



PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED SURROUNDING ROUND 2 PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETINGS

Open Houses held March 22 and 23, 2023

The second round of public engagement for the Cottonwood Pass Concept Design project consisted of two public open house meetings. The meetings were held on March 22, 2023 (in Glenwood Springs, from 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.) and March 23, 2023 (in Gypsum, from 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.) to present design concept options and evaluation of those options.

A robust media campaign was used to spread the word to inform travelers in the surrounding area. Advertisements were placed in the print versions of the Glenwood Post Independent, Vail Daily, and Aspen Times that ran twice in the week prior to the public meetings. A digital campaign also ran in the online versions of those publications targeting Eagle and Garfield counties. This resulted in approximately 60,000 total impressions and more than 30 visits to the project web page.

To notify adjacent and nearby property owners and tenants, a postcard was mailed to 2,400 people. Other advertisements included a news release distributed to CDOT, Eagle County, and Garfield County’s contact lists, articles by Vail Daily, Denver Gazette, and 9 News, CDOT social media posts, emails to the project contact list, and notice on Town of Gypsum’s welcome board on US 6.



Approximately 45 members of the public attended the meeting in Glenwood Springs and 55 attended in Gypsum. Display boards focused on providing a project overview, presenting site design options and the draft evaluation, and outlining next steps.

Meeting display boards and handouts were posted to the project web page the day following the meetings and an additional week was provided for public comment. Comments were submitted on comment forms during the open houses, transcribed by project and county staff during conversations at the open houses and prior to the meeting, and submitted via email and letters. Following is a listing of comments submitted in March 2023.



SITE-SPECIFIC COMMENTS

EAGLE COUNTY

SITE 1

- ◆ Option 2 does not seem realistic. Option 1 is more realistic. These are tough turns. I like the proposed guardrail but the \$1M estimate for three areas of improvement seems low to me. If these can get done, great but I am guessing that we will need more modest improvements due to budget.

SITE 2

- ◆ Coulter Creek Crossing - look at ways to decrease sediment from cows.
- ◆ This stretch has reasonable improvements but I would look to lanes without shoulders to reduce cost and impacts. Same caution about increased speeds reducing safety improvements.

SITE 3

- ◆ Maybe I am misremembering but I thought there was a hill where the curve is being smoothed. If costs are an issue some widening at the existing curve and a guardrail could be a lower cost option. It is helpful to slow down vehicles going into the subdivision area. The refined option seems more viable but not sure if it would require a retention wall \$\$\$\$. I would consider a guardrail regardless.

SITE 4

- ◆ Looks good.

SITE 5 - BLUE HILL

- ◆ Blue Hill – curviest section is worst and should be highest priority – are there short-term improvements the County could do? Add guardrail?
- ◆ Blue Hill is #1 priority.
- ◆ Why don't they have traffic lights on Blue Hill to control one way direction?
- ◆ Is an on demand, intermittent stop light to control alternating traffic at Eagle County Blue Hill location a technical infeasibility (where County R&B / National Guard Flaggers have manned the switch back during I-70 Canyon Closures)? What are the obstacles to an alternating traffic stop light, i.e. power source? How does lighted control device compare to man labor costs and / or future two way improvement / or proposed road diversion around Blue Hill?



- ◆ I have spent many hours driving up and down the Cottonwood Road. My grandparents took up residence on this side of the pass in 1920. Since then, my family has owned and maintained our ranch on the pass. I have always considered the worst part of the road being the part going down Blue Hill, although the resurfacing a few years ago was a great help, there is still the matter of widening the road that needs to occur. The many narrow spots and blind curves are extremely dangerous. There have been several times when a vehicle has gone over the edge trying to avoid being hit by oncoming traffic. One of these accidents occurred in the forties when my great grandmother, aunt and uncle were coming down the road and met an oncoming vehicle, forcing my aunt, uncle, and grandmother over the edge and down the mountain to the valley below. They were all injured and taken to the hospital, but survived. That was 80 years ago, and the problem still exists! Blue Hill Road is dangerous because of no way to avoid oncoming traffic. With the increase in traffic, the problem has worsened.

In the past, county workers that have maintained the road have been frustrated because they feel the remedy to fix the problem spots could be easily solved. It doesn't take engineers, countless studies, public meetings, grants, loans, and unnecessary spending to remedy the problem. All it would take is practical wisdom, equipment, and men with experience to get the job done.

At one point, many years ago, the man who was in charge of maintaining the road decided to widen a spot so vehicles could pass. It took him, his maintainer, and a few days to widen an area that is still used today. He wanted to do more, but was told not to.

Since that time, it has appeared to take an act of congress to widen that treacherous road. I don't believe we need more studies, engineer planning, etc. to simply buy the necessary equipment and widen the road! As a footnote, the county once had the equipment they needed, but they sold it... another example of poor management. Stop wasteful spending and widen the road before someone is killed!

- ◆ Eagle County Site 5, I would choose the Option 2, maybe with a little less improvement where walls are required. We will need all the money for Blue Hill.
- ◆ I attended the public meeting in Gypsum yesterday. I've lived in Vail since 1974, driven Cottonwood Pass countless times, and often marveled that there has not, to my knowledge, yet been a fatal accident on Blue Hill. The \$55-59 million conceptual cost of Option 2 for that area makes me think it is highly unlikely to ever be built, and if it is built, it's many years from completion.

If a fatal accident occurs in the meantime, especially because of the attention the road is getting, I think there will be a huge public uproar about why nothing has been done for so many years. Therefore, I wonder if there isn't a much cheaper option, such as minimal widening of the current road and the addition of guardrails. Let's not make the perfect the enemy of the good. Thanks for considering this.



SITE 6

- ◆ Should eliminate curve. Connect straight through.
- ◆ Eagle County Site 6, Blue Hill is what it is. Once we start cutting back into the slope, we will find out how far we have to cut and how much money it will eat up. Ongoing maintenance will be an issue. For me, I would see whether I could get another 4 feet into the slope without starting the cascading grade chase, maybe with retention on the inside and guardrail on the outside to see if I could get an 18' platform and then declare victory.

GARFIELD COUNTY

SITE 1

- ◆ I think the best choice in my opinion is Garfield County Site 1. It's also cost effective too.
- ◆ Left turn phases should be added to the signal at CO 82 and Catherine Store Rd for the side street movements.
- ◆ The right turn lane at the intersection of Catherine Store and SH 82 is an important improvement. When value engineering takes place, I would encourage you to maintain this improvement in all cases.

SITE 2

- ◆ The proposed guardrail will build up sand debris and eventually cause problems with runoff when it can no longer sheet flow off the road. With this design there will need to be regular maintenance of the traction sand. At the southbound approach to Site 2, there is no shoulder and the road drops steeply away. There looks to be an attempt to shore it up with shotcrete or similar. The inside of the curve is bordered by a steep, cobbly uphill bank. This will make widening difficult without reinforcement on the bank. An advanced curve sign with additional speed guidance is a good idea.

