

---

Subject: Local Agency Issues Task Force Meeting—Hybrid Alternative Overview

---

Client: CDOT Region 1

---

Project: I-70 Peak Period Shoulder Lane

Project No: 215164

---

Meeting Date: August 26, 2013

Meeting Location:

---

Notes by: Steve Long

---

**ATTENDEES:** 9/30/2013 Note: Minutes have not been finalized. Waiting for Steve to provide names of attendees.

**DISTRIBUTION:** Attendees, Project File

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

1. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss acceleration lane designs and potential median widening options to reduce impacts to the creek.
2. Steve Long gave a brief explanation of considerations for design of acceleration lanes.
  - a. Length requirement
  - b. Taper considerations
  - c. Main line considerations
  - d. Recoverable area
  - e. Sight distance
3. Each acceleration lane had been laid out by the design team in preparation for the meeting. These layouts were illustrated on handouts which summarized the physical infrastructure requirements, including:
  - a. Required widening (max width)
  - b. Length and max height of wall
  - c. Required accel. /decel. length
4. The layouts were based on a left PPSL option, and assumed a merge condition (not a yield condition). There was some concern that a right side PPSL would require less widening, and that this option should be evaluated. The design team committed to do some layouts to verify differences between left and right. The layouts represented constrained designs and in most cases were below required standards to respect contextual consideration.
5. There was also concern that the design team was laying out the accel lanes on current 70 mph design criteria. Some task force members believed this was not appropriate and a 45 mph design speed should be used to meet only PPSL on peak requirements. Though this may shorten the length of ramps and reduce the associated impacts, the design team was

concerned with safety issues related to off peak operations. The design team will discuss options with FHWA and report back at the next meeting. The design team also committed to looking at further reduced designs and possibly mimicking existing conditions.

6. It appeared that the majority of Clear Creek County and Idaho Springs Task Force members were not comfortable with any widening at these ramps.

#### Specific Discussion of Individual Acceleration Lanes

##### Empire Junction:

- Possibly widen toward median. This could impact the emergency turnaround in the median. Also VMS sign.
- Vegetation at the gore limits sight distance.
- Consider pushing the start of PPSL east to avoid widening impacts.

##### Downieville:

- Future bike path may not be accommodated by this design. There is currently no location for this future path identified, therefore, it is difficult to understand and identify potential impacts.

##### Dumont and Lawson:

- Closing this acceleration ramp during peak times should be considered. Large community impacts should be vetted through Clear Creek County officials. Cut through traffic to the frontage road and Idaho springs may benefit the communities.

##### Fall River:

Another potential ramp closure. There was discussion that accel and decel lanes could both be closed. Also, the project team should consider a complete full-time closure, which could be mitigated with a bridge over Clear Creek to connect to the frontage road and access the interstate at west Idaho springs. Removing the ramps could help with “cut through” traffic

##### West Idaho Springs:

Ramp closure would help with peak hour Colorado Boulevard gridlock. Idaho Springs believes that local businesses would resist this and not pursue.