AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTIONS AND OVERVIEW
2. PROJECT TT CHARTER
3. RESPONSES TO TECHNICAL TEAM ISSUES
4. OUTCOMES FROM ISSUE TASK FORCE MEETINGS
5. OUTREACH SUMMARY
6. FOLLOW UP
   - Report Out
   - Project Overview
7. DISCUSS PROPOSED SOLUTIONS
   - Final Design Details
   - Specifications Sections
   - Transition to Construction
   - Lessons Learned & Best Practices
8. OUTSTANDING ISSUES
9. DEVELOP CRITERIA FOR
10. NEXT STEPS
    - Projects
    - Upcoming Meetings
- Floyd Hill
- Region 3 Vail Pass
- Idaho Springs Transit Center
- Clear Creek Greenway
- CR 314 Phase II
- Fall River Road Bridge
- Smart 70 / RoadX
- Geohazard Mitigation Program
- Variable Speed Limit
SIMPLE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>7/11</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>11/14</td>
<td>11/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT #14</td>
<td>TT #16</td>
<td>TT #17</td>
<td>TT #18</td>
<td>TT #19</td>
<td>TT #20</td>
<td>FOR Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus Area 2</td>
<td>• Barrier</td>
<td>• Water Quality</td>
<td>• Environ Impact &amp; Mitigation</td>
<td>• ROD Compatibility</td>
<td>• Present Final Design Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus Area 3</td>
<td>• Wall treatment</td>
<td>• Rock cut Treatment</td>
<td>• Information</td>
<td>• 1041</td>
<td>• Lessons Learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Barrier (Intro)</td>
<td>• CR 314</td>
<td>• Signage</td>
<td>• Assurances</td>
<td>• ConOps</td>
<td>• CSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/23</td>
<td>7/13</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td>9/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT #15</td>
<td>ALIVE Mtg #4</td>
<td>CR 314</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Barrier (Focus Area 2 and 3)</td>
<td>• Draft Con Ops</td>
<td>• Induced/Lateral Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SCAP</td>
<td>• Water Quality</td>
<td>• Section 106 ITF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drainage</td>
<td>• Rock cut Treatment</td>
<td>• FIR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pullouts</td>
<td>• Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertise Jan 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ingress/Egress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CR 314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rock cut Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ConOps / Operating Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• VSL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Induced/Lateral Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT ELEMENTS DISCUSSION

- November TT
  - Final Design Details
  - Lessons Learned
  - Specifications
  - CSS Transition to Construction
FOLLOW UP
REPORT OUT

- Concept of Operations
- MOU
- Documented CatEx
- 1041 Process
PROJECT OVERVIEW

Proposed Action

- Addition of a 12-mile tolled Peak Period Shoulder Lane (PPSL) between east Idaho Springs and the U.S. Highway 40 (US 40)/I-70 interchange in the WB direction
- Addition of 5 WB and 2 EB safety/enforcement pullouts; improvement to 1 EB
- Rockfall mitigation
- Improvement to roadway geometry
- Improvements at Exits 240 and 241
- Improvements at Dumont Port-of-Entry Interchange

Schedule – Advertise in early 2019
DISCUSS PROPOSED SOLUTIONS
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Roadway – Interchange improvements at Exit 240
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Roadway – Interchange improvements at Exit 241
FI NAL DESIGN DETAILS

Roadway
- Ramp lengths
  - Improved over existing conditions on accel and decel lengths (except for at truck ramp/Downieville)
- Guardrail
  - Replaced Type 4 with paddles
  - Replaced Type 3 on the outside for consistency
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Utilities – Sanitary sewer / waterline in Idaho Springs
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Lighting
  - Lighting on SH 103 bridge
  - Lighting in box culvert
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Drainage / Water Quality – Sediment Basins Lawson (sheet 329)

Discuss Proposed Solutions
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Drainage / Water Quality - Sediment Basins 1, 2, and 3 (sheet 318 thru sheet 328)
FINIAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Drainage / Water Quality – Sediment Basins 1, 2, and 3 (sheet 318 thru sheet 328)

DISCUSS PROPOSED SOLUTIONS
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Drainage / Water Quality – Sediment Basins 1, 2, and 3 (sheet 318 thru sheet 328)
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Drainage / Water Quality – Fall River Road

DISCUSS PROPOSED SOLUTIONS
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Drainage / Water Quality - Drainage Systems

Discuss Proposed Solutions
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Drainage / Water Quality – Drainage Systems

Discuss proposed solutions.
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

➢ Drainage / Water Quality – Drainage Systems
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Geotechnical – At Bin Wall Shift
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Geotechnical – Buttress Location

BEFORE

AFTER
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

➢ Geotechnical – Exit 239
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

➢ Geotechnical – Spring Gulch
FINAL DESIGN DETAILS

- Structures
  - Median Wall
  - Box Culvert
  - Noise Wall
SPECIFICATIONS SECTIONS