SITE 3

- ◆ The driveways and culverts need more delineation. Many were missing or damaged.
- ◆ The realignment of the curve (Dryson) at Garfield County Site 3 does not meet a cost-benefit test. I would recommend some widening as per the previous curve. On the ground, one sees the topographic and drainage challenges of the proposal and I would hope that would rule this proposal out. There is an active wildlife crossing at the curve and slowing down traffic should be a priority for both curves.



SITE 4

- ◆ The addition of guardrail will not improve the crash problem at this curve and steps should be taken to reduce speeds. Property owner is not in favor of the guardrail downhill of his property. It will interfere with snow storage for both his driveway and Catherine Store Rd, and could change the runoff flow to negatively affect his driveway. The guardrail uphill from the driveway will border an uphill berm, and it does not need protecting. The snow will build up in the shaded areas of the guardrail creating a drainage and icing problem, unless the county does a more thorough removal job. The county had installed chevrons on the curve that made some improvement, but were later removed. They should be reinstalled. An advanced curve sign with additional speed guidance is a good idea.
- ◆ The guardrails at the curve on Garfield County Site 4 should only be proposed at the bottom of the curve where the semi flipped. The adjustments to the curve and widening would be helpful. The upper guardrails do not seem needed and may create a false sense of security that leads to speed increases. A portion of the road shoulder below the curve has experienced degradation, money could be spent here on safety and perhaps guardrail.

SITE 6

I do not believe that the changes on Garfield County Site 6 are needed and will only result in increased speeds, which will reduce rather than increase safety.

SITE 7

- ◆ The design is horrible for bicyclists. The existing layout is better. Think it will increase traffic overall and then more traffic will be on Cattle Creek Road.
- ◆ I would compromise a bit on the ideal to straighten it out some while minimizing cuts, retention, and fill. May not be a perfect T intersection but maybe somewhat better sightlines

SUPPORT FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS TO COTTONWOOD PASS

- ◆ Like the intersection changes and signage that will send people to Catherine Store Road.
- ◆ Need an alternate route, totally agree.
- ◆ Will need huge improvements.
- ◆ I think this is a necessary road for everyone in the long run, especially for safety.
- ◆ Improving the pass to allow two lanes would be a big deal towards the safety of the pass. A minimal approach towards these improvements seems fair to lessen the concerns potential speeders, the owners who live there, and the wildlife.



- ◆ This is a fantastic and much needed project for our community. It will bring Eagle County together and provide employees relief, as Glenwood Canyon continues to close almost weekly.
- ◆ I appreciate your time and work on this project as I am a supporter of improving that road for summer use. As a resident I do use it and continue to appreciate any work to make it more drivable and safer.
- ◆ I support safety improvements, particularly Blue Hill, Site 5 Eagle County. I think this is the most dangerous portion of Cottonwood Pass. While other sections in Eagle and Garfield Counties may have had more fatalities, they were likely caused by driving too fast. While I think Blue Hill should be the first section fixed, all of the improvements would be welcome. If there is a chance of Cottonwood Pass becoming a year round option the more expensive option for Blue Hill should be selected. I understand the negative reaction of adjacent landowners. However, several of them work in Real Estate and development and they seldom care when their proposals impact others.
- ◆ Improvements to Cottonwood Pass are really needed. It would be nice if the entire length could be widened and paved.
- ◆ I am a Gypsum resident, and I like the proposed changes to Cottonwood Pass Road. I also think it could be a toll road for everyone except residents of that area in order to keep traffic to a minimum and help offset costs, unless that in itself would be too costly. We appreciate your working on this in a sensitive way. Thank you.
- ◆ I am a resident of Eagle County and commute through Glenwood Canyon to Glenwood Springs daily during the work week. Improvements in both counties along Cottonwood Pass are necessary. Extended closures of I-70 have huge impacts on the local economies and citizens. There is a strong link between the two valleys (roaring fork and eagle valley) and enhancing the only available secondary transportation link is critical to the wellbeing and safety of road users. The proposed options for safety enhancements are a good first step.
- ◆ I would very much appreciate improvements to the Cottonwood Pass connector between Eagle and Garfield counties.
- ◆ I think this is a great project and should move forward as soon as possible!!
- ◆ I live in the Eagle County portion of Missouri Heights in Red Table Acres (Upper Cattle Creek and Elk Range). I frequent Cottonwood Pass for professional (meetings in Eagle), volunteer (Eagle County Open Space Committee) and recreation uses (bike, hike, camp). Thanks for working on this. I never really supported improvements on Cottonwood but the repeated disruptions on Glenwood Canyon have convinced me that some level of improvements is needed. Not happy about that but it is reality.
- ◆ I support all the improvements as proposed. I also encourage CODOT to look at improving both sides of the intersection at Hwy 82 and Catherine Store Road on the Garfield County side. The road in front of Catherine Store needs drastic improvement, with many potholes and pour sight lines due to



grade, as well as including a left turn and right turn lane for traffic coming from Carbondale. I believe the state should consider improving the Cottonwood Pass route to State Highway Standards in the future to provide a more formalized detour route around Glenwood Canyon, as well as improve connectivity between the Vail and Roaring Fork Valleys. I understand the improvements at this time are for improving the route for local traffic, as well as to decrease the amount of vehicles who get stuck on Cottonwood Pass, requiring rescue or blocking the route for local traffic. I also understand that locals who live along the route are against improvements because they fear it will bring more traffic, but the route is already established on mapping software and the improvements are needed to keep the route open and safe. Furthermore a shorter detour is needed to bypass Glenwood Canyon. Perhaps the Federal Government could provide funding by rerouting US Hwy 6 over Cottonwood Pass, or designating it State Highway 182. I would recommend that until the state decides to improve this route to state highway standards, that they place signage at both ends of Cottonwood Pass warning of the dangers of the route, prohibiting semi trucks and advising local traffic only. Steep fines should be used for semi trucks over 35' in length that get stuck on the route or are not servicing local addresses, as seen on Independence Pass.

