



CDOT R4, South Program
1050 Lee Hill Drive
Boulder CO 80302

MEETING MINUTES
CDOT REGION 4, BOULDER RESIDENCY

DATE/TIME: September 16, 2019, 10:00AM-12:00PM
PROJECT: US 36, Permanent Flood Repair at Site 17 (CDOT 20744)
LOCATION: Estes Park Town Hall, Board Hearing Room
SUBJECT: Project introduction with agency stakeholders; traffic impacts at Muggins Gulch

ATTENDEES:

Greg Muhonen, Town of Estes Park
Kate Rusch, Town of Estes Park
Travis Machulek, Town of Estes Park
Christy Crosser, Town of Estes Park
Brian Varrella, CDOT Resident Engineer
Stacy DeWitt, CDOT Project Engineer (for Site 17)
Monte Malik, CDOT Project Engineer
Tim Sullivan, Larimer County Sheriff's Office
Gabriele Benson, PWS Fire & Water
Roberta Lopez, CDOT
Mark Lamutt, Jacobs
Tim Eversol, Jacobs
Dave Coleson, Estes Park School District Director of Operations and Transportation
Kim Chase, USPS Estes Park
Cheryl Jils, USPS Estes Park
Christopher Galas, USFS Estes Park
Dave Wolf, Estes Fire
Ted Plank, Pinewood Springs Fire, Boulder County Transportation
Kim Mitchell, Town of Lyons (on phone)

AGENDA:

- I. **Summary:**
 - A. Brief overview of the Muggins Gulch Project



- II. **Traffic Impact Options:**
- III. **Full Road closure**
 - A. Road closed except for Emergency and Essential Services, including windows in the morning and afternoon for School Buses
 - B. Aggregate Construction Access minimum 15 ft wide
 - C. Duration of 30 days
- IV. **Single lane closure**
 - A. 24 hour Alternating one way traffic with temporary signals
 - B. Duration (72 days total)
- V. **Discuss Pros and Cons in the decision matrix handout**
- VI. **Identify any additional Risks the Stakeholders aware of**
- VII. **Acquire feedback; needs, concerns, mitigation opportunities**
- VIII. **Wrap up**

ACTION ITEMS:

- I. **CDOT**
 - a. Present feedback to CDOT Management and FHWA
 - i. Select traffic option
 - b. Determine access window times and permitted access
 - c. Request funding for CDOT Public Info Consultant prior to construction
 - d. Look into mailbox cluster installation
 - e. Send digital content to attendees
 - f. Update attendees on project in early October
- II. **USPS**
 - a. Contact UPS, Fedex, and Amazon and get feedback to Stacy
 - b. Send Stacy the specifications for mailbox cluster and proposed location
- III. **Emergency Services**
 - a. Reach out to ambulance services to coordinate response East of construction zone
 - b. Dimensions and weights of Fire & EMT need to be specified and sent to Stacy

MEETING MINUTES:

Note: All information sorted by **action items in red text** and **key feedback in blue text**.

- II. **Meeting being recorded (audio) for reference**
- III. **Introductions, including phone participants**
- IV. **4-slide overview PowerPoint from Stacy**
 - A. Two options for construction
- I. Opt. A = Full construction with emergency access and school district access
- II. Opt. B = Single-lane closure option is single-lane alternating traffic
 - B. Looking for input from the group on preferences and operational needs
- V. **Single-page handout shows a draft of schedule and pros/cons decision matrix**
 - A. Key difference between two closure options is time of construction and interruption to traffic flow
 - B. Detour routes are SH 7 and US 34



- C. CDOT using a Best Value approach to public information (PI) and construction
- I. Best Value provides a vehicle to manage cost and contractor experience
 - VI. Key needs, gaps and information from stakeholders**
 - A. Communication will be a challenge -- no cell service
 - B. How open will workzone be to emergency services outside normal passage hours?
- I. Contractor will be required to keep emergency access open 24/7 -- protocol must be arranged with construction contractor
- II. US34 set up comes into and out of canyon to manage emergency services as they need
- III. Delay minimized, except around blasting times -- notice will be provided ahead of blast times -- lead time needs to be analyzed
- IV. Ambulance services come from Estes Park so need EMTs to create a plan
- V. School bus passage hours would require a pilot car
- VI. 40-ft, 60,000 lb. vehicle with 8-ft length needs to pass
 - C. Dave Colson shared the times the bus would need to go through the work area
 - I. The bus would be going through that area 2 times in the AM and 2 times in the PM as it goes down to Pinewood and back.
 - a. AM: East bound coming through at approx 7:10
 - b. AM: West bound coming through at approx. 7:30
 - c. PM: East bound coming through at approx. 3:46
 - d. PM: West bound coming through at approx. 4:05
 - D. Dimensions and weights of Fire & EMT need to be specified (Chris Wolf, EP Fire)
 - E. USPS -- exact miles?
 - I. Miles 7.7-8.0, rock blasting at 7.85
 - F. Pinewood Springs – water is delivered from the creek; are there plans for interruption?
 - I. No disruption to water
 - II. Current flows will be maintained until both pipes/tunnels are completed & water diverted to the historic channel
 - G. Larimer Sheriff -- staging at Lyons Gulch, is USFS aware of impact on access?
 - I. Working with USFS and only using 1/3 of area
 - II. **Concern of hikers commingling with construction equipment at trailhead, Recommend using the entire trailhead to avoid parking and trespass into operations**
 - H. Estes Park (Kate R. & Greg M.) -- are 72-day closure times working days or calendar?
 - I. Full closure is calendar days, possibly 24/7 closure (Opt. A)
 - a. No weekend opening, fully closed except for School & EMS
 - II. The 72-days of single lane closure are working days
 - a. Single lane alternating closure full timeline for 72 working days plus weekends
 - b. If Opt. B proceeds, then alternating traffic disruptions will occur through about 5 months of disturbance
- III. **First consideration should be emergency services, 2nd for business disruptions**
- IV. **Suggest managing perception that closure is not closure forever to prevent rumor carry-over like that seen during the US 34 Canyon project**
- V. **Messaging needed at Lyons, Estes, and I-25**
 - I. Pinewood Springs -- **special access for Pinewood and Big Elk Meadows residents is a good idea**



