



Floyd Hill – Project Leadership Team

Meeting Summary

April 6, 2022, 9:00 AM to 11:30 AM

CDOT Golden - Lookout Mountain Conference Room and Virtual (Zoom)

1. Welcome and Introductions

Participants introduced themselves. Jonathan Bartsch, CDR, noted that the primary goal of the meeting was to prepare for the Technical Team kick off.

Project Updates: Kevin Brown, CDOT, provided an update on the three Early Projects: the Empire wildlife crossing, Genesee wildlife crossing, and roundabouts and parking. Kevin noted that due to community concerns regarding the parking lot at Homestead Road, which was to be funded by CDOT's Division of Transit and Rail (DTR), CDOT was recommending that location be put on hold and that a new location be pursued. After discussing with DTR, a new location is being evaluated in Jefferson County near Evergreen. CDOT intends to move forward with the roundabouts project, which should be ready for ad in July, and the wildlife crossings after that: Genesee in late September, and Empire after that. The parking lot will likely be a fourth project that will follow a separate CSS process.

Cindy Neely, Clear Creek County, noted that the Floyd Hill community has significant concerns about the size of the parking lot. While there is continued interest in improving the Homestead lot for neighborhood uses, moving the larger lot to a new location is supported by the county.

Andy Marsh, Idaho Springs, noted that the location in Evergreen is not convenient for travelers heading westbound. Kevin agreed but noted that it was not different from the Homestead lot (both are split diamond interchanges) and that the location would be better for use of the MEXL. Melinda Urban, FHWA, said the new location may also have community concerns and that CDOT would need to do some outreach for the new location too. Kurt Kionka, CDOT, reiterated that the new parking lot location would be evaluated as a new project that would go through the full CSS and NEPA processes.

Andy noted that Idaho Springs has a mobility hub planned and would welcome additional investment in that location if the Jefferson County location was not desired.

PLT Agreement:

- Agree that moving Pegasus parking to another location is preferable based on community concerns.
- New parking lot location should be fully evaluated as a new project and follow the CSS process.



2. Finalize PLT Charter

Taber Ward, CDR, reviewed the PLT charter, which was distributed prior to the meeting. She reviewed each of the items in the charter, starting with the critical success factors and asked if they were still relevant.

General: Cindy asked that WB be removed from the project title. The PLT agreed.

Critical Success Factors: Amy Saxton, Clear Creek County, asked if additional community consideration needed to be added to ensure that operations do not affect nearby communities. For instance, would managed lane operations cause new or worsen congestion in Idaho Springs? For example, would diversion of traffic through Idaho Springs occur due to people avoiding the toll? Also, would the transition from three to two lanes at Exit 241 create a new bottleneck when the PPSL is not operating?

Andy suggested that the Greenway be specifically called out and not treated as general recreation. He said he would like to see preserving and enhancing the Greenway as a separate critical success factor. Amy noted that the Greenway should be called a corridor not a path. Cindy also said that supporting the plans for the open space park needs to be included as a critical success factor. The PLT agreed that supporting the Greenway and open space park were important success factors.

Membership: Amy said that both she and Cindy would like to be part of the PLT and actively participate. She asked if the charter could be revised to reflect that both primary and alternate members can participate. Margaret Bowes, I-70 Coalition, said that if alternates are fully engaged in the PLT, they should be able to participate. Amy said that having Cindy be an active part of the PLT discussion is a benefit to the CSS process and to the County. The PLT agreed that if alternates were active participants, they should be able to participate in meetings. However, it is still important that the primary and alternate members are aligned so that there is not disagreement within the represented organization (will speak with one voice).

Meeting Attendance: Andy asked if hybrid meetings would continue and recommended that they be allowed. The PLT agreed that hybrid meetings should continue.

PLT Communications: Taber said that meeting materials could be provided three days in advance but not a full week as had been the previous practice. The PLT agreed that it would be okay to have materials three days in advance. However, Margaret asked that it be clarified to three business days rather than calendar days.

For pre-meeting check-ins on agendas, Cindy asked that the parenthetical phrase that PLT would delegate members of the group be deleted and that agenda be sent to everyone. Lynnette Hailey, City of Black Hawk, asked that the agendas be sent out and that any members that have comments respond to the whole PLT if there is a suggested agenda change. Cindy also asked that CDOT be allowed/encouraged to contact individual members as needed for the agenda setting process. Amy asked that meetings be scheduled at a regular cadence so that they are consistent on calendars.



A post-meeting “meeting briefing matrix” outlining the meeting agenda items, agreements and action items will be distributed one week after the meeting. The full meeting summaries will be distributed on a monthly basis. Melinda asked who the materials would come from. Taber said that materials would come from CDR.

The group agreed that it was not necessary to maintain a Google drive of the project meeting materials. They will continue to be posted on the project website.

Public attendance at PLT meetings: Melinda asked about the public observation and whether a public comment period would be included. Taber explained that there had been previous cases where ITF members or other interested parties had wanted to participate or observe PLT or TT meetings.

Amy noted that the early project ITF with the public participants changed the meeting dynamics and was not as productive as the working meeting format of the CSS process. Mandy Whorton, Peak Consulting Group, noted that the PLT advised on including members of the public at that meeting for efficiency (rather than holding a separate meeting). The PLT agreed that the language “at the discretion of the PLT” provides flexibility for the PLT to direct public engagement at meetings and that further changes to the charter were not needed.