CONCERNS ABOUT ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC & SPEEDS

- ◆ Concerns with trucks being allowed in the corridor.
- ◆ Don't want more traffic.
- ◆ The improvements will lead to faster speeds, which may lead to more injuries from crashes if faster speeds.
- ◆ How do you control the speeds when you widen?
- ◆ Remove road from Google – make sure only passenger cars and pickups are allowed to use the road. Restrict!! Assist CDOT in I-70 improvements to make canyon safer and open.
- ◆ Remove road from Google. Eagle/Garfield/CDOT should all be working together to make this safer. Assist CDOT in I-70 safety improvements. Why isn't R&B county/sheriff's/state patrol here for input?
- ◆ Google maps is making this impossible.
- ◆ Restrict access! Use law enforcement at high need time – Passenger car and pickup only.
- ◆ Better signage at Glenwood to detour use of Cottonwood Pass – Restrict access travelers should not make it thru Glenwood headed to detour. Use law enforcement.
- ◆ Better signage! Stop traffic prior to Pass! Restrict use.
- ◆ Need to stop traffic to large and medium trucks either at Cottonwood Pass or improve I-70 with this money and not have that problem at all.



- ◆ Last time the canyon closed for several days we collected over 10 garbage bags of trash that had been thrown out of vehicles along Cattle Creek Road. It seems that just the traffic alone would affect Cattle Creek (the actual water, cattle creek) and along with this actual trash, this is another reason we must defer traffic. Please help keep non-resident traffic OFF Cattle Creek Road. Thanks for your help.
- ◆ Please do not encourage more traffic through this rural area.
- ◆ I don't support adding more traffic to Cottonwood Pass. It will always be too dangerous. Funds would be better spent in Glenwood Canyon mitigating problems there.
- ◆ When I-70 is closed, it simply moves to Cattle Creek. Cars speed at 50-60mph both directions. I've been nearly hit while standing at my mailbox, have had cars pass me on blind corners, have been honked at as I put garbage in my can, and run off the road while on my bicycle. Drivers have become more rude, self-centered, and un-caring. I know my neighbors feel the same we're all very frustrated that our quiet, rural neighborhood becomes an interstate. The signs directing people over Catherine Store to 82 are ineffective, because map apps send them down 113. I'm not a NIMBY, but I'm definitely not in favor of seeing more traffic, from commuters to tourists, and tractor-trailers on quiet rural roads. Missouri Heights is a quiet area, with safe roads, except when traffic is searching for a bypass, then it's a dangerous major thoroughfare, where pedestrians, cyclists, pets, and wildlife are at risk.

SPEEDING & ENFORCEMENT

- ◆ Speed limit signs need to be placed so they are more visible.
- ◆ Add ticket cameras.
- ◆ The proposed changes at these sites will not have an effect on speeding vehicles, which is the biggest problem. More enforcement is needed. There is no justification to spend the money on the changes identified on lower Catherine Store Rd.
- ◆ These improvements will increase the use and speed of users, I think that a max speed limit of 30mph and slower sections is needed. Enforcement with portable non manned speed guns with cameras in multiple changing locations might be effective. Even without improvements individuals dangerously speed now. This will only get worse if there are no consequences.
- ◆ Construction traffic has really picked up on the Eagle County section of this road and travel speeds have gone up with it. Safety and capacity improvements could lead to additional speed and need for expensive enforcement. It will need to be a balancing act.

CR 113 (CATTLE CREEK)

- ◆ Left turn from Hwy 82 on to Cattle Creek gets congested.



- ◆ Understand that any improvements would be more impactful with all the driveways and how narrow it is. Understand that signs won't slow people down.
- ◆ Must make improvements to CR 113 if this proceeds. It will be used more than CR 100. Intersection of CR 113 and Hwy 82 is too dangerous. Garfield would be more productive help CDOT with improvements to I-70.
- ◆ Improve 113 and 82 intersection because you will not stop the traffic to that dangerous intersection. Improve I-70 with this money to avoid this issue all together.
- ◆ CR 113 must be evaluated if this proceeds! CDOT must do safety improvement at CR 113 and Hwy 82!
- ◆ Intersection at 113 and Hwy 82 is horrible and dangerous and you won't stop people from using it with these plans.
- ◆ The work to date seems to funnel all of the traffic to Catherine Store Rd. Focusing the improvements on one road makes financial sense and can simplify improvements. At the same time, the additional traffic is concentrated on one route and that does not seem fair. For instance, paving the Eagle County portion of Upper Cattle Creek and widening where necessary would allow signage to direct travelers to Basalt and Aspen to that route. That would reduce the impacts on Catherine Store/Cattle Creek. I personally would not benefit from this as I bike the dirt section often and all of the roads in Missouri Heights, however I think it is only fair to distribute the traffic in logical ways to signalized intersections with SH 82.
- ◆ Regardless of the suggested Catherine Store route for those traveling west across Cottonwood Pass, many folks will decide to travel down Cattle Creek Road since it is the shortest route to Glenwood Springs and the lower valley. I suggest re-painting the right/left turn lane road lines at the intersection of Cattle Creek Road (113) and Hwy 82. This will make turning onto Hwy 82 there safer and more efficient. Many people turning left onto Hwy 82 use the right lane and those turning right often use the left lane slowing the flow of traffic. Another idea would be to install the solar powered beaded flashing red light ribbons around all the stop signs at that intersection since those driving down Cattle Creek and/or 110 Road often run the stop signs located above the actual Hwy 82/113 intersection creating a significant safety issue with anyone turning from Hwy 82. These are simple and relatively inexpensive solutions that should help improve safety and traffic flow at all times, but especially when the I-70 is closed. Thanks for your consideration.
- ◆ Thanks for the presentation last night. I want to know how you are going to keep traffic off Cattle Creek/CR 113 and can we please have speed bumps every mile between mile 2 and mile 6? We are a small, quiet community who uses the road like our park. The traffic we had during the closing from the mudslides triggered PTSD with many of us who live close to the road and whose driveways connect directly to the road. Closing our road would be great as would signs reading: Residence traffic only. Can you keep Cattle Creek off Google maps, etc.? You did not seem to be addressing our issues with the presentation.



- ◆ Cattle Creek is safer, little improvements needed, a good idea for the intersection is to include for a future alternate route for the other side of River fire escape route. Easier and faster access for fire and ambulance.

GLENWOOD CANYON

- ◆ We know there have been problems with how to pay for improvements. My wife and I suggest there would be a temporary adoption of something that can happen soon – having a follow-me car through Glenwood Canyon. Would stop people from thinking this is the Autobahn. More state troopers in Glenwood Canyon would help. It could be more user-friendly to the public than a pace car. The canyon is difficult for law enforcement due to lack of space. They shouldn't have made all of Glenwood Canyon asphalt. It should have been concrete originally. There wouldn't have been so many problems every spring.
- ◆ Adjust speeds through canyon.
- ◆ For Glenwood Canyon, use pilot cars more enforcement.
- ◆ The issue is needed speed enforcement in the Canyon – use photo-cameras.