- Section 104 – Scope of Work / Maintaining Traffic
  (pages 14 – 16)
- Section 107 – Environmental Mitigation Table
  (pages 24 – 42)
- Section 626 – Public Information Services
  (pages 390 – 405)
- Traffic Control Plan – General
  (pages 426 – 431)
## CSS TRACKING TOOL

Comments or Input on the CCS Tracking Chart

### WB PPSL CSS Issues Tracking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSS Issue by Core Value</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date of CSS Recommendation Design/Pre-Construction</th>
<th>Date of CSS Review During Construction</th>
<th>Date of CSS Review Post-Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety by designing and building appropriate pullouts for emergencies and law enforcement use. 5 Westbound and 2 additional Eastbound pullouts were incorporated into the project.</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>5/23/18 – TT reviews and provides input on pull out locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety by designing and installing a Type 9 Barrier with a glare screen through Idaho Springs for the median barrier and on the outside on the walls (replacing Type 4 barriers with paddles to reduce strobe effect of lights at night).</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>6/4/18 - Idaho Springs Community Meeting 7/11/18 – TT reviews Idaho Springs barrier recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSS TRANSITION TO CONSTRUCTION

- Team Establishment
  - Immediate Response Team
    - Primary and Alternate
    - Construction issues requiring immediate resolution
  - Combined PLT / TT
    - Process check-in
    - Public information
    - Construction modifications
LESSONS LEARNED & BEST PRACTICES

➢ Review Results from Anonymous Survey

1. How did you participate in the WB PPSL project? Check all that apply.
   16 responses

2. To what extent do you feel your input was valuable and your contributions were considered in decision making?
   16 responses
DISCUSS PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

LESSONS LEARNED & BEST PRACTICES

- Review Results from Anonymous Survey

3. Do you feel project meetings you participated in were an effective use of your time? Rate your satisfaction with the following meeting elements.

6. From your agency or organizational perspective, how would you rate the quality and timeliness of information and documentation?

16 responses
LESSONS LEARNED & BEST PRACTICES

- Review Results from Anonymous Survey
  - What was the most effective aspect of project meetings?
    - Sharing of perspectives and ideas
    - Collaboration and facilitation to build consensus and agree on solutions
    - Local stakeholder input
    - Pulling together the resource agencies, project team, consultants, and other stakeholders so they all hear the same thing at the same time
    - Visual aides (large maps, diagrams)
    - Project issue discussions
  - What one thing would you change about the WB PPSL process?
    - Clarity around PLT and TT roles
    - Ensuring a balance of stakeholder input – avoid one perspective dominating
    - Less meeting frequency and less backtracking of topics already agreed upon
    - Correcting inaccurate information and validating facts
LESSONS LEARNED & BEST PRACTICES

Review Results from Anonymous Survey

7. To what degree do you feel that CSS principles and steps were incorporated into the WB PPAS project development process?

9. How satisfied are you with the design of the WB PPAS?

15 responses

- Very much: 33.3%
- Satisfied: 26.7%
- Somewhat satisfied: 40%
- Not very satisfied: 7.5%
LESSONS LEARNED & BEST PRACTICES

- Review Results from Anonymous Survey
  - What about the CSS process worked well?
    - Early distribution of materials
    - Diversity of stakeholders at the table
    - Neutral facilitation and communication
    - Bringing stakeholders together to ask questions and give input
  - What would you change?
    - Consolidate meetings
    - More one-on-one meetings with stakeholders
    - Meeting location - closer to project location
    - Balancing stakeholder voices
LESSONS LEARNED & BEST PRACTICES

Review Results from Anonymous Survey

10. How effective do you feel the Project Leadership Team and Technical Team was in incorporating technical aspects into the PPSL project development process?

16 responses

- Extremely effective: 31.3%
- Effective: 37.5%
- Somewhat effective: 13.3%
- Not very effective: 3.8%

Please explain further:
- More review time is needed
- Genuine interest from technical side to understand viewpoints of community
- More representation of community and reaching out to local stakeholders on part of representatives
- Consideration of broader impact
LESSONS LEARNED & BEST PRACTICES

Review Results from Anonymous Survey

11. How effective do you feel the Issue Task Forces were in crafting solutions or recommendations regarding specific issues?
15 responses

12. How effectively do you feel the general public was engaged in this project?
14 responses
LESSONS LEARNED & BEST PRACTICES

- Review Results from Anonymous Survey
  - What suggestions and/or recommendations do you have for engaging the public on future projects?
    - WB PPSL was effective, timely, and appropriate
    - Keep materials available for public to see after meetings (in county buildings)
    - Incorporate discussions and Q&A into existing events public already attends
    - Neighborhood meetings
    - Broad participation beyond CCC
  - What was the greatest success of the WB PPSL CSS process?
    - Coordinating with stakeholders
    - INFRA grant
    - Approved CATEX with compromise including FHWA
    - Final design
    - Long-term relationships and partnerships
PROJECTS

- WB PPSL
- CR 314
- Fall River Road Bridge
- Greenway

NEXT STEPS
- Greenway ITF - November 14, 2018
- FOR Meeting - November 15, 2018
- Construction PLT Kickoff Meeting - Spring 2019