



Subject: PLT Meeting #3

Date: Wednesday, November 09, 2015

Location: Eagle County Building, 500 Broadway Eagle County, CO 81631

Attendees: See attendance list attached, PLT

1. Introductions

Kurt kicked off the meeting with introductions, briefly gave a project overview, and summarized the agenda in the attached PowerPoint.

2. Review of Deliverables

Wendy opened this discussion topic and told the group that the bulk of this meeting would be summarizing the Tier 1 screening process. We will also be briefly discussing the Open House Summary and Next Steps moving forward including the Tier 2 alternatives and evaluation screening.

3. PLT Roles and Responsibilities

Wendy briefly went over the 6-step process and reminded the PLT that most of the work required by the PLT occurred in Steps #1 and #2. We used information from the Public Meeting and the PLT to Establish Criteria (Step#3). We are now between Steps #4 and #5 , Developing and Refining Options and Alternatives. Today the Project Team, wants to empower the PLT to explain the Tier 1 screening to the stakeholders and solicit feedback and support moving into the Tier 2 screening.

4. Public Open House Summary review

Wendy walked the PLT through the highlights of the Open House Summary and explained how we used the survey findings from the Open House to inform the evaluation process or the Tier 1 alternatives screening. The Project Team did review all of the comments received to date, including emails to CDOT and Eagle County, and has identified a handful of substantive comments which require specific responses. Wendy suggested we use one of our "small group" meetings in the scope to convene a group including stakeholders who submitted more substantive comments. We may also include others, such as Edwards Estates and nearby businesses. The Project Team will work internally to set an agenda and create the invite list which will include the PLT.

Action Item: The Project Team will work internally to create an agenda and invite list which will include the PLT. The initiation of these small group meetings is anticipated for the beginning of next year.

5. Alternatives Development and Evaluation Screening

- Wendy transitioned the meeting to Michelle and Kurt to walk through the Tier 1 screening findings. Kurt started to discuss the screening process. He said with the number of issues identified to date to resolve, the Team divided the entire project area into four separate areas of focus. Components were developed to address these four separate areas.
 1. **I-70G** (Edwards Spur Road) Mainline
 2. **US6** Intersection
 3. **RA** Rest Area/Old Edwards Estates Intersection
 4. **PBT** - Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Connectivity
- Kurt referred to the success factors included in the PowerPoint and reminded the group how they were utilized. The Critical Issues helped to identify the needs to be resolved relative to the Success Factors. Using the Success Factors, the team engineered several components which provided the potential to address issues. He highlighted how the team evaluated the components to identify pro's and con's qualitatively. We evaluated each component relative to supporting core values.
- Michelle summarized the results for Tier 1 analysis and reviewed specific questions and concerns in more detail. Michelle said each of the component screening details are included in the Tier 1 screening notebook (distributed at the meeting). The components are conceptual level and are schematic in nature. She said for the mainline options we will retain all four components, both RA components and the entire suite of pedestrian, bicycle and trail connectivity components will move forward for further study. The components that were screened and subsequently eliminated focus on the US6/I-70G intersection options...

I-70G **mainline**, Michelle summarized the screening for each component. All of these were retained.

- Cliff asked if the I70G-1 component bridges are sufficient to be left in place. Michelle said we haven't looked at them in that detail yet and Michelle said we will evaluate this in more detail during Tier 2. . Martha said CDOT could inspect the bridges and asked Karen to look when the last bridge report was conducted. They are updated every two years.

Action Item: The Project Team will work together to determine the potential for the existing bridge structures to be expanded upon if the bridges can be inspected.

- The I70G-3 concept includes new bridges and roadway widening as a separate parallel system right next to the existing roadway. We could have the new bridges adjacent to the existing bridges. This would be separate roadway alignments, one for existing northbound lanes and one for new northbound lanes and would merge together at the intersections. Todd asked if construction for this component could be less impactful. The team answered possibly, but detailed analysis of this would be conducted in Tier 2. Martha asked if this component goes forward that there is there an opportunity for hybrid alternatives to be developed. Kurt said that we anticipate these types of hybrid options to avoid and or minimize impacts wherever possible.

- Rick asked if existing ROW is wide enough to accommodate parallel alignments. The team responded that yes ROW is approximately 300' wide, but we are trying to avoid sensitive areas within existing ROW wherever possible.

US6 intersection, Michelle reviewed each of the US6 concepts. There were a number of components that were eliminated. Michelle described operational assumptions associated with each US6 component.