WINTER ACCESS

- ◆ Concerns with road being open year-round.
- ◆ Would like Cottonwood Pass open year round (x 3).
- ◆ Live up Buck Point in Eagle County. Needs to be open in winter for residents to access Eagle County.
- ◆ To make all these improvements and not continue winter maintenance (not making this an alternate route year-round) doesn't justify the cost needed to improve the pass in the first place. There is needed discussion on this ruling. Having a 3-hour detour is not fair who those commute through the canyon.
- ◆ No winter use! (x2)
- ◆ As the representative of Vail Mountain Rescue Group (the agency that Eagle County Sheriff's office uses for search and rescue) in this matter I would request that an improved winter road closure gate be installed at the Gypsum side of the Cottonwood Pass road. Vail Mountain Rescue Group has responded to numerous winter rescues over the years on Cottonwood Pass when Glenwood Canyon closes and people ignore the current closure gate arrangement. The current gate has proven inadequate as it is easily avoided by motorists. Making this closure more difficult to avoid would greatly enhance safety by avoiding the need for rescues in the first place. The sooner this improvement could be implemented the better as rescues are a current safety issue. Thank you in advance for your attention in this matter.



OTHER COMMENTS

- ◆ We need a shorter I-70 detour.
- ◆ Suggestion to place porta potties to stop people from using driveways.
- ◆ Concern with wildlife and retaining walls. Will animals go up & over/under? Want to be sure the NEPA process happens.
- ◆ Wildlife concern from landowner.
- ◆ There should be more wildlife warning signs.
- ◆ Plows are not pushing the traction sand completely off the road in some areas, creating a 1'-2' buffer where understeering cars could lose traction. Drainage ditches and culverts are not being maintained enough.
- ◆ The area needs the delineation to be standardized and needs more of it. Several delineators exist on the approach to Site 2. Some are green metal posts with buttons and others were yellow plastic bollards with reflective tape.
- ◆ There are signs that do not meet standard for placement and height.
- ◆ By the way, the signs to Cottonwood Pass are still on lower Cattle Creek and at the 113/112 intersection. Can you try again to get them removed as soon as possible?
- ◆ There are many cyclists riding Catherine Store Rd. There should be more signage to share the road.
- ◆ Littering is a big issue and will only get worse with more traffic.
- ◆ I am not opposed to some minimal improvements on the road, but I am opposed to extensive paving and widening of the Cottonwood Pass Road. It would be very detrimental to residents and wildlife if this road became a major thoroughfare for people traveling between I70 and the Roaring Fork Valley. Please keep in mind the tremendous harm this would cause.
- ◆ I realize Cottonwood Pass is a county road shared by two counties. However, leaving the phased improvements of this road to two counties without coordinated construction phasing is folly. Neither county can be trusted to ever get anything done.
- ◆ I believe that this Cottonwood Pass project is a horrible idea. First, nature would suffer, and then developers would seek to further destroy our small towns along the route. A 300 million dollar investment into Glenwood Canyon would be best, no consultant studies needed. Contact Elon Musk. This is the perfect opportunity for his Boring Company to design a toll route through the canyon underground.



- ◆ Keep all I-70 out of Gypsum for the same reason you keep want to keep traffic out of Cattle Creek! If you can't enforce trucks from speeding on a four lane highway how are you going to accomplish it on Cottonwood? Install a height and length box at the beginning of each end keeping box trucks and over length campers out of it? How are you going to ensure safety on kids crossing valley road in the summer, and school times? How are you going to ensure there is adequate emergency responses?
- ◆ Viewing the 14 sites at the March 23 Gypsum open house, am more favorably supportive of seeing more lower cost safety improvements in multiple locations over a few high cost improvement sites.
- ◆ After going to presentation, reading articles, talking with neighbors, living here for 32 years, etc., we have come to the conclusion that the money for this project would be better spent on preventing accidents on I-70.

Keep Cottonwood Pass closed in the winter; don't make improvements which will just encourage traffic in the summer, save a ton of money, keep cattle creek (the actual creek) from being polluted by all the traffic that would come that way. If there is a long closure on I-70, only allow 10 vehicles at a time to go either way on Cottonwood.....possibly with a lead car since there's no room for pullover.

Use money for speed control on I-70, Cottonwood, and Cattle Creek and Catherine's Store Road, and for the 3-way intersection at Cattle Creek road and County Road 100 and the highway 82/100/113/ frontage road intersection.

These are the only improvements that make sense as spending millions to improve Cottonwood Pass is a real waste. It's a dangerous pass with no cell service and winds like a river. Work on keeping I-70 open and save Garfield County millions of dollars and diminishes the number of disgruntled neighbors and allows us to keep our active outdoor neighborhood.

COMMENTS MENTIONING MULTIPLE TOPICS

- ◆ What is the main objective? Traffic going west past Glenwood or traffic going to Basalt and Aspen?

Catherine Store at Highway 82 (100 Road) to Cattle Creek intersection heading over Cottonwood Pass. Time – 12 minutes. 3.6 miles. The hazards that you've addressed within the concept plan for 100 Road supports the decision of making Cattle Creek a far better alternative. 7 additional miles on highway 82 to intersect with Cattle Creek, for a total of 10.6 miles to the same point and additional time from 100 Road to Cattle Creek of approximately 10-15 minutes. Total time 22 to 27 minutes.

Cattle Creek intersection at base of Cottonwood Pass to Highway 82. Time – 13 minutes. 6.8 miles. Substantially less improvements needed - follows the bottom of the valley so there is no substantial hills or sharp corners. The road surface is well maintained and in good shape, bar ditches in place, visibility is more than adequate. At address 3335 on Cattle Creek road would be the only area of a major adjustment. Total time 13 minutes. This intersection could and should be designed for a future fire evacuation and alternative route for residents across the river.



Red Mountain and Crystal Springs Roads. Both of these roads have the same and or more of the same hazards as 100 Road.

1) Traffic road count and speed surveys - I initiated in 2017 showed 9000 plus vehicle trips over a 5 day period of which 95% were speeding, the top speed at 56mph and again in 2019. Additional traffic being added (which we believe this alternate road will become the preferred road for vehicles avoiding the canyon and rush hour in Glenwood Springs) will exasperate the current driving patterns assuming the same attention to maintenance and patrol will remain in place.

2) Channelization (the act of managing the road). County Road 100 was built and designed to handle traffic doing 25 mph and you state the speed limit won't change but the lack of maintenance and patrol has made 100 road a dangerous road. Alcohol is prevalent everywhere. The poor maintenance or complete lack of I addressed with Dwight, Joe, Wyatt, and Harry. The road needs to be brought up to standards. All aspects of maintenance is seriously lacking. I am not only bringing attention to the problems but I believe I am bringing solutions.

3) How did County Road 100 become the only "concept" road with a full scale concept plan? Cattle Creek Road is a more viable alternative because the road is already established with softer curves, defined bar ditches, site visibility (i.e.: vegetation), guard rail placement, no steep hills or sharp curves and access to highway 82 with acceleration and deceleration lanes.