- I. Will hopefully use something similar to US 34 but since work zone is smaller the potential for passes will be scaled back
- II. Public information officer will be part of contractor's team
- III. Option B (one-lane-road with Temp Signal) will require emergency responders to wait in the signal queue (if emergency responders pass the queue, they would potentially end up head on with opposite direction of general traffic with nowhere to go)
 - J. Communication in canyons on prior projects; what worked well on SH7 & US34 CDOT Projects?
- I. EP Fire – EMS received a radio from Kiewit during US34 for heads up on ETA and number of units coming
 - a. Allowed the chance to communicate directly with contractor safety and traffic control crews to move EMS vehicles & personnel through worksite quickly
- II. Lyons -- business impacts will be highest during EP Summer Break, and understands there are many pieces in this process to consider
 - a. Resident commute access to/from Pinewood & Big Elk Meadows will be heavily impacted
 - b. Agrees with messaging needed on I-25; most traffic to and through Lyons is coming from the Denver metro area
- K. USPS – US 34 had morning and evening commuter window times; same on this project?
 - I. Maybe; to be determined after contractor is on board
 - II. Timeline for mail coming in at 5am, UPS & FedEx moving 5-10AM
- III. SH 7 detour might be an option but large detour
 - a. Mail deliveries adding 1 hour will increase delivery times during cold and dark hours
 - b. Would lean to 30-day full closure since it is most predictable, lowest volume of mail to move, and typically fully staffed
 - c. Will reach out to UPS, FedEx and Amazon and get feedback back to Stacy
- IV. Impact will only be an extra 15 minutes one way on either US 34 or SH 7
 - a. SH 7 project traffic impacts will be timed to not interfere with Opt. A closure
- VII. CDOT knows both Opt. A and Opt. B create safety, mobility and livelihood impacts, but of the two options, is there a preferred least-worse option?**
 - A. Estes Park -- would likely advocate for 30-day closure instead of 72-day
 - I. Risks better controlled, time of uncertainty optimized, and impact lowest on the Town of EP
 - II. Easiest to manage public information and avoids all impact to Memorial Day traffic flow
 - B. EP Fire -- supporting 30-day closure to reduce disruption with full access during entire closure
 - C. Larimer Sheriff -- preference would be for 30-day closure
 - I. Less problematic
 - II. Unmanned lighting during weekend will create a safety problem
 - III. If closed fully, ask CDOT Maintenance to pay closer attention to ice and snow management on SH 7; not maintained well during winter
 - D. Pinewood Springs Fire supports 30-day closure
 - I. Provide all EMS with schedule of specific blast days with prior notice to make sure they have a plan to maintain emergency service



- E. EP School District -- morning and afternoon access during non-blast days, but what about non-blast days?
- I. Blasting will accommodate those bus travel times
- II. Still some risk of full closure, so need to have a contingency plan in case problems arise similar to SH119 Boulder Canyon
 - a. Allowing access to top of blast to improve control of operation and reduce risk of unknowns
- F. Boulder Co. Transportation -- no primary issues for Site 17
- G. Pinewood Springs -- when will it be announced?
- I. After Construction award & prior to full closure
- II. Stakeholder outreach begins 7-21 calendar days prior to actual closure
 - a. Looking for funding to accelerate that right now
 - b. PI is delegated to the contractor
- H. Estes Park -- work prepared for US 34 Canyon was very effective
- I. Meeting with citizens, CDOT employees present, public invited, and fully engaged in-person prior to standard late-time messaging
- II. Recommend getting months ahead of closure; deserve to know at a minimum through a press release
- III. EP Schools agrees emphatically -- need upfront info for commuters and a plan to share with them as far ahead of time as possible
 - I. Larimer Sheriff -- don't forget Blue Mountain and Swing Gulch
 - I. Need commuter checkpoint process info out as soon as possible
 - II. If going with permitted access, reach out to residents ASAP
 - J. Lyons -- what are next steps?
 - I. Advertise construction in October 2019
 - II. Notice to proceed in January 2020
 - III. Looking for funding and support for early PI work if possible, but not likely
 - K. Estes Park -- chance to cycle or walk through construction zone?
 - I. CDOT will look into it
 - L. EMS -- gate closure is not first choice but absolutely an option with knox box
 - I. Keyed lockbox or coded lock box
 - II. Automated systems would also be an option
 - M. Lyons -- when will we know decision or timing?
 - I. Likely within the next few weeks
- VIII. Wrap up**
- I. Stacy DeWitt is your point of contact; stacy.dewitt@state.co.us, 303-546-5652
- II. Notes: <B:\0 CDOT Projects\20744 US36 Site17\Stakeholders>