- US6-1, Signalized Intersection and US6-2, Roundabout options are more traditional intersection types and as a result the team is carrying these forward into Tier 2 evaluation.
- US6-3 was discussed at length. A double roundabout does not meet public expectations, there is no double roundabout in Colorado. There may be unacceptable business operations and ROW impacts in the southwest quadrant.
- US6-4A is being retained, because it would provide local access to Riverwalk and properties to the west. It was noted that there are pedestrians currently walking across I70G and not crossing at the crosswalk at US 6, This component would provide access that is safer in this mid-block area. This concept would make it easier for people to access the local businesses. Cliff asked if CDOT would have to purchase entire ROW through the private parcel on the west side of I-70G. The team would need to explore this during Tier 2 once more design has been conducted, but the team does not anticipate a total take at this time. Todd noted that earlier development plans for this parcel required them to build a roundabout on US 6 but maybe this could be constructed with the project. Martha thinks the concept is good to reduce congestion at access points and reduce the traffic at the main intersection.
- US6-4B, this component is closer to the Eagle River and there may be grade differentiation issues. This would make this less favorable than the previous 4A configuration. The team eliminated this because it goes through the Eagle River Preserve. Cliff said the master plan has considered a public area or amphitheater at the corner of the preserve and he is thinking of removing it from the plan as a result of stakeholder opposition.
- US6-5, this component was developed to address conflicts associated with the heavy left turn movements that occur today at the existing signalized intersection. All of these left turns would be routed to the roundabouts east and west of the I-70G/US6 intersection. The roundabouts would require the appropriate laneage to convey the heavy left turn movements and may result in a larger footprint and more impacts to the surrounding area. For these reasons, this component was eliminated. Rick noted that it could double the amount of traffic at these roundabout locations which pedestrians have to cross.
- US6-6, this component is known as a Super Street and would allow for heavy left turn movements on US6 only. The through and left turn movements on I70G would be directed to the “jug handle” signalized intersections east and west of the main intersection at I70G. The “jug handles” would impact parking and circulation in Riverwalk, which already has circulation problems. Cliff also noted that the level of signage you would need to provide guidance for drivers would constitute a significant change to the local scale and and setting. For these reasons, this component was eliminated. Additionally, there are no Super Street intersections in Colorado and would not meet driver expectations.

- Rick said the team may need to look at the County regulations for development and landscaping. Also keep in mind that the retailers want more visible signage so if you are moving traffic more quickly through the area, reduced visibility could impact the local businesses. Certain landscaping types may exacerbate this. The team needs to make sure landscaping is tastefully done and does not performance for traffic operations and nor will it impact local businesses. At one of the Edwards Interchange roundabouts, the ornamental grass is so tall you can't see the other cars. Martha said there is a similar situation at the roundabout at Eagle, Martha said be conscious to consider landscaping. Michelle said that sight distance criteria is provided in the federal roundabout guidelines and will be followed for this project, and we will consider slower speeds and visibility when assessing impacts to business.
- US6-7 Partial continuous flow intersection pulls out heavy lefts and allows the US 6 through movements and left turn movements to move at the same time. The intersection operations on I-70G would need to be further investigated on the type of traffic control needed at the crossing. This type of intersection is unusual for Colorado and does not meet driver expectations. It also has a large footprint at the intersection and results in ROW impact to the northwest quadrant. For these reasons, this component was eliminated.

Rest Area/Old Edwards Estates Intersection (RA) components, Michelle summarized the screening for each component. All of these were retained.

- The team looked at two components at RA; a signal and a roundabout. They are both being carried forward. Cliff asked if geometrics at the rest area are already substandard. Michelle noted that the Old Edwards Estates local road has a steep slope, but this is acceptable for local roadways. Improving this geometry would still be reviewed in Tier 2. Todd talked to people in Old Edwards Estates regarding issues. The biggest issue comes from the unsignalized intersection condition and never getting a gap in through traffic to make a left-hand turn towards the I70 Interchange.. Kurt said there also may be a benefit relative to traffic signal timing and progression along I-70G and a new signal at this intersection may provide gaps at the flanking intersections at US6 and Miller Ranch Road. A roundabout might work at this intersection too and will be evaluated during Tier 2. The team will consider signal timing and progression as we move forward into Tier 2 with traffic operations.
- Todd suggested that analysis might depict that if the team adds a roundabout at I-70G and US6, there may not be improvements needed at this location. The team needs to look at volumes with each package. Eva said there will be similar concerns about the gaps with roundabouts in US6. The trucks coming out of RA are big issues according to Todd, they get stuck right there. The Rest Area left-hand turning movement has a LOS F so there is an issue that the team needs to be addressed to fix this problem.

Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Connectivity (PBT) ,

- Michelle summarized the screening for each component. All of these were retained. PBT-1 utilizes existing trails, provide a new grade-separated crossing at US 6, and provides more connectivity. A hybrid with PBT-2 may move forward. We would incorporate the existing trail through the preserve. Lots of people who live south of US 6 need to safely cross near here. Cliff

said there may be improved access into the preserve; He added there also may be a quasi-public trail from the West End development when it develops. There will also be a trail that parallels US 6 on the north side of the highway. Cliff said the County may consider providing sidewalks on both sides of US 6. Kurt asked Cliff about trail connectivity to the West End development. This trail will be provided by others; in essence it may be private and may not be incorporated for public use. Cliff said the alignment along Fritz's property and structure may want to be depicted as a "dashed line" because a trail does not exist here. The team decided we needed to make some assumptions for analysis to understand and quantify the impacts and appropriate mitigation. Rick said we may want to explore whether a trail would be better to go along river. The team wants to be mindful of not impacting riparian vegetation associated with the River. The PBT-2 component has sidewalks on both sides of US 6 and it may be used as hybrid for Tier 2 alternative evaluation.