4) My perspectives on sites of concept plan, Garfield County side. 1) Cost of turn lane with moving ditches and traffic lights but no change for the south side by Catherine Store. 2) Hughes corner - there is currently 6-8 feet of pavement under the sand and not striped correctly. The existing road surface to the existing guardrail is adequate for traffic traveling 25mph. Between sites 2 & 3 you have an area of No shoulder, a 25' drop off with inadequate signage and delineation. 3) Ochko corner - speed is the only adverse condition on this corner and softening the corner will only enhance the speed. 4) Again enhancing this corner (our driveway) will only increase speeds and every accident on this corner has been from excessive speed, without exception! Plus it will have a slingshot effect. The guardrail going down from and out of our driveway, there's some curb appeal for us. Do you know what we get from someone's insurance? Nothing, it's considered wilderness and the burden lies on us to clean up and repair our property. How long until a guardrail is beat up and tangled and looks like crap much less sand and snow building up in front of it, putting the run off onto the road creating a hazard in and of itself. The guardrail above and going into our driveway, there's a mountain and a bar ditch, this makes no sense. On the south side of this corner which is our property as well is an active wetland and natural spring which has not been addressed. An area between 4 & 5 north bound with a 50-60' drop off has no shoulder and is delineated with a bicycle reflector. 5) The worst possible development of this concept is to remove the hillside corner because this is a physical barrier that makes drivers slow down before heading down a steep graded mountain. The amount of material to be removed would be tremendous.

5) In closing I feel the need to state that regardless if it's county, state or federal funds, it's all tax payer money and doing the bypass down 100 Road is not the most viable route for the money and



should not be applied to redevelopment on the Garfield County side rather it should go to maintenance and patrol of the current road regardless if it is 100 Road or Cattle Creek Road.

- ◆ We are writing to comment on the proposed Cottonwood Pass Design Concept that was presented at the public meeting #2 on March 22, 2023. Our concerns with this project have not changed since it was first presented. In fact, as the project has proceeded, I find myself focusing on the cost/benefit of this entire project. This project was initially presented as a means for creating a safe alternative for travel when the I-70 corridor through Glenwood Canyon is **closed in the summer**. Now it is “to improve safety at 14 specific locations along Cottonwood Pass to make the county roads safer and more functional as a vital travel connection between the local communities.” On the FAQ sheet that was handed out March 22 it is stated that “Maintaining the road during the winter isn’t planned at this time, although this is a potential long-term goal if funding can be secured”. **WHAT?** It seems that what started as a study to address impacts and costs associated with maintaining a safe corridor during canyon closures has morphed into the potential beginnings of a much larger project.

We live in between Garfield County Sites 3 and 4. Proposed grade, lane, and shoulder ‘improvements’ will lead to increased speeds. Neither of the Design Options identified mentioned installing adequate signage. We are concerned that the improvements proposed will create more unsafe conditions due to the speeds at which users will travel. The average speed on County Road 100 is already well over the posted speed limit. How much faster will people drive? While locals know the curves exist, the targeted canyon closure detourees will not—what is the plan for identifying the sharp curves and steep grades? It seems that it would be significantly less expensive to work on signage before realigning curves. It might be more cost-effective to increase sheriff patrols to address the speeding issue than to make the area more conducive to speeding. One of the more interesting pieces of the study was the number of vehicle trips in 2019—well before the Pandemic and its influx of new homeowners, canyon fire, and closures due to flooding. What are the current numbers and what is the projected increase in traffic without or with canyon closures? We question whether the cost and scope of all identified improvements is supported by data and forecasts of future canyon closures.

If we were to select one piece of this plan that identifies a location that needs improvement to handle the current volume of daily traffic, it would be improvements to Blue Hill in Eagle County (Site 5). This steep, narrow, and slippery-when-wet piece of road creates bottlenecks and unsafe driving conditions—even more when the canyon is closed due to flash flooding and the dirt road is also probably rain-soaked (we avoid using cottonwood pass when the road is wet).

As an overall comment, we still question whether County Road 100 is the most appropriate road for this projected route. The Highway 82 intersection is unsafe—cars and trucks speeding along the straight highway often fly through long after the light has turned red. While sight distance is certainly a criteria for safety, the intersection at CR 114 has been designed to accommodate traffic from CMC. It is difficult to understand how this has been identified as a less safe intersection than CR 100. The intersection would bring travelers to Highway 82 at a point that would take them easily into and through Glenwood Springs. There is a functional traffic light already there as well as turn



lanes in all 4 directions. How much of the disrupted traffic using this route is estimated to be driving up valley and how much traffic will be forced to drive the extra 18 miles to rejoin I-70 in Glenwood Springs?

We have stated our concerns to you in person, via phone, and in letters. Those concerns have not changed. Widening the road/easing the curves is only one, very expensive, solution to creating safer travel corridors. Appropriate signage installed NOW would be a wise and low cost step to take while CDOT and the counties are searching for the enormous sums of money that it would take to complete each part of the proposed improvements. Is there a document that identifies sites in order of priority?

- ◆ I am a 44-year resident of Garfield County and reside in Missouri Heights. My family and I drive Catherine Store Rd., Crystal Springs Rd., and Cattle Creek as the primary access routes to our home. We also use Cottonwood Pass on a somewhat regular basis to access the Eagle Valley. We have used Cottonwood Pass during the 44 years we have lived in Garfield County. We have seen the incremental changes on the Cottonwood Pass Road made by Eagle and Garfield Counties over the years. In general, those changes have been to the road surface as opposed to any significant roadway alignment modifications. The improvements to the road surface certainly have helped drivability when the road is wet. Historically, the clay content in the road driving surface made it extremely slippery and sometimes impassable when it was wet.

I first became aware of the current effort to investigate improvements to Cottonwood Pass through a newspaper article about the I-70 Detour Act proposed by Third Congressional District Representative Lauren Boebert dated March 30, 2022. That Act specifically referenced costly impacts associated with closures of I-70 through Glenwood Canyon and identified “at least 1 alternative that includes the possibility of improving Catherine Store Road, as proposed by Garfield County, Colorado” as well as “improving an existing road down Cottonwood Creek, as proposed by Eagle County stakeholders and the Colorado Department of Transportation;”. This Bill never gained support but had the effect of initiating this current effort at a state and local level. I am aware of the prior investigation of Cottonwood Pass as a potential route for I-70 years ago when alignments for the highway were being investigated. I have been involved as a stakeholder with this Cottonwood Pass Concept Design Project from the beginning and have participated in the various Zoom meetings and open houses.

