



Subject: PLT Meeting #4

Date: Monday, May 09, 2015

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

Attendees: See attendance list attached, PLT

1. Introductions

The group had a brief round of introductions; Pete Mertes will be replacing Kurt Kolleth as the Project Manager.

2. Review since previous PLT #3 Meeting

Wendy reviewed the project 6-step process and the Tier 1 screening that lead to three packages moving forward into the Tier 2 screening. Some refinements were made to the packages and ultimately called Alternatives 1A, 2A, and 3A. Package 1A was revised to replace the bridges instead of widening the bridges and was refined to become to 1B.

Wendy walked through the attached PowerPoint to remind the group what was covered since PLT #3 and what the Team had been working on for the last six months. The Project Management Team has been busy coordinating internally to screen alternatives and refine recommendations to carry an alternative into Task 2 project design. Three separate packages were created by assembling the retained Tier 1 components the PLT discussed at PLT meeting #3. These three system-wide alternatives were carried forward into the Tier 2 screening process. Michelle will be discussing these in detail later on the presentation.

3. Review of Public Open House Summary and Small Group Meetings

Wendy reminded people of the conclusions we drew from the first public open house held on August 27, 2015. Over 75 comments were recorded and the primary Interests from the Core Values were Safety & Connectivity.

We also held three small group meetings with community representatives to discuss bicycle and pedestrian considerations, residential considerations and business access considerations. The proposed alternatives were presented and participants were able to ask questions and make suggestions for the design team to consider during additional design refinements.

4. Alternatives Development and Evaluation Screening

Wendy explained since we had last met the design team had comprised packages of improvements into three remaining alternatives for more detailed (quantitative analysis). She turned the presentation over to Michelle Stevens to describe these alternatives and the evaluation process. Below is a summary of the discussion:

- Michelle began the discussion by explaining the three remaining alternatives carried into the Tier 2 screening. Based on the Tier 2 screening, Alternative 2A that included a roundabout intersection at US 6 and bridge replacements over the UPRR and the Eagle River was selected as the recommended alternative. Further refinements were made to Alternative 2A based on coordination at small group meetings and with CDOT and Eagle County to formally develop the recommended alternative. This alternative (2A) was presented to the PLT.
- The recommended alternative typical section for 2A was modified by adding 4-foot shoulders along I-70G and a sidewalk only along one side (east) of I-70G. CDOT and the County wanted to include a note that adding a vertical barrier between the sidewalk and roadway and a tiered wall system to accommodate a sidewalk below roadway grade level will be evaluated during design to improve comfort for sidewalk users. A note will also be added to the right curb and gutter to note that the type of curb will be evaluated during final design to provide a taller barrier-style curb. Karen said to show a barrier as an option where the design depicts a 4-foot buffer and add a “callout” that this will be determined in final design. Add caveats: tiered wall vs. guardrail because placing the sidewalk right beside the road is not acceptable. The landscaping in the narrow area between the curb and gutter and the edge of wall on the right side will be replaced with concrete rather than vegetation. Also a bridge rail will be added to the wall on the right side for safety.
- Martha asked if the team had considered using a taller style curb instead of guard similar to the one used on I-70 B in Grand Junction. Martha asked about the recommendation for the detached sidewalk and asked if the design team had considered placing the sidewalk parallel to the roadway near the toes of slope. Karen said placing the sidewalk parallel to the toes of slope would be challenging with the grades near the north end of the project.
- A question was raised about the landscaping elements in each alternative and Michelle explained the team is at approximately at 15% design and not all of the landscaping elements have been defined. Cliff asked about how the landscaping adjacent to the southbound lanes will be maintained. The recommendation was to depict hardscape with guardrail.