- PBT-2 Cliff said sidewalk on north side should be extended to the entrance of the preserve. Eva said this project may not be built, but the team may need to accommodate it.
- PBT-3- looks at providing a separate trail with its own pedestrian bridges over the UPRR and Eagle River. If there were separate trail funding, this could be built separately. Right now, people have to walk on I-70G which is unsafe. A grade-separated crossing could be used at US 6. Todd said perhaps this improvement could be funded using alternate pools of funding, as a standalone project. There is a round of TAP grants in January. We may not be ready, but the team could be ready in 2019, especially if water quality components are included. Mark Rogers is the contact for TAP grants. CDOT and the County could evaluate this further to be prepared for the next application submittal.

6. General comments on Tier 1 screening

- Cliff said driving through roundabouts while pedestrians cross within roundabout at the same time seems likely a safety concern that needs to be addressed. He is aware of a number of close calls. Because pedestrians are crossing within the circle itself, the peds are looking for cars that have entered and are looking to whether they will go straight or come in front of you at the exits. Cars crossing crosswalks at the roundabout come to a dead stop to yield to pedestrians and this can cause the potential for rear-end crashes with other cars within the roundabout. He advocates in addition to having crossings at the roundabout, to have flashing beacons upstream and/or downstream of the roundabout. He thinks most pedestrians would choose this location. Martha has had similar experiences and there is definitely a visibility issue with roundabouts. Karen said this can be evaluated with the information available today.
- Michelle said this would be a great topic for a technical team and/or an Issues Task Force.
- The group agreed with the Tier 1 screening analysis.

7. Tier 2 packages

- Michelle briefly summarized each of the Tier 2 packages assembled from the retained Tier 1 components. A summary description for each package is included in the PowerPoint presentation.

- Karen noted that we have not started to evaluate the packages and they may be refined prior to screening. Karen noted the conceptual packages are subject to change and are not well-defined. We need to add caveats to each of these graphics with verbiage saying something to the effect of “work in progress” and the package is subject to change during Tier 2 refinement stages of the project.

Action Item: The team will add disclaimers to the Tier 2 packages.

- Michelle explained the red boxes depicted on the package graphics denote where access is currently provided and that the team has not explored these access points in detail until we enter into Tier 2.
- With Package 2, Michelle highlighted the bike roundabout. Cliff then asked if an oval roundabout at US 6 was feasible. Martha said there is one already in Avon. An oval roundabout may be possible but needs to be further analyzed with respect to fastest path speeds and other criteria before it is selected. Cliff asked if the oval configuration is being driven by a need to protect the Gas House. Kurt said it is not the only driver; it is the nature of all four quadrants and reducing impacts overall. We will explore this configuration further in context to traffic operations and performance and minimization of impacts.

Action Item: The team is to obtain trail information from Ellie Caryl with Eco Trails for future trail connections and Martha asked the team to specify what trails are to be done by others. Specify that we are accommodating trails by others.

- Package 3, Michelle briefly described highlights of this package with regard to access and trail connections, and using the parallel I-70G component. Cliff said be mindful of platform configurations for bus stops. Kurt said this will occur when we get to a short range of alternatives during Tier 2. Kurt noted that as we continue to refine, the bus stops may be relocated. This is where hybrids come in. The team will start with these three packages and evaluate operations and performance and then these may be refined and combined.
- Cliff said the bypass road shown in US6-4A could become an extension of the Riverwalk experience, then additional development could follow and you would then need to accommodate the main street environment. However, it could quell some of the excitement due to through traffic speeds. Rick said this package would split the West End property in half. As an offset could you eliminate space between roundabouts on US 6. Eva said they are now proposing to do residential only and they would eliminate mixed use. Eva said this may necessitate buying the parcel. We may look at moving the roadway to the edge of the parcel, as Eva is not supportive of how it is shown today. Kurt said we are looking at this kind of feedback. Eva will coordinate with the developers of the property for input. Cliff said the roundabout at the existing entrance of West End has been approved.

Action Item: Eva will send Package 3 to developer for input.

8. Next Steps

- Kurt concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for their attendance and providing such constructive input and said we had lots of good comments and the purpose of this meeting is to solicit feedback. By December, the team would like to finalize operational analyses on these Tier 2 packages and share the findings.
- Between now and the first of next year, the team needs to make sure we can finalize everything needed to move forward into Tier 2 screening. Rick said to bear in mind the retailers are gearing up for the holidays now and that January and February may be better months to discuss this when they have the HOA meetings. Small group meetings with local businesses and HOA's are anticipated to begin the first part of next year.