



APPENDIX E. PLT/TT AGENDAS AND ISSUES COVERED BY MEETING

**Westbound I-70
Concept Development Process Final Report
Appendix E: PLT/TT Agendas and Issues
INDEX**

<i>Description</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
WB I-70 Concept Development Process Meeting Schedule and Communications Record	E-1



WB I-70 Concept Development Process Meeting Schedule and Communications Record Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
August 30, 2016 3:30–5:00 PM	PLT Visioning	Easter Seals, Georgetown	PMT, PLT	Meeting Kick-off	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HDR will facilitate the Visioning Workshops. • CDOT will conduct three series of visioning workshops for each identified corridor segment. • CDOT will ask the PLT for technical team members for each workshop. • CDOT will solicit consultants and contractors to assist in the development of alternatives for each segment. • The workshops will begin in the fall of 2016.
October 27, 2016 3:30–5:00 PM	Internal Consultant Meeting	HDR Offices	HDR, CDR, THK	Meeting Kick-off	Overview of project, current partners and delegation of kick-off activities.
November 17, 2016 1:00–3:00 PM	PLT	Easter Seals Camp, Georgetown	PLT, PMT	<p>Overview of WB I-70 Mountain Corridor process, project team and stakeholder roles, schedule and desired outcomes.</p> <p>Determine the study area limits and outline the Technical Team</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refined and modified PLT and TT roles, and project outcomes. • Received feedback on Corridor Context Statement; Core Values; Critical Issues; Criteria. • Reviewed CSS Process and Next Steps.
November 22, 2016 8:00–9:30 AM	WB I-70 Corridor Internal Meeting	CDOT- Golden	PMT	PMT Planning Meeting and Kickoff	Review of project goals, timeline, consultant teams and roles, outcomes and next steps.
December 5, 2016 2:00–3:30 PM	CSS Meeting/WB I-70 Mountain Corridor	Clear Creek Offices	PMT and CCC Representatives	Discuss CSS process for the WB I-70 Mountain Corridor project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Product of CDP • Role and membership of PLT • Role of TT • Role of consultants/contractors • Segment D
December 12, 2016	PLT Meeting	CDOT–Golden	PLT, PMT	PLT Kick off Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Roles and Responsibilities and membership of PLT, TT and PMT.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process
Meeting Schedule and Communications Record
Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
9:00 AM–12:00 PM					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review CSS Process. The PLT advocated for a public meeting and agreed to participate at the meeting and help with public outreach. Theme of first public meeting: Lessons learned (positive and negative). Revision of Project Charter.
December 21, 2016 1:30–3:00 PM	PMT Meeting	CDOT–Golden	PMT	Internal Planning Meeting with PMT	Prepare for January 4, 2017, TT meeting.
January 4, 2017 9:00 AM–12:00 PM	TT Meeting #1	CDOT–Golden	PMT, TT	TT Kick Off	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review CSS Process. Review of Roles and Responsibilities and membership of PLT, TT and PMT. Review related projects, ROD and MOU. Review Scope of the project. Identification of corridorwide critical issues exercise and mapping project.
January 18, 2017 9:00 AM–12:00 PM	TT Meeting #2	Easter Seals Camp, Georgetown	PMT, TT	<p>Confirmation of Corridor Critical Issues and brainstorm, draw and record Corridor Concepts on Segment 1 plot maps.</p> <p>Identification of Corridor Concepts for Segment 1.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TT continues to refine and map Critical Issues on Segment 1. TT begins to identify Segment 1 Concepts. The TT agrees that the process is going very fast and they need more time to digest information. Need to slow the pace of decision-making down. TT provided with flow chart showing context statement, core values, critical issues, and evaluated criteria.
January 25, 2017 9:30 AM–1:30 PM	PLT	CDOT–Golden	PMT, PLT	<p>PLT to confirm Technical Team effort and Stakeholder Engagement process, reviews AGS approach, and clarifies Segment D approach and timeline.</p> <p>PLT reviewed flow chart showing context statement, core values, critical issues,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some members of the PLT expressed concern that the process and proposed timeline is moving too fast and 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. 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

