



MEETING SUMMARY

Westbound I-70 Mountain Corridor - Concept Development Process

Project Leadership Team (PLT) Meeting

Wednesday, January 25, 2017

9:30 am – 12: 00 pm

Agenda

Time	Agenda Topic
9:30 am – 9:45 am	Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review
9:45 am – 10:00 am	<p>Review and Discussion: Review of process activities, timeline and check-in with PLT on how the process is going.</p> <p>Desired Outcome: PLT gives process feedback and confirms timeline.</p>
10:00 am – 10:45 am	<p>Review and Discussion: Review Critical Issues and Segment 1 Concepts developed and mapped in January by the Technical Team. Introduction to Evaluation Matrix.</p> <p>Desired Outcome: PLT understands and discusses the critical issues, concepts developed and next steps for the TT. PLT review evaluation matrix.</p>
10:45 am – 11:15 am	<p>Discussion: Discuss the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Public Meeting #1.</p> <p><i>See Addendum</i></p> <p>Desired Outcome: Discuss purpose, roles and responsibilities for Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Public Meeting #1.</p>
11:15 am – 11:30 am	<p>Discussion: Confirm approach to ensure AGS is not precluded.</p> <p>Desired Outcome: PLT understands and supports AGS review for the WB I-70 Concept Development Process.</p>
11:30 am – 11:50 am	<p>Review and Discussion: Segment D approach and timeline.</p> <p>Desired Outcome: PLT understands the context and approach for Segment D.</p>
11:50 am – 12:00 pm	Next Steps and PLT Chartering

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Jonathan Bartsch, CDR Associates, welcomed the group. The meeting participants introduced themselves and stated their affiliation. Jonathan reviewed the agenda. The group agreed to the agenda as presented and proceeded.

Review of process activities, timeline and check-in with PLT on process

Updates

- Clear Creek County passed a Resolution on Segment D. Municipalities in the County should also pass their own related Resolutions if they so desire to indicate that they agree with the CCC Resolution. Some attendees noted that they had been involved and the resolution reflects their desires and views.

Action Item: CDR to distribute Segment D Resolution to the PLT

Communication

PLT would like to be included in all TT email correspondence and receive all materials that the TT receives. This will help PLT stay in the loop and champion the process.

Process Timeline Discussion

Generally, some members of the PLT expressed concern that the process and proposed timeline is moving too fast.

- The PLT and TT both feel that they do not have enough time to digest, organize and understand the range of diverse critical issues and related context that has been identified. Are we setting this process up for frustration?
- The TT and PLT need to be involved in the discussion of how issues are organized in a meaningful way so that they connect with concepts.
- Details matter. For example, we don't want to be so rushed that we didn't realize that we would cut off bicycle access.
- Clear Creek County does not want to be put in a pinch or looked at as "CCC is slowing this down." However, CCC is committed to doing the project right regardless of the time it's going to take. There needs to be a level of comfort and commitment to different perspectives – this takes time.

- Need more time to do good CSS process. This includes identifying the critical issues, sitting with the issues and then working through the issues.
- Some members of the PLT noted that at the last TT meeting, there was actually quite a bit of time allowed to look once more at issues that had been previously identified and confirm or add to those.
- It is important that this process is not just an exercise to comply with public participation requirements to satisfy higher-level goals. This process should not just be a checklist. Real input is needed.
- The TT needs more time before jumping into Segment 2 on the February 23 meeting.
- When we move to another segment, we should start out with initial brainstorm of critical issues. This has been done. Then, send these critical issues out and reconfirm issues before starting on concepts.
- Need 2-3 meetings minimum per segment.
- The engineering consultants and contractors may also need more time (in addition to the upcoming 9am-4pm meeting on February 6).

Discussion Outcome

It is important to slow down. Everyone at the table acknowledges and agrees to make sure the needs of the community are thoughtfully and fully considered and addressed in this process.

The PLT agreed to the schedule/timeline presented in the handout “as is” but only through the February 23, 2017 meeting.

Target Date	Activity
February 6 9am to 4pm	Engineering contractor/consultant working session to develop and evaluate Segment 1 Concepts.
February 8 or 9	PMT fills out Evaluation/Decision Matrix for Segment 1 and sends to TT for review.
February 23 (4 hour meeting)	TT meeting to review and provide feedback on corridor-wide Critical Issues, Segment 1 Concepts and the Segment 1 Evaluation/Decisions Matrix. Brainstorm Concepts for Segment 2.

****NOTE:** Emails exchanged after this PLT meeting between Clear Creek County and CDOT/CDR indicated that there was some confusion to this timeline and process agreement and outcome. Clear Creek County had thought that the February 23rd

meeting would include brainstorming **ISSUES** Segment 2, but not **CONCEPTS** for Segment 2.

