Welcome to the SH 66 Planning and Environmental Linkages Study

Public Meeting

APRIL 25 & 26, 2017

Thank you for attending! We are pleased you are here to hear more about the SH 66 Corridor! We are eager to hear your ideas to help shape the future vision for the corridor!

How to get the most out of this meeting:

- View the displays and talk with our project team members to learn more and share your ideas
- Participate in the interactive activities
- Fill out a project comment card and drop it in the box
A Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) study is an approach to transportation decision-making that considers community, environmental and economic goals early in the planning stage and carry them through project development, design, and construction.

**A PEL Study:**
- Identifies transportation issues and environmental concerns
- Defines a clear purpose and need
- Results in useful information that can be carried forward into the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process

**Project Purpose and Need**

The SH 66 PEL will identify existing conditions, anticipated problem areas, safety, and operational needs to determine the short-term and long-term transportation priorities.

**Purpose**
The purpose of transportation improvements along the SH 66 corridor is to improve safety, reduce existing and future traffic congestion, provide efficient access for existing and future development, and improve mobility and connectivity for all transportation modes that match the context of the adjacent communities.

**Needs**

**SAFETY PROBLEM** The corridor has experienced a number of safety concerns.

**VEHICULAR** Several intersection and mainline locations along the SH 66 corridor have a high number of crashes, when compared to other similar roadways.

**BICYCLE** Areas along the corridor have experienced bicycle safety concerns, from recorded incidents, physical characteristics, and cross-street connections.

**PEDESTRIAN** There are a number of pedestrian destinations in the corridor, which do not have sidewalks connecting them and can cause unsafe pedestrian movements.

**MOBILITY PROBLEM** The movement of people, goods, and services along the corridor has resulted in a number of mobility problems that can be rooted in various transportation modes.

**VEHICULAR** Traffic congestion, inadequate intersections that fail to accommodate users’ needs, highway design, and unreliable travel times substantially impact the ability of people to move across and along the corridor.

**BICYCLE** A majority of the SH 66 corridor is a heavily utilized for bicycles (recreational, commuter, and events). There are many areas of the corridor that have insufficient shoulders that can accommodate bicycles or non-advanced riders.

**PEDESTRIAN** There are a number of pedestrian destinations in the corridor, many of which do not have sidewalks between the destinations.

**TRANSIT** Transit service in the corridor is primarily focused on north-south connections and not local east-west service. There is currently a non-continuous connection of transit service providers in the corridor.

**ACCESS PROBLEM** The current number, locations, and design of public roadway accesses have contributed to traffic operational and safety deficiencies along the corridor. There are individual private driveways, business accesses directly onto SH 66, and inconsistent access spacing, which leads to mobility and safety problems.
SH 66 Planning and Environmental Linkages Study

1. Stakeholder Interviews
   Visioning Workshop
   Sections/Constraints/Goals

2. Data Collection
   Current Demand
   Future Demand (information from stakeholders & visioning)
   Purpose & Need
   FHWA CONCURRENCE POINT

3a. Roadway Classification
    JULY 2017

3b. Roadway Capacity
    JULY 2017

4. Intersection Alternatives
   FHWA CONCURRENCE POINT
   Public Meeting *TODAY

5. Screen Alternatives
   WINTER 2017
   Choose alternatives that best fit the current and future transportation system, current surrounding land use and future land use context.
   Evaluate environmental impacts/constraints
   FHWA CONCURRENCE POINT

6. Prioritization
   EARLY 2018

7. Documentation
   MID 2018
   PEL Questionaire
   Summary Sheets
   FHWA CONCURRENCE POINT

8. ACP Development
   MID 2018

9. Preserve Right-of-Way
   FHWA CONCURRENCE POINT

10. NEPA/Design
    Identify Funding, Conduct NEPA Analysis

11. Implementation
    Design, Construction

Subsequent Steps

Public Meeting
Planning Context & SH 66 Community Values

Existing Plans Reviewed in the Context of SH 66 PEL

- Town of Lyons Primary Planning Area Master Plan (2016)
- Town of Lyons Comprehensive Plan (2010)
- City of Longmont Envision Longmont (2015)
- Town of Mead Comprehensive Plan (2009)
- Town of Mead Transportation Plan (2013)
- Carbon Valley Transit Service Feasibility Study (2011)
- Firestone Master Plan (2013)
- Boulder County Transportation Master Plan (2011)
- Boulder County Mountain Town Transit Feasibility Study (2011)
- Weld County Transportation Plan (2011)
- DRCOG Metro Vision Plan (2017)
- Saint Vrain Trail Master Plan (2004)
AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC
Both Directions of Travel
LEGEND

- Property Damage Only
- Injury
- Fatal
- Signalized Intersection
SH 66 West of County Line Road is within the RTD service boundary.
Environmental Resources and Other Context
Existing Floodplains and Floodways
Traffic Noise Sensitive Areas
Hazardous Material Concerns
Minority Population Percentage
Low-Income Population Percentage
Existing and Potential Historic Resources
Railroads