- Catherine had a comment about cross sections. It doesn't look like the cross-sections depict the proposed trail improvements. This is a roadway typical section for I-70G not intended to capture all of the trail improvements. The trails are shown on the plan exhibits. Overall guidance is to look for opportunities to separate the trail from the road.
- .Cliff said it would be advantageous to show traffic control on the renderings as well as additional safety treatments. Eva said the team should not make these revisions now. Todd agreed with leaving it out as well as it may set expectations that are not achievable. Martha said that Mike McVaugh (new Region 5 RTD) has lots of innovative ideas about traffic control and accommodating alternate modes that have been successful in Region 5. Martha challenged the group to consider innovative treatments as we refine design.
- Ken asked how exactly the pedestrian flow to reach I-70 G will work. The existing pedestrian bridge underneath the Eagle River Bridge has a number of existing utilities suspended from it. Eva suggested coloring the existing trail from the pedestrian bridge to Old Edwards Estates yellow as existing on the exhibit.
- The proposed intersection design at the Rest Area could accommodate a signal or a roundabout, but for a signal the intersection would need to meet a signal warrant first. A roundabout could replace the 2-way stop in the future and does not need to meet signal warrants. Maintaining the 2-way stop as long as possible allows us to be fiscally conservative. The rest area intersection was changed from a roundabout to a 2-way stop for the recommended alternative There are design challenges locating a roundabout in this area as there is a minimum 5-foot difference between the existing roadway grade and proposed roadway grade to accommodate the new bridge structures and requires extensive reconstruction of the County Road to catch the grades. Traffic analysis does not support major changes at this intersection in the design year. This information will be made available for the public meeting.
- Todd said semi- trucks often get "stuck" at the rest area and asked the team if it would it be possible to stagger the intersection between the rest area and the intersection. The grade in and out of the rest area may be a little steeper but I-70 G is considering flatter grades with the new design.
- There was a discussion about the lifecycle costs for the existing bridges since they were built in the 1970s. CDOT is still reviewing these costs and comparing bridge replacement vs widening.

Review of recommended bicycle and pedestrian elements

- At the small group meeting, Old Edwards Estates residents noted that they use the pedestrian bridge over the Eagle River to access the east side of I-70G and do not like to walk along the existing highway. Having sidewalk on one side of the roadway seemed acceptable to those at the meeting. They did want the remaining sidewalk to be separated from the roadway with a buffer and a vertical barrier to improve comfort in walking along the highway. Therefore, sidewalk was only provided along one side of I-70G.
- The team considered midblock crossings and was advised to remove them by CDOT Traffic as unallowable on the state highway system. The sidewalk was reduced from 10 feet to 6 feet adjacent to the Gas House per direction from CDOT. Martha suggested widening the transit refuge.

- There are no sidewalks on the east side of Edwards Village Boulevard, south of the Corner at Edwards currently. A short stretch of sidewalk along the east side of Edwards Village Boulevard was removed to avoid permanent impacts to the parking at the Corner at Edwards. The PLT wanted to keep the sidewalk if possible, but understood that the west sidewalk would provide connectivity to existing sidewalks. Adding a sidewalk along the east side will be further evaluated in design. Cliff suggested a route across Edwards Corner leading to the crosswalk. For ADA accessibility, we could consider running the route down a ramp.
- Access to Transit stops will be provided with sidewalks to each stop. A question was asked if pullouts would be provided for the transit stops. FHU has a typical layout used along US 6 for the transit stops as provided by CDOT. Incorporating new stops will be coordinated with ECO Transit during design. It was noted that people may still cross US 6 at the transit stops illegally. The alternative concept does provide improved pedestrian pathways to safe crossing locations to accommodate the majority of transit users; however, a raised median does provide a refuge for balance it with parking at Edwards Corner. There is a sidewalk through the parking lot. A grade-separated crossing is not affordable at this time and only an underpass would be physically feasible
- The trail through the Preserve was discussed. ECO Trails is currently working on an alignment from I-70G to the Preserve. Eagle County did not want to show a dashed line between the Preserve and I-70G, but a large arrow from the Preserve at the trail and a note stating that an alignment for the trail will be determined by others.

