other edits discussed at this meeting
26 (Ms. Whorton)
- 27 - Distribute the Step 5 Reassessment Summary document and reformatted CE Work Plan in Word
28 format (Ms. Whorton and Ms. Henderson)
- 29 - Review and provide comments on the Reassessment Summary Document (all CE members)
- 30 - Schedule CE meeting for February 24, 2021 (CE Co-Chairs or delegate)
- 31 - Schedule first Environmental Subcommittee meeting (Ms. Saxton)
- 32 - Schedule first Outreach Subcommittee meeting and review collateral materials developed by the
33 Coalition in 2018 (Ms. Bowes)
- 34 - Invite interested CE members to the I-70 Coalition TDM committee meeting (Ms. Bowes/Mr. Handy)
- 35 - Set recurring meetings between CE Co-Chairs and CDOT Executive Management (Mr. Wheelock/Mr.
36 Jesaitis)
- 37 - Provide notifications of subcommittee meetings to full CE mailing list (CE Subcommittee Chairs)