

---

Subject: Local Agency Issues Task Force Meeting

---

Client: CDOT Region 1

---

Project: I-70 Peak Period Shoulder Lane

Project No: 215164

---

Meeting Date: September 9, 2013

Meeting Location: CDOT Golden

---

Notes by: Steve Long

---

**ATTENDEES:** **CDOT:** Jim Bemelen, Andi Schmid, David Singer, Neil Ogden, Angie Drumm, Jim Bemelen  
**Clear Creek County:** Tom Breslin, Tim Mauck, Phil Buckland, Tom Hayden, Jo Ann Sorensen,  
**Empire:** Wendy Koch, **Becky Alman**  
**HDR:** Steve Long  
**Idaho Springs:** Jack Morgan

**DISTRIBUTION:** Attendees, ITF Members, Project File

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

### 1. Update on definition of interim:

- a. Time Frame of PPSL. CDOT commits to re-assess the PPSL five years from opening in 2020, corresponding with the ROD re-assessment, which will review the overall purpose and need and effectiveness of the implementation of components of the Preferred Alternative, as well as evaluating and reconsidering the full range of Tier 1 improvements. CDOT further commits to accumulate data regarding the

- Volume
- Travel time reliability
- Traffic counts and traffic type
- Revenue
- Safety/crash data

A re-assessment of PPSL will be discussed if any of the above data indicates a need for improvement or changes.

- b. Peak Period Definition. A peak period is defined as a period of three hours or more where the volume exceeds 2,900 vph. Initially in 2015 the PPSL project is expected to run on 58 days out of the year or 3.5 percent of the total hourly time.

In 2020 the PPSL is expected to operate 64 days out of the year or 3.9 percent of the time. Therefore, CDOT commits to allow PPSL only at times where volume exceeds 2,900 vph for a period of three hours or more and not to exceed 4 percent of the total hourly time of the year.

A formal MOU between CDOT and FHWA establishing these terms will be documented and can be assembled into a 1041 permit for local agency concurrence.

2. Update of FHWA meeting and left versus right PPSL operations:

a. CDOT and design team met with FHWA on September 5, 2013, to discuss left versus right operations. Steve Hersey (CDOT Region 1 traffic engineer) and Bernie Arseneau (former Minnesota DOT director) were in attendance to aid in current shoulder lane applications.

- Neither the design team nor FHWA supported a yield condition at acceleration lanes; therefore, acceleration lanes must require full acceleration and **load** merge lengths for both on-peak and off-peak operations.

When comparing a yield condition, right side has 30% less widening. Eight-foot widening on the right versus 12-foot widening on the left when substandard. If standard, left versus right is the same.

- HDR recommends not going with yield condition. FHWA concurred.

b. Truck discussion regarding what lane trucks would travel in—left versus right:

- Trucks are in center lane for right option.
- Trucks are in right lanes for left option.
- Trucks need to weave to the right to access the chain-up station or port-of-entry.
- For the right option, the right lane needs to be as small as possible. This would preclude traditional/typical truck right-lane usage.
- Because the roadway width is restricted (no widening), you don't want to use up all that width on the shoulders 95 percent of the time.
- CDOT and FHWA agreed that if trucks, during peak period, are on the shoulder, it will cause operational problems.

c. Discussion regarding signing:

- It was explained that right side needs 50 percent more signs. Steve stated this is a big issue to stakeholders and that it can be confusing to the driver as well.
- Stakeholders want to minimize the number of signs.
- Driver expectation would prefer less signs.
- Left side general purpose lanes stay in the same lanes
- Right side general purpose lanes would have to shift to the right to get out of managed lane.
- Left side operations are better than right side per the feasibility study. Travel times are less—12 minutes less on all lanes.
- Consensus was reached with a left side PPSL.

d. Update on deceleration/acceleration lanes:

- As suggested at the previous Local Agency Issues Task Force meeting, the design team refined the design of the deceleration and acceleration lanes.
- FHWA was consulted in the determination of absolute minimums. FHWA would not accept anything less than the existing parameters.
- It was determined that only two deceleration lanes would need to be modified—US 40 and east of Idaho Springs. Each of these is “quick button hook” ramps. They are in interchange infield areas and would not require widening of the exterior roadway envelope.
- The SH 103 interchange is an independent study and was not presented.
- Acceleration lane refinements:

	9/9/13 On-Ramp Design	8/26/13 On-Ramp Design
<b>EMPIRE JUNCTION ON RAMP</b>		
Area widening required	1,485 square feet	2,515 square feet
Maximum wall height	N/A	2.1 feet
Wall Length	N/A	150 feet
<b>DOWNIEVILLE ON RAMP</b>		
Area widening required	3,075 square feet	7,400 square feet
Maximum wall height	3.8 feet	7.3 feet
Wall Length	450 feet	600 feet
<b>DUMONT ON RAMP</b>		
Area widening required	1,640 square feet	8,700 square feet
Maximum wall height	2.4 feet	7.2 feet
Wall Length	250 feet	700 feet
<b>FALL RIVER ROAD ON RAMP</b>		
Area widening required	0 square feet	0 square feet
Maximum wall height	N/A	N/A
Wall Length	N/A	N/A
<b>EAST IDAHO SPRINGS ON RAMP</b>		
Area widening required	5,190 square feet	5,278 square feet
Maximum wall height	N/A	N/A
Wall Length	N/A	N/A

- Members of the ITF were still concerned that widening impacts were not acceptable, but agreed that refinements were moving toward a compromise.