PLT Agreement:

- Remove WB from the project title in the charter.
- Add supporting/improving/enhancing Greenway and Open Space Park as a separate success factor.
- Add integration of PPSL and Floyd Hill/PPSL operations as a separate success factor.
- Allow alternates to fully participate in meetings at the discretion of the PLT.
- Continue to have hybrid meetings where virtual participation is available.
- Materials can be provided three business days ahead of meetings.
- Post-meeting issues summaries will be sent out within one week of meetings, full meeting summaries will come out on a monthly basis.
- Meeting materials will be archived on the project website, and a Google drive is not needed.

Actions:

- Revise the charter to include PLT agreements.

3. Discuss and Confirm Evaluation Criteria and Measures of Success

Taber distributed the CSS considerations chart and walked through the columns.

Cindy suggested the PLT’s role should be more in directing the TT rather than itself looking at the measures of success. Cindy said the first thing for the TT should be to look at the measures of success and evaluation criteria and how to talk about the larger design refinements. The PLT needs to give the TT guidance on what they need to do regarding the criteria. Rather than discuss the evaluation criteria, PLT should use time to make sure that the TT members and ITF



members in place. She suggested charging the TT with coming up with the measures of success and moving on to other agenda items.

Anthony Pisano, Atkins, asked if the ITFs would be known. Mandy noted that the PLT identified a number of standing and known ITFs that could be stood up sooner. Other ITFs could be added later, as is standard practice when issues arise. The group reviewed the suggested ITFs and membership. Margaret said that some of the ITFs in the spreadsheet were different than those in the Stakeholder Involvement Plan, which would be discussed later in the meeting.

Taber reviewed the TT and ITF members. Kurt asked the PLT to help fill in names/contacts for the ITF members so that letters can go out similar to the TT letters. Taber updated the spreadsheet of ITF members.

Cindy said it would be important to get a schedule to the TT, along with milestones for PLT and TT. This would be helpful to understand the time commitment. Kurt said a schedule would be presented at TT. Cindy suggested that the schedule may be too compressed for as many ITFs as the PLT envisioned, and the roles of the TT and ITFs should be discussed with the TT.

Anthony said that the ITFs likely need to be meeting by the beginning of May in order to keep the design refinement evaluations on track for September cost estimates.

4. Public Information Plan

Mandy reviewed plan. The following edits or additions were suggested:

- In the discussion of Project Teams, note which ITFs would be engaged early during the design refinement evaluation and which would be mobilized later.
- Change the Project-Specific ITF for recreation to Recreation, Greenway, and Open Space ITF
- Under Key Milestones and Activities, clarify that the different stages of the project development have different needs, including public involvement needs for the NEPA process (pre-decision document). Also, discuss the relationship of the CM/GC involvement with the early projects.
- PILT – note that the PLT will designate and invite members similar to the process for WB PPSL. Also, note that the PILT is primarily for public **information** not public **involvement**.

5. Technical Team Meetings

Taber noted that the TT meeting is scheduled for April 15. Many of the PLT members will be at the TT meeting and an agenda will be developed; may ask for PLT input on the TT agenda.

6. CDOT Project Kickoff Meetings

Kurt said that the CDOT project kickoff would occur April 19 and April 20 in the afternoons. The meeting would be in the traffic operations center next to the West Program offices on Corporate Circle. Kurt and Kevin Brown will look at the space and make sure it is well set up for a large in-person meeting. Kurt invited any PLT members that want to attend the first meeting



and asked if there was one person from the PLT that wanted to observe the second day. The first day would be more of a scoping meeting where the teams would get to know each other and discuss the scope and schedule for the CM/GC process. Matt Hogan, Kraemer, said that the first day would be helpful for his team to understand the CSS process and the environment of working in the Mountain Corridor. The second day would be more technical and logistical, setting up technical task forces or working groups and internal coordination between the technical specialists among the consultant, contractor, and CDOT teams. Cindy, Amy, Lynnette, Joe, and Andy said they would try to attend the first day, and Margaret said she would join virtually for some of the meeting. Kurt or Taber will forward the invite to these PLT members so that it was on their calendars if their schedules permitted attendance.

Actions

- Develop agenda for TT on April 15
- Send invite for CDOT Kickoff on April 19 and April 20, 2022
- Taber noted that the TT meeting is scheduled for April 15. Many of the PLT members will be at the TT meeting and an agenda will be developed; may ask for PLT input on the TT agenda.

7. Future Scheduling, Next Steps, and Action Items

Action items are documented in the meeting notes and generally relate to Project Team set up and coordination.

8. Attendees

Cindy Neely, Amy Saxton (Clear Creek County); Andy Marsh (Idaho Springs); Joe Behm (Central City); Margaret Bowes (I-70 Coalition); Lynnette Hailey (City of Black Hawk and Gilpin County); Melinda Urban, Liz Cramer (FHWA); Kurt Kionka, Vanessa Halladay, Kevin Brown, Tyler Brady, Jeff Hampton, (CDOT); Anthony Pisano (Atkins); Matt Hogan (Kraemer); Mandy Whorton (Peak Consulting); Jonathan Bartsch, Taber Ward (CDR Associates)