WB I-70 Concept Development Process
Meeting Schedule and Communications Record
Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
				and evaluation criteria in blank matrix.	<p>going to take. There needs to be a level of comfort and commitment to different perspectives—this takes time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization of Critical Issues on a color-coded map. • Public Meeting #1 logistics and details agreed upon for March 14 meeting. • Second version of Charter reviews and PLT to provide comment. • Process Agreement: 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.
January 26, 2017 9:00–11:00 AM	Floyd Hill Field Tour	Floyd Hill	Neil Ogden, Ben Acimovic, Kevin Brown (CDOT), John Muscatell (Floyd Hill Community), Taber Ward (CDR)	Field Tour of critical issues and opportunities on Floyd Hill	Tour highlighted key problem areas and critical issues for Floyd Hill including: emergency responders/access; wetlands area/open space; fire and water access problems; neighborhood isolation; greenway potential; truck parking and turnaround issues; slope and grade challenges for building and modifying the road.
January 30, 2017	PLT Email	Electronic Correspondence	PMT correspondence to PLT	<p>Summarize 1-25 meeting minutes and provide updated supporting materials.</p> <p>Sent out PLT meeting minutes, categorized issues by core value, color-coded maps, charter, Segment D.</p>	<p>PLT members were asked to review and comment on the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-25 PLT meeting minutes • Categorized Issues by Core Values • Color-coded Critical Issues Maps • I-70 Charter and Operating Protocols • Planned approach to Segment D
February 6, 2017 9:00 AM–4:00 PM	Contractor/Consultant Engineering Meeting	HDR Offices-Denver	PMT, Engineering Contractors/Consultants	Contractors/consultants present work done so far and then break into Groups to work on discrete design assignments	Contractor/Consultant Groups refine design concepts for Segment 1. Concepts are ready to run through evaluation matrix and go to the TT and PLT for review.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process
Meeting Schedule and Communications Record
Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
February 17, 2017 9:00 AM–12:00 PM	PMT	CDOT–Golden	PMT	Prep for Feb 23 TT	Developed draft Segment 1 Evaluation Matrix.
February 23, 2017 8:30 AM–12:30 PM	TT	Easter Seals Camp, Georgetown	TT, PMT	To solicit feedback from TT on (a) Segment 1 and Segment 2 Critical Issues, (b) Segment 1 Concepts and, (c) the Segment 1 Evaluation/Decisions Matrix.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of Segment 1 and 2 Critical Issues by TT. Recommended to PLT and Public Meeting #1 for final review. • Distributed and reviewed revised flow chart. • Received and provided comment on Segment 1 Evaluation matrices. Made notes on the matrix at the meeting. • Also received handwritten evaluation matrix input from John Muscatell. • Agreement that PMT will develop Segment 2/3 concepts and Decision Matrix for review by TT at March 8 meeting. • Confirmation of Public Meeting #1, March 14 flyers and notice.
February 27, 2017	Email Correspondence with John Muscatell and JoAnn Sorensen	Electronic Correspondence	PMT Correspondence to PLT and TT	Recommend wording changes to Segment 1 matrix.	PMT sent several emails to the TT and PLT forwarded from TT members John Muscatell and Jo Ann Sorensen (with project team responses). These emails contained Muscatell and Sorensen's recommendations concerning changes to the wording in the Segment 1 interchange matrix. PMT made suggested changes to the matrix.
March 3, 2017 1:30–3:00 PM	PMT	CDOT–Golden	PMT	Prepare for March 6 TT and March 8 PLT meetings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed revised Segment 1 Evaluation Matrix. • Developed draft Segment 2 Evaluation Matrix.
March 3, 2017	Email Correspondence to PLT and TT	Electronic Correspondence	PMT Correspondence to PLT and TT	Distribute meeting summaries; distribute emails about language in matrix; distribute revised evaluation matrices and Categorized Segment 2 Issues.	<p>PMT sent an email update to the TT and PLT including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting summaries • Additional language changed in the Matrices • New matrices • Updated to the Categorized Critical Issues by Core Values