As an observer and participant, I saw this project reduced in scope from a detour for I-70 traffic during closures in Glenwood Canyon to road improvements targeted at Roaring Fork Valley locals commuting to the Eagle Valley. This is an important point because there is a drastic difference between local traffic on Cottonwood Pass and huge I-70 traffic volumes from Glenwood Canyon closures.

Cottonwood Pass is a rural roadway intended for very low traffic volumes and is wholly inadequate for handling very high traffic volumes associated with I-70 closures. I support limited improvements to make the roadway safer for low-volume local traffic during non-winter months only. Any consideration of improving Cottonwood Pass to handle I 70 traffic volumes during Glenwood Canyon



closures should be rejected outright. Cottonwood Pass Road and connections to roads in Garfield County traverse rural low density agricultural/residential properties. The pastoral character of these areas would be completely altered and irreparably destroyed by improvements to Cottonwood Pass and connecting roadways to accommodate interstate traffic volumes. I believe my opinion is shared by the vast majority of property owners in the rural portions of Garfield and Eagle County that would be impacted significant changes to the rural roadways necessary to handle huge traffic volumes. I believe there would be strong opposition to any such proposal.

The Cottonwood Pass Concept Design is simply a “concept”. This process included general public scoping and a low-level input process to get input on basic roadway modifications. There was no substantial engineering completed on the roadway modifications proposed. No traffic studies were completed to address current/future traffic volumes on existing roadways or intersections. No funding has been secured to complete roadway improvements. Potential costs range from moderate to very large costs. Garfield County has indicated that they have other higher priorities for roadway improvements. Eagle County may have some limited funding for improvements, but the costly work associated with addressing “Blue Hill” is unlikely to be available well into the future if ever.

Garfield County identified County Road 100 a.k.a. Catherine Store Road as their preferred route for traffic and for roadway improvements. It is my understanding that this decision was based upon anecdotal input and staff/elected official’s observations. No comprehensive analysis of roadway limitations, design capacities, or other engineering/scoping analysis was completed to make these determinations.

Local drivers using county roadways and Cottonwood Pass are familiar with the routes and their intended destinations. For example, an individual coming from the Eagle Valley to Glenwood Springs over Cottonwood Pass will not choose to use Catherine Store Road because it does not make practical sense and it is a longer distance. That driver will take Cottonwood Pass to Cattle Creek and turn north on Highway 82.

Improvements to Cattle Creek were not considered as part of this project. Similarly, Crystal Springs Road in Garfield County was not evaluated for improvements. Individuals going to Carbondale over Cottonwood Pass are going to follow that route as the shortest distance. These issues were not studied in any depth nor supported by any traffic analysis. There are other significant deficiencies in the overall project methodology. These inadequacies result in incomplete or deficient project conclusions. For example, in the Q & A section the following was included. *“Q: How will drivers know which route they should take to travel Cottonwood Pass? What will be done to keep traffic off Cattle Creek Road? A: This project is considering modifications to the geometry of the intersection of Catherine Store Road and Cattle Creek Road (Garfield Co Site 7) to a T intersection with free-flow through movements between Cottonwood Pass and Catherine Store Road, rather than the current configuration that naturally directs southbound traffic onto Cattle Creek Road. Other improvements such as signage will be considered to direct traffic and distinguish the routes.”* I know first-hand that reconfiguring the intersection at Cattle Creek and Catherine Store Road will do little or nothing to steer traffic away from Cattle Creek if that is the most direct route to the driver’s destination. It does



not make sense to force traffic out of their way when there is a more direct route. Navigation software such as Google Maps will show a driver the most direct route to a destination.

It is understood that the scope of work for the project was limited by funding. It is also understood that political pressures came to bear on initiating this work because of the substantial impacts resulting from closures of I-70 through Glenwood Canyon. Perhaps, the most valuable information that comes out of this concept design are identification of common sense/practical improvements to county roads to better serve local traffic.

It is important to recognize that use of this “Concept Design” for addressing future traffic beyond local volumes is completely inappropriate. It would be far more effective to utilize future public monies to improve Glenwood Canyon by tackling debris flow, traffic safety and other hazards that close I-70 instead of pursuing expedient solutions on country roads through very rural portions of Garfield and Eagle Counties. Poorly considered solutions to the I-70 closures utilizing Cottonwood Pass are prohibitively expensive and will destroy the pastoral character and qualities of the lands that will be impacted. The Cottonwood Pass Concept Design ideas should **only** be used to improve roads for local traffic during nonwinter months. This project objective should be clearly stated at the beginning of the document and in all conclusions to ensure that the information is not used inappropriately in the future to create an I-70 detour for Glenwood Canyon closures. Thank you for considering my input.

(The above comment was noted as endorsed and adopted by the Keep Missouri Heights Rural organization.)

- ◆ As long-time residents of Missouri Heights, we have many concerns regarding the proposed improvements to the Cottonwood Pass Road in Garfield and Eagle Counties. Those concerns go beyond those of safety and access that are the focus of the Design Concept presented in recent public meetings. Although the available design documents touch on some of these issues, those documents are not satisfactory in their discussion of the following points:

What signage and other directional instructions would be incorporated into any improvements? This is discussed briefly in the presentation material but needs much more investigation. As you know, Missouri Heights has myriad public and private roads, long driveways and dead-end forest access points. Due to the rural nature of the area, road signs are regularly vandalized, knocked over or otherwise obscured. It is inevitable that increased traffic over Cottonwood Pass will spill over into residential areas, backcountry dirt roads and dangerous routes like the Red Canyon Road even if signage is abundant and explicit.

The environmental impacts of the proposed improvements and the subsequent increased traffic are glossed over in the presentation material. Cottonwood Pass and Missouri Heights have historically been highly rural and undeveloped areas that provide important wildlife habitat as well as clean air, dark skies, good quality water, and relatively little noise pollution. All of these and more are at risk from increased traffic over Cottonwood Pass. The environmental impacts of road improvements and increased traffic and their mitigation must be incorporated into any further investigation.



What would improvements require in terms of added public safety, highway patrol and emergency response resources? With the traffic increases that can be anticipated due to road improvements, it is inevitable that accidents and emergency incidents will increase. In addition, an improved road will require more ongoing maintenance and monitoring. Repair and replacement costs will increase as will the cost of adjacent improvements like wildlife crossings, emergency telephones (or extensions of cellphone service areas) and fencing.

The design concept notes that there are no plans at this time to open Cottonwood Pass to year-round traffic or to large commercial vehicles. However, if the improvements mean that travelers can access the Roaring Fork Valley more quickly than travelling by way of Glenwood Springs and Highway 82, traffic will inevitably increase beyond the levels currently projected. If the road improvements lead to Cottonwood Pass becoming a highly-traveled and popular alternative to Glenwood Canyon, there will be enormous pressure to make it more usable both in terms of capacity and availability. What guarantees can be put in place to assure that the current seasonality and vehicle capacity of Cottonwood Pass remain in place?