5. General comments on Tier 2 screening

Discussion on access

- The access at 1st Street in Riverwalk was changed from a full access to a right-in/right-out due to a number of recent crashes identified by CDOT at this location. The community would prefer a $\frac{3}{4}$ movement at the least at this location. CDOT will coordinate with Traffic to determine if this would be acceptable to show on the graphics. Todd is concerned about the impacts with access. Karen asked about any other accesses that the PLT needs to discuss. All access points will be further reviewed during design as noted by the red boxes and callouts on the exhibits.
- Eva asked about what happened with comment from the Gas House. CDOT will address it with the owner after this meeting (Connie Irons). She had concerns about the impacts the roundabouts may have on ROW; a signalized intersection will encroach into the development as well. The Gas House sign is currently located in CDOT ROW. Karen reminded everyone that quite a bit of Gas House's parking is in the CDOT right-of-way. There was a suggestion to consider an oval roundabout at this location. What is CDOT's policy about signage in our easement? Martha stated that there are outdoor advertising policies with a number of rules and regulations and to modify or make exceptions to this policy would be difficult.

Action Item: Send Karen her contact information.

General

The group discussed nomenclature for the alternatives considered.

- Ken said the alternative nomenclature is cumbersome to understand, the Team needs to be sure we are specific for the Open House when describing the alternatives. He is aware of how the changes occurred but we need to describe the alternatives clearly and concisely. He suggested we call the recommended alternative Modified 2A.
- A Summary white paper was developed to define the specific changes made between Alternative 2A and the resulting Recommended Alternative. Michelle went through the summary to call out the changes. Cliff noted that the second to the last line in the white paper should be labeled “grade-separated crossing.”

Action Item: FHU and HDR will work together in refining the recommended alternative summary to provide clarity.

Action Item: Send draft materials to PLT to review/revise.

Landscaping.

- Regarding the rendering exhibit, there was a suggestion to take out the landscaping, and add a note “landscaping is locally maintained”.
- Eva and Martha agreed that there were some lessons learned from Phase 1 regarding landscapes and aesthetics. This will affect how CDOT coordinates with local agencies on funding moving forward. Ken and Todd want to add veneers to the walls for Phase 1. It would be local agency project and could save money.

Funding:

Regarding cost estimate, Eva would like to review it because she hasn't seen it. A separate meeting will be scheduled to review and refine the costs prior to releasing it to others.

Karen wants to do a Value Engineering (VE) as part of the second task order. Martha said we still have numbers from the SB 228 list, so supports additional VE. Martha said after the VE, we should develop a phasing plan because funding is very competitive. The team may want to coordinate with TPR since there are a lot of corridors that we compete against. Cliff thinks the US 6 roundabout and widening could be done, although grades are difficult to incorporate into phasing. The project is also on the list for FAST Act II.

Miscellaneous

- Cliff asked if there was anything other considerations for the roundabout versus traffic signal. Michelle said the rationale is in the screening matrix. We need to simplify results for the open house.
- Ken Marchetti would like a presentation to Edwards Metro and ECA. Eva or Karen will do this.
- Eva suggested that we have duplicate stations and graphics with staff members at each. Eva likes stations but Cliff thinks there is some merit to a traditional format.

The Recommended Alternative exhibits were reviewed and the following changes noted:

- The title will be changed to state Recommended Alternative (Revised Alt. 2A)
- The existing sidewalk connecting the existing sidewalk along the east side of Edwards Village Boulevard to the parking lot at the Corner at Edwards, south of the existing mid-block crossing needs to be colored.
- A large arrow needs to be added from the Preserve pointing towards I-70G and the existing trail between the Preserve and I-70G needs to be removed and a note added similar to the note already on the plans regarding this trail.
- The existing trail from the pedestrian bridge to Old Edwards Estates needs to be colored.
- The Access at 1st Street may need to be changed to a $\frac{3}{4}$ movement.

The Recommended Alternative Rendering was reviewed and the following changes noted:

- The title will be changed to state Recommended Alternative (Revised Alt. 2A)
- “installed and” will be removed from the landscaping notes.
- A note will be added that the pedestrian bridge will be replaced at the Eagle River crossing.

6. Next Steps

- The open house was discussed. Mid-June is the target timeframe. June 15 seemed to work for most. Eva will locate a place for the meeting—either the community center or Battle Mountain School. Eva thought duplicate stations with tour guides may be the best way to facilitate the open house. A handout could be provided that provides information on where we have been. HDR will work on the boards list.
- Costs were discussed briefly and that a meeting between CDOT, Eagle County, and the HDR/FHU team is needed to review the costs provided to finalize.