CDOT responded that the February 23 TT meeting could instead focus on reviewing and providing feedback on **Segment 1 only** on 1)Critical Issues 2) Concepts and 3) Evaluation/Decision Matrix. Segment 2 discussions will be taken off of the February 23rd agenda entirely.

Clear Creek County responded that they are comfortable with confirming Segment 2 **ISSUES** at the February 23rd meeting.

After the 2/23 TT meeting, PMT and PLT will check in again to reassess the timeline and determine next steps.

Organization of Critical Issues

The mapping of critical issues is helpful to the process to understand the geospatial context. However, the PLT noted that there are so many issues and these issues need to be organized so they can be analyzed and managed. The organization process should be aimed at assisting the PLT and TT in identifying which issues are triggers, which issues have fatal flaws, and how these issues relate to core values.

The group discussed many different possibilities for organization. The group concluded that the initial Flow Chart created by Kevin Shanks, THK, is a generic template. This template is the basis for segment-specific flow charts -- each segment-specific flow chart will be tailored with specific Critical Issues (taken verbatim from the segment maps) and corresponding Evaluation Criteria.

Steve Long, HDR, cautioned that segmenting can lead to losing sight of the overarching framework of what we are trying to achieve. It is important that we retain and integrate corridor-wide issues. This needs to be an iterative process, not just looking segment-by-segment, but looking at the full piece.

Discussion Outcome

HDR and THK will take a first stab at organizing the critical issues for each segment. HDR and THK will then send this draft (for Segment 1 only) out to the PLT/TT for feedback and further refinement to ensure that these issues/concepts are manageable and easier to evaluate.

Next steps for HDR/THK/PLT

1. HDR/THK - Put critical issues into core values buckets (color coding) per segment.
2. HDR/THK - Take a first cut at Evaluation Criteria

3. Report back to PLT/TT
4. PLT/TT will provide feedback to ensure that critical issues are manageable and in the right categories and flowcharts
5. PLT will provide feedback and edits to evaluation criteria to be used in the Evaluation matrix
6. TT members will receive these updated documents (Tier 1 critical issues, Tier 1 issues as categorized into core values and evaluation criteria) prior to the February 23rd TT meeting. At the meeting TT members will provide feedback on issues and evaluation matrix preliminary results.
7. TT decisions will go back to the PLT for review and confirmation

Review of Fatal Flaw Analysis

A concept can have a “fatal flaw” for multiple reasons. A few of these were considered at the PLT meeting:

1. If the concept is not in compliance with the ROD
2. If the concept precludes AGS
3. If a concept is so objectionable that there would be significant pushback
4. If a concept is publically unacceptable
5. If a concept is not feasible
6. If a concept is illegal
7. If a concept negatively impacts multiple critical issues.

Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Public Meeting #1

The PLT agreed to the following plan for Public Meeting #1:

Date: March 14

Time: 5pm-7pm

Location: Clear Creek Rec Center

Draft Agenda:

5:00pm – Open to the Public

5:30pm-5:50pm – Presentation

5:50pm – 7pm: Comments/questions from the public and interactive map exercises to identify critical issues and concepts

**Note, this meeting should not be advertised as an “Open House” as people may miss out on the presentation. **

See Addendum at the end of this Meeting Summary for Public Meeting Information

Action Items:

- PLT to send ideas for “lessons learned” board
- CDR to draft meeting agenda and notice and send out to PLT for review
- See Addendum for additional Actions

Review Segment 1 Concepts developed in January by the Technical Team

Steve Long from HDR presents a summary of concepts developed by the Technical team

1. Off-alignment options (tunnels)
2. Interchange options – what could we do at interchanges to improve them? Variety of ideas were presented, e.g.
 - Interchanges in between Beaver Brook and Hidden Valley become “interchange complexes” that work together and have different movements to get travelers to different locations. This would help with areas that are really tight.
 - US 40 and US 6 – take interchange movements out at 6 and move to Beaver Brook or build a new interchange that is NOT at such a constrained area. Move US 6 movement 100 feet to the top of the hill
3. On-alignment options
 - Coming down the hill – US 40, where does the wall go?
 - Roundabouts

These concepts will be further developed along with likely other ideas from the consultants/contractors and mixed and matched at the engineering contractor/consultant meeting on February 6.

AGS Plan

HDR is working with the Aztec consulting group who developed and evaluated AGS for the corridor. Aztec provided “hybrid” alignment drawings to HDR on 1.24.17. The AGS is generally grade separated and not at the same level of I-70.

- “Hybrid:” The “hybrid” AGS option was chosen because it was a lower cost and lower speed than the “high-speed” AGS option. The hybrid is more suited for the curve radius

and needs less tunneling than high-speed. It is also closest to the i-70 ROW so could be considered the “worst case” from the standpoint of identifying any possible conflict with the highway improvements.