WB I-70 Concept Development Process
 Meeting Schedule and Communications Record
 Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
March 6, 2017 12:00–3:00 PM	PLT	CDOT–Golden	PLT, PMT	Review Segment 1 Concepts and Evaluation Matrix, confirm Segment 2 Critical Issues, and discuss Segment 2 concept development process.	<p>PLT modified Segment 2 Critical Issues to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School bus travel • Exit 103 as a portal for entering and access to USFS • Snow plowing added to Mobility issue • Change to “Idaho Springs Historic District and structures should be noted and considered” <p>Meeting Action Items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ACTION: In addition to hanging maps/concepts around the room, HDR will provide printed maps to each PLT and TT member for future meetings. HDR will re-image the maps to upload larger versions on Dropbox that are readable. CDR will upload new maps. 2. ACTION: PMT to clarify that all documents are working documents until June. PLT and TT members are welcome to send comments on Critical Issues, Concepts and Evaluation Criteria from now through June. 3. ACTION: CDR/HDR to provide PLT a document that visually tracks how to get to the conclusion of each segment and then integrate this with the conclusion of the entire process. 4. ACTION: CDR to update Critical Issues list for Segment 2. 5. ACTION: HDR and THK will check the wording in each cell of the matrices to make sure it adequately describes different ratings.
March 8, 2017 12:00–3:00 PM	TT	Clear Creek Rec Center	TT, PMT	To confirm Segment 1 Concepts and Decision Matrices and input from PLT.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision Matrices for Segments 1 and 2 updated at the meeting with TT input.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process
 Meeting Schedule and Communications Record
 Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
				To review and gather input on Segment 2 Concepts and evaluation criteria. To confirm Segment 3 Critical Issues.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement on Segment 1 Critical Issues. • Critical Issues for Segment 2 and 3 updated with TT input. • HDR to send relevant elements of ROD and the MOU to the group to ensure clarity and intent. • PMT, TT and PLT to continue conversation re: PPSL Cross Sections, perhaps hold an ITF with some TT members to navigate the issues of PPSL width. • Change PPSL Cross Section nomenclature to be less misleading. • FHWA, TT, PLT, PMT to discuss “operational improvements.”
March 14, 2017 5:00–7:00 PM	Public Meeting	Clear Creek Rec Center	Public, PMT, TT, PLT	Solicit ideas and feedback from impacted members of the public on the WB I-70 Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of Project Scope, Critical Issues, PLT, TT process and membership, why improvements are needed; data, lessons learned and identified solutions. • The PMT collected public comments and offered responses. Additionally, the PMT modified critical issues maps, concepts and decision matrices based on public comment.
March 16, 2017 10:00–11:00 AM	PMT	CDOT–Golden	PMT	Prepare for April 4, 2017, consultant/contractor meeting	Preparation materials needed for April 4, 2017, meeting.
March 17, 2017	Email Correspondence	Electronic Correspondence	TT Correspondence to PMT	Segment 2/3 Cross section feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email from Jo Ann Sorensen to the PMT. This email provided comments on the Segments 2 and 3 roadway cross section decision matrix. • The PMT incorporated these changes in the next version of the decision matrix.
March 17, 2017	ITF	Clear Creek County	CDOT, CCC	Discuss Segment 2/3 cross section	Discussed context of MOU and ROD.
March 23, 2017 1:30–3:00 PM	PMT	CDOT–Golden	PMT	Prepare for April 11, 2017, ITF meeting	Discussed FHWA and CCC concerns.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process
 Meeting Schedule and Communications Record
 Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
March 28, 2017	ITF	Clear Creek County	FHWA, CCC	Discuss Segment 2/3 cross section	Discussed elements of the EB PPSL project and safety concerns
April 4, 2017 9:30 AM–12:00 PM	Contractor/ Consultant Engineering Meeting	HDR Office– Denver	Engineering Contractors and Consultants, PMT	Segment 2/3 Concept Development	<p>Lessons learned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accident data show that incidents have decreased since implementation. • The narrow corridor typical section makes most drivers uncomfortable. This probably decreases speeds and limits speed differential between the PPSL and general purpose lanes. This may offset safety impacts of the narrow lanes and shoulders. • Additional width may be desirable at critical locations. • Curves and safety critical areas. • Interchange ramps (especially at 240 EB ramp). • PPSL striping is not typical and leads to driver confusion. WB and EB PPSL striping need to be consistent and coordinated moving forward. • One foot inside PPSL shoulder (shy distance) is narrow. • Additional sight distance at left hand curves adjacent to concrete barrier (with glare screen) should be considered. • Additional break-down/pull-outs/speed enforcement and emergency access areas should be considered. <p><u>Differences between EB and WB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EB had river encroachment issues; WB will need to address rockfall. • Uphill grades on WB may pose different operational challenges than EB downhill grades. • Existing cliff and rock faces may have more restrictive sight distance than barrier.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process
Meeting Schedule and Communications Record
Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
					<p><u>Recommendations difference than EB</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider additional buffer or shy distance where appropriate. • Add more sight distance to inside curves around barrier. • Provide for rockfall mitigation. Do not push general-purpose lanes closer to rock cliffs unless rockfall hazards are mitigated.
<p>April 11, 2017 8:00 AM–2:00 PM</p>	<p>ITF–Coordination Meeting CCC, FHWA, Idaho Springs</p>	<p>Idaho Springs Town Hall and Corridor Field Trip</p>	<p>Paul Jesaitis, Stephen Harelson, Neil Ogden, Richard Zamora (CDOT); JoAnn Sorenson, Tim Mauck, Steve Coffin, Becky Almon (Clear Creek County); Andrew Marsh, Mike Hillman (Idaho Springs); Kelly Larson, Shaun Cutting (FHWA); Steve Long, Gina McAfee (HDR, Inc.); Jonathan Bartsch, Taber Ward (CDR Associates)</p>	<p>The purpose of the meeting was to tour significant sections of WB I-70 Mountain Corridor and reach a common understanding and expectations around next steps for the Concept Development Process for the WB I-70 Peak Period Shoulder Lane (WB PPSL) Project.</p>	<p>This ITF was focused on the interpretation of the 2011 ROD and 2013 MOU as related highway improvements on WB I-70 Segments 2 and 3.</p> <p><u>Discussion Points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The WB PPSL must be consistent with ROD. • WB PPSL improvements will be temporary/interim. This will be documented in an operations and maintenance agreement with CDOT and FHWA similar to EB PPSL. • The WB PPSL will be developed using a CSS approach to develop the section width. • Bridges/rock cuts/median (aesthetic guidelines)/guardrails/ walls (noise and retaining) and other design features will be considered using the CSS approach, and examined similar to what was done on EB PPSL. • WB PPSL will not attempt to accommodate buses, as it has been determined it is not appropriate for this project.
<p>April 11, 2017 2:00–4:00 PM</p>	<p>Interaction between Walstrum Quarry and I-70–Frei and Sons</p>	<p>2 Brother’s Deli, Idaho Springs</p>	<p>Al Frei Jr. and CDOT</p>	<p>Discuss issues to be considered.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume of aggregate trucks entering the Walstrum Quarry • Recreation traffic. Parking, Rafting buses, and future green way users at the base of Exit 244 • Detours during construction