How will local residents be compensated for the loss of value to their property resulting from increased traffic? Many residents of Missouri Heights, including those whose property is adjacent to the proposed route, are long-time residents whose financial future is bound up in their property value. These property values will certainly be adversely impacted if what is now a lightly-traveled rural road becomes a seasonal thoroughfare.

We recognize that the many hazards and stoppages that have plagued Glenwood Canyon in recent years have caused hardship and even danger to many local residents and that improvements to the Cottonwood Pass Road are needed. We also recognize that we are early in this process and that there will be many opportunities to discuss and debate these and other topics in the future. In the meantime, we urge you to consider the above points so that we can be assured that the full range of impacts and costs are taken into account as planning proceeds.

- ◆ Improving the Cottonwood Pass road will lead to more vehicles using the pass along with higher speeds. The comment in the CDOT Q&A handout stating, “There are no expected changes in average traffic volume ... from what is experienced today, ...” is blatantly false and unimaginative. Given the current growth patterns in the Eagle Valley, Roaring Fork Valley and the State of Colorado how can it possibly be thought that improving a road, that is in high demand, will not result in increased volume, speed, hours of use and of course increased associated problems. The naive idea that this road, along with its impending improvements, is to be used primarily for local commuter traffic is also a miscalculation. CDOT’s and the county’s own traffic figures show that when the canyon is closed there is a 10x increase in traffic volumes. Any traffic restriction in Glenwood Canyon will result in increased volumes on Cottonwood Pass. With road improvements on Cottonwood Pass the increased use will only result in more of the same problems that I-70 Glenwood Canyon now suffers from i.e., numerous traffic accidents resulting in delays and road closures, speeding & aggressive driving leading to increased traffic accidents, reckless or careless driving by oversize vehicles, unsafe road conditions caused by weather, rocks, flooding & snowslides. Many of these issues deal with



lack of enforcement that is caused by staffing &/or the inability to actually conduct traffic enforcement in a confined travel corridor. Instead of primarily dealing with these issues in Glenwood Canyon the state & county governments will now be taxed with dealing with them on a narrow 2 lane dirt road - thus doubling the issues that are currently in play today.

Will there be a NEPA process prior to work commencing on Cottonwood Pass? If the counties take it upon themselves to start improvement work will they go through any kind of increased analysis & public scrutiny?

Will there be any kind of agreement between the counties to coordinate the improvement work? In other words what happens if one county elects to proceed with improvements while the other county doesn't want to?

How will traffic be diverted to Hwy 82 by the Catherine Store? I know if I want to travel to Glenwood Springs, or further west on I70, I'm going to use either Cattle Cr or the CMC access roads. What's to keep others from doing the same?

I would like to see more specific comments regarding wildlife impacts and the mitigation proposed. From what I saw at the public meeting only generalized comments are used when discussing wildlife and environmental issues. What specifically has the CPW said in their comments? Have they stated the increased traffic volumes and speed will only lead to increased wildlife/vehicle accidents along with death & injury to both humans and wildlife? If so what is proposed for actual mitigation?

Has CPW indicated that wildlife movement & migration will be disrupted and negatively impacted? It has been my experience (50+ yrs) when dealing with the above two issues they are only discussed & inadequately addressed after the impacts have occurred. In some cases it has taken decades or not addressed at all, see I70 & Hwy 82 as they run through the Eagle & Roaring Fork Valleys for prime examples.

Other negative wildlife impacts that are going to occur on an improved Cottonwood Pass road include disruptions to solitude, feeding, breeding, & birthing. How will these impacts be dealt with?

The massive retaining walls proposed for sections of the improved road will create significant barriers to wildlife. Proper mitigation needs to be addressed.

- ◆ Stop the madness. You are single handedly destroying our homes and our property value by cramming this down our throats. One of those pictures you practically have cars in the homeowners living room. Whoever is making these decisions needs to step back and take another look. Widen a few spots, make a few spots safer, get this route off of google and keep it off. Put the majority of the money into I-70 where it belongs. Keep thousands of cars off of this rural road, it is a county road that is 25 MPH and you are allowing cars to drive 50 to 60 MPH on it this road is not intended to be an interstate. There are children out in the rural roads and animals it is no longer safe and nobody seems to care.



- ◆ Thank you for considering these comments. I am not in favor of any improvements on Cottonwood Pass please consider the following:
 1. Manage the existing conditions: Although there are some safety considerations and concerns, all of these could be addressed by drivers simply slowing down for the conditions of the road. One of the best solutions to slowing down traffic might in fact be to let the road deteriorate some. Potholes slow people down. Posted signs at each end that the road is NOT maintained and there is not cell service throughout.
 2. Widening and straightening Cottonwood will create other safety concerns: Speeds will increase causing similar safety issues which are present now. Policing speeds will still be a problem. Why not address those concerns now instead of investing the money to “improve” a road that will still need to be policed. Changing a road in order to facilitate faster driving seems like a backward solution when the area is clearly one where slower driving is necessary.
 3. Keep Cottonwood winding and mountainous: There already exists a wide interstate built for the purpose of moving large amounts of traffic. Please do not start the process of widening and straightening Cottonwood pass but instead use the money to continue to improve and manage I70.
 4. This is a mountain community...not a city. Keep it that way. Keep the traffic on I70. The population that has chosen to live in Eagle and commute to Aspen needs to slow down their speeds if they choose Cottonwood, or stay on 70.
 5. This is a mountain community....there will be rock slides and closed roads due to weather.
 6. This is a mountain community...Sometimes emergency care cannot reach folks as fast as in a city.
 7. This is a mountain community with unimproved roads. Stay off remote roads if the risks of driving them are not acceptable. If the reason for beginning these improvements is to “pave the way” for routing I70 traffic through Cottonwood. Consider instead that I70 needs improvements through Glenwood Canyon. Instead of investing in an entirely new route, improve the one that already exists. Thank you for considering these thoughts.
- ◆ I like the rural character and less traveled path of Cottonwood Pass. I've traveled the road May-October for both pleasure and work commute for over 20 years. I don't encourage nor expect Cottonwood Pass to become a paved 2 lane high traffic roadway, and don't expect it to absorb the traffic load and brunt of future I-70 / Glenwood Canyon closures. I'm sensitive to rural experience for private landowners in that area. With the more recent traffic impacts from I-70 road closures since 2021, my prevailing observation and concern is with human driver behavior habits during detours. Have routinely seen incidents of inappropriate passing, exceeding speed appropriate for road surface and road width conditions, and a gross unwillingness to slow or moderate forward speed to observed oncoming traffic conditions. While improving road width and overall safety to keep vehicles on the road and in their lane is good -- improved road may result in higher speed and no improvement in driver judgment. I don't favor speed bumps or anything like that. I would be



interested to see if any segment of Cottonwood Pass would introduce signage to designate who has right of way and who shall yield to oncoming traffic. Ultimately, I remain skeptical in regards to human driver behavior, and therefore, where CDOT Garfield County / Eagle County funds are allocated, favor road designs that are of lower price tag.