AGS non-preclusion plan: The plan is to work with Chris Primus from HDR (was also on Aztec team that developed and evaluated AGS concepts). As the WB I-70 concepts get developed, these concepts will be laid onto the same maps as the AGS maps. Chris will look at the Concepts that get developed to make sure that you can still fit in a future AGS. None of the concepts developed will move forward if they preclude a future AGS. This is part of the fatal flaw criteria.

The AGS analysis will be presented at Public Meeting #1.

Segment D – Empire Junction to Eisenhower Tunnels

Question Presented: Segment D is different. What do we want to do with it? If the group wants no action, that is fine. If the group wants to gather baseline information for the next study that may come up in 5 years, that is also fine. What does the group want to do?

Discussion:

Clear Creek County mentions the need for adaptive management. Need some estimation in terms of what is the next task at hand. We need to set up some level of criteria to evaluate the impacts. What does increased traffic mean for tunnels? Need to put down the level of impacts for 2020-2025 impacts. How do we think, model and look? ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.

Silverplume voices their concern about losing the “bridge to nowhere.” This bridge goes to a greenway and proposed park service rifle range. It is important that this bridge not be lost. Further, Silverplume does not want to give up any land to I-70 project. This sentiment may change as property taxes go up and need more business, but at this point, no one wants to give up land to project.

USFS is concerned about the cumulative impacts and environmental impacts from widening the road from Empire Junction to the Tunnels. Need a model like Glenwood Canyon , with over- and underpasses to address the environmental concerns in this area.

Clear Creek County passed a Resolution on Segment D. The PLT would like to review the Resolution before making a decision.

Action Items:

- CDR to distribute the Resolution and table the discussion until PLT members have had a chance to look at the resolution.
- PLT to go back to local communities to see if they would like to add Resolutions before moving forward

- This discussion is tabled until the next PLT meeting
- At this point, focus on Segments 1, 2, 3 without losing sight of impacts on Segment D.

PLT Charter

The PLT Charter was distributed to the group prior to the meeting.

Action Item: PLT will provide electronic comments and feedback with the goal of confirming the Charter at the next PLT.

Attendees

Steve Harelson, Margaret Bowes, Joe Mahoney, Carol Kruse, Tim Mauck , Mike Hillman, Cindy Neely, Lizzie Kemp, Joseph Feiccabrino, Tom Hale, Wendy Koch, Neil Ogden, Kevin Brown, Kevin Shanks, Gina McAfee, Steve Long, Ben Acimovic, Bob Smith, Randy Wheelock, Jonathan Bartsch, Taber Ward

Addendum – Public Meeting Plan

When | Tuesday, March 14, 2017

Time | 5pm - 7pm

Where | Clear Creek Rec Center | 98 12th Ave, Idaho Springs, CO 80452

Meeting Purpose | Purpose for the meeting is to:

1. Remind interested stakeholders about what previous studies have been done. This includes the ROD, MOU and PEIS.
2. Request input into other ideas that should be considered for WB improvements from the top of Floyd Hill to Eisenhower Johnson Memorial Tunnels.

Next Steps

Action	Timeline	Responsible Parties
PLT Confirmation	1/25/17	PLT
Prepare and distribute public meeting announcement	2/1/17 – 3/14/17	CDR (design), PLT/TT/CDOT (distribution)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facebook, flyers (Safeway, schools, post office, etc.) • E-mail blast, • Canyon Courier • Neighborhood Associations • CDOT digital traffic signs • CDOT project website • Other Ideas? 		
Prepare a first draft of graphics for PLT and TT review.	2/14/17	HDR/THK
PLT and TT confirmation of graphics.	2/20/17	PLT/TT

Develop and Review Meeting #1 Agenda	Week of 2/20	PMT/PLT/TT
PLT and TT attend Meeting #1	March 14	All
Meeting Recording, Documentation and Follow up	End of March	CDR/HDR/THK

Proposed Graphics:

- Purpose of the Meeting
- What is the Record of Decision and what is in the Record of Decision (text and maps)
- What EB work has already been done since the ROD (i.e. Twin Tunnels – EB and WB, Mountain Express Lanes, EB auxiliary lanes)
- Benefits and lessons learned from these previous projects (transportation performance, construction challenges, economic benefits to the county and Idaho Springs)
- Need for WB improvements
- Process for WB concept development
- Players in concept development process
 - o Who is on PLT, TT, PMT and what are their roles
- Maps showing 1) Critical Issues and Concepts identified so far, 2) ROD commitments, 3)MOU agreements and 3) Clear Creek County and Idaho Springs visioning ideas
- Clean maps on tables with post-it notes for people to write their ideas
- What's next?
 - o Recommendation from concept development process (including a public meeting in the spring)
 - o Initiate NEPA process
 - o More public involvement
 - o Design, construction dependent on funding.
 - o The plan is to construct WB PPSL first before any improvements on Floyd Hill