WB I-70 Concept Development Process
 Meeting Schedule and Communications Record
 Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep in mind the need for construction resources especially concrete • Aggregate resources • ROW • Realign I-70 over Kermitts (now called Two Bears) up the valley, parallel the Central City Parkway and back onto the ROW at Hidden Valley.
April 25, 2017 1:00–3:30 PM	TT	CDOT–Golden	TT, PMT	Review and finalize evaluation of WB I-70 Segment 1 and review and discuss Segments 2 and 3. To provide summaries and updates regarding recent project meetings.	TT recommends Segment 1 Interchange and Alignment decision matrices to the PLT with the edits provided on 4/25 meeting incorporated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Evaluation Matrix itself—verbiage used, colors, evaluation process • Summaries and findings at bottom of the matrices TT Recommends Segments 2 and 3 Decision Matrix to PLT with the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove Bustang. • Incorporate lessons learned in PPSL as presented as the project moves forward. • Put the largest section into the category of NOT RECOMMENDED. Do not carry forward.
May 4, 2017 12:30–1:30 PM	PMT	CDOT–Golden	PMT	Prep for May 22 PLT Meeting	Reviewed May 22, 2017, PLT presentation materials.
May 22, 2017 10:30–11:30 AM	USFS, PMT	CDOT- Golden	USFS, PMT	Discuss USFS Concerns	USFS expressed their concern/comments around the following topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial pace of the Concept Development Process. They also acknowledged that the process slowed down into response to PLT/TT feedback. • Confusion around how Concept Development is related to NEPA and the level of detail that could be addressed in the Concept Development.

WB I-70 Concept Development Process
 Meeting Schedule and Communications Record
 Updated June 23, 2017

Date and Time	Meeting	Location	Attending	Purpose	Summary of Issues and/or Agreements Reached
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about AGS not being prioritized and no money is being secured by CDOT for AGS. USFS' interest in AGS is to help limit access to USFS lands that are sensitive or overused. • Commented that USFS staff is short right now and staff needs 3-4 weeks to review and comment on documents. • There may be additional USFS staff attending TT/PLT meetings.
May 22, 2017 12:30–3:00 PM	PLT	CDOT–Golden	PLT, PMT	To review and validate the Technical Team's recommendations on Segments 1, 2 and 3 Concepts and Decision Matrices. To updates on Public Meeting #1 and recent project meetings. To review and discuss the transition to NEPA and the PLT/TT Process and schedule moving forward.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCC stated their strong support for the idea of a WB PPSL—and that it must be consistent with the ROD. • Agreement on Section 2/3 Alternative to Recommend to NEPA: “WB PPSL” Concept: “Use existing infrastructure. Similar to EB PPSL. Through CSS process, will do a foot-by-foot review of context to determine appropriate level of improvements. An interim improvement. “ Bring to PLT/TT meeting in July for review, feedback and approval. • Review and Agreement around CDP to NEPA process and Next Steps.