- ◆ I live on lower Cattle Creek and witness semis (Amazon Prime to be specific) going past my house to access Cottonwood Pass. This is over the legal limit for length and how are you going to enforce that? The speed limit is 35-40 and people go past my driveway going 60mph at the least. How are you going to enforce that? Can speedbumps or dips be put in so we can safely exit our driveways without getting hit by a speeding vehicle? I have also seen 10 to 15 cars backed up at the bottom of Cattle Creek where there are 5 intersecting roads trying to access Hwy 82 and it is probably the most dangerous intersection in the valley. How is that going to be addressed? Even though the route shows improvements from Catherine Store, that is only for up valley travelers. All people down from there will use Cattle Creek so they don't have to drive to Catherine Store to access an improved road. I move to promote CMC road for people to use instead of Cattle Creek, as there is a stoplight there already in place. County road 113 is a rural road with joggers, walkers, baby strollers, bikers and dogs, not a route for semis and very fast drivers!
- ◆ My husband and I attended the meeting in Glenwood Springs. Thank you for hosting. As you can tell we live on CR 113 and are highly impacted each time the Interstate is closed. I would like to see warnings on the interstate as one approaches the canyon stating, please obey speed limit through this menacing canyon. Use cameras to photograph license plates and fines \$1,200. -\$1,400. will be issued to those executing caution. Hopefully this would assist in limiting some accidents that are caused by speeding. Widening the pass and making it safer will only cause drivers to go faster. During Interstate closure it should be patrolled and possibly pilot cars hired to lead. I would hope an environment study to assess the impact on wildlife would be incorporated into the monies spent. There's no stopping traffic from following their GPS and using CR 113 instead of Catherine Store Road. Therefore a traffic light must be installed at intersection of Hwy 82 and CR 113 and 110. That is total mayhem, not only when the Pass is heavily used but constantly. CR 113 was never built to be a major throughway. Like Cottonwood Pass it is a rural road and very few people foreign to this area of the country know how to navigate these roads. I've been known to be a flagger when pulling our RV out of the driveway onto CR 113 as the traffic moves too fast for our hidden driveway. Personally I think the money coming to this project should be concentrated to fixing the issues on I-70. Lastly, I want to acknowledge Garfield County Road and Bridge for taking great care of CR 113 and the surrounding roads. I'm very pleased with the maintenance they provide in keeping us moving. Best of wishes with this humongous task.
- ◆ Thank you all for your efforts on this project. We live off of lower Cattle Creek Road and use it frequently to get from our home to Glenwood and back. We use Cottonwood Pass to get to Gypsum and points east when traffic volumes, canyon closures, or weather affect Glenwood Canyon. Additionally, I am a firefighter with Carbondale & RFPD and respond to and from Station 85 on CR 100 as needed.



Cottonwood Pass needs to be improved: it is a lifeline for locals. During the Cottonwood Pass closures during the Grizzly Creek fire and the next year's mudslides, it would have been quicker for us to go to Costco in Salt Lake City than to take the Steamboat detour to get to Gypsum. My wife gets her prescriptions there and had to jump through some hoops to make alternate arrangements. More than once, having Cottonwood open has saved us from taking the detour when returning home from points East. Our regular life includes friends and events in Eagle county East of Glenwood Canyon. Like most people, we have to go to Denver sometimes, or have people from the Front Range come visit us. In recent years, we have begun attempting to schedule these visits in the shoulder seasons between snow closures of Glenwood Canyon and rockfall closures of Glenwood Canyon. It is a noticeable impact to our lives. Some of our visitors from the Front Range are city people who I wouldn't send over Cottonwood pass in its current condition.

Improving Cottonwood Pass is only helpful if measures can be taken to prevent it being used more by interstate traffic. I like the current effort to maintain the rural character of the route. Nobody who lives around here wants to induce more traffic onto Cottonwood Pass - it would be better to leave it as-is. Many of the problems with Glenwood Canyon are caused by drivers with no common sense. When there isn't a closure, we don't see many of these folks on Cottonwood Pass. When there is, the prevalence of bad drivers goes up, not just the traffic counts. The widening and softening curves will help with this. I frequently encounter people up there who don't seem to understand how wide their little sedan is. We have to try to keep this to a minimum as well as improve the road conditions to accommodate the unavoidable folks with challenges. Cattle Creek: It is imperative to try to keep non-local traffic off of Cattle Creek. Even those of us who live here drive too fast on it. I have personally responded to 3 rollovers including 2 fatalities on that road in the last 2 years. All locals. During the I-70 closures, I personally turned around several interstate semis who were headed up Cattle Creek. In each case the drivers were blindly following their GPS, which wanted to take them over Cottonwood. I think the realignment of the intersection at CR113/CR100 will help. I think the project will also need some fairly intense signage throughout regarding: no semis, no through traffic, local traffic only, etc. I do appreciate CDOT and the 2 counties working on this.

- ◆ Thank you for the open house in Glenwood last week, we appreciate it. From what I can tell the decision has been made to increase traffic over Cottonwood Pass. I would like to request that you consider putting in multiple electronic speed monitors that automatically send a ticket to offenders. My suggestion is for the ticket to be substantial, I would vote for \$500 plus. This high ticket will get the message out that we will not tolerate drivers going over the speed limit. The amount of road kill including people's pets, livestock and possible children will be greatly reduced if we monitor drivers speed. I would estimate many drivers will hit 60 MPH easy once they get to the top of the hill near the turn to the Strang ranch coming from Catherine's Store. I am very serious about this, the deer, elk, coyotes, bobcats, mountain lions etc... do not need more humans in a hurry using this road because we have now made it easier to drive. I feel very sad about the direction the planners are going. The ultimate goal appears to find an alternative to I-70 when it is shut down which I understand is more often these past few years. I moved to Carbondale in 1989. Do we know what percentage of the canyon shut downs are due to human error? Accidents - it seems like truck accidents are the biggest problem, drivers driving too fast, swerving in and out of traffic to get to



their destination 5 - 7 minutes earlier, not paying attention, dragging chains that cause fires. Increasing traffic control on I-70 would be a terrific way to minimize road closures. One way is to have two patrol cars drive side by side through the canyon at or 5 miles below the speed limit to control speed. A silly thing to have to do but it seems to be the only way to slow them down. This would be much less costly than the millions or will it hit billions to give the speed racers yet another road to shut down due to reckless driving. Thank-you for your consideration and response.