



Region 3 Eagle Residency

US 40 Fraser
Meeting Minutes
Project Leadership Meeting #2

Project: NHPP 0403-062 / 22804

Meeting Held: February 3, 2020

PLT Member Attendance:

<i>Participants:</i>	<i>Representing:</i>
Martha Miller	CDOT R3 Program East Engineer
Grant Anderson	CDOT Mountain Resident Engineer
Jacob Rivera	CDOT Design Project Manager
Mark Bunnell	CDOT R3 Traffic (on phone)
Paula Durkin	CDOT R3 Environmental PM

<i>Participants:</i>	<i>Representing:</i>
Jeff Durbin	Town of Fraser Manager
Russell Pennington	Town of Fraser Public Works Director
Chris Baer	Grand County Road and Bridge Superintendent
Kate McIntire	Grand County Manager
Kurt Kolleth	Jacobs Engineering, Consultant PM

See attached Meeting Attendance List for additional attendees.

The following summarizes the meeting discussion (bullet items correspond to meeting agenda):

DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
<p>Project Overview - Jacob gave a general overview of the project including a description of two separate traffic and planning efforts that are happening concurrently between CDOT and the Town of Fraser. Both of the efforts are under contract with Jacobs Engineering.</p> <p>CDOT Feasibility Study: The CDOT Feasibility Study is intended to analyze the current capacity and bottleneck issue on US 40 between Eisenhower Drive and Rendezvous Road. This includes widening US 40 from 2 to 4 lanes and possible auxiliary lanes. Additionally, this may require re-alignment of the existing shared use path adjacent to the roadway. The feasibility study will also look at the CR 72 intersection to analyze if a roundabout or improved signal would function better at this location. Also, as part of the project, CDOT conducted a Safety and Operations analysis of the corridor to look for any deficiencies in design or operations with existing US 40.</p> <p>Town of Fraser Traffic Study (aka Scope B): The Town of Fraser has also separately contracted with Jacobs Engineering to take a larger look at the roadway network in the Town of Fraser and specifically examine opportunities for a continuous Fraser Valley Parkway between CR 5 and Rendezvous Road. A lot of recent and future planned developments within the Town has driven the need to take a larger look at overall operations of the existing and future network and define goals for preferred mobility, access, etc.</p>		



DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
<p><u>CSS Overview</u> - Jacob noted the study has entered into the fifth step of the Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process and that the study will not complete this step to fully Evaluate, Select and Refine Alternatives or Options simply because there is no funding to advance the project. CSS is a six step process that includes the following steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define Desired Outcomes and Actions 2. Endorse the Process 3. Establish Criteria 4. Develop Alternatives or Options 5. Evaluate, Select and Refine Alternatives or Options 6. Finalize Documentation and Evaluate the Process 		
<p><u>Traffic Forecasting</u> - Kurt discussed the traffic forecasting process. He highlighted the numerous sources consulted to develop traffic volume forecasts for 2022 and 2045. The forecasts suggest volumes will increase two-thirds by 2022 and quadruple by 2045.</p> <p>Attendees noted the following related to the forecasting discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grand Park development has not been discussed in several years, did not realize plans were still moving forward. • Starting to realize there is an incredible amount of development planned. • We do not want to lose sight of encouraging people to come to Fraser for car-free vacations: train, Bustang, The Lift are options, and we cannot asphalt our way out of the projected congestion. Kurt replied it is imperative to start looking at multi-modal options, it is not preferable to recommend the maximum roadway network. 		
<p><u>Alternatives Analysis Updates</u> - Kurt discussed the results of the traffic analyses for the roundabout and traffic signal alternatives. The roundabout option would not provide adequate capacity or operations at County Road 72. The projected volumes are too high for a roundabout that could be installed at this location. The delays are extensive, particularly for the County Road 72 drivers trying to enter or cross US 40.</p> <p>All agreed that roundabouts will be eliminated from further consideration for US 40 in Fraser. Kurt noted that the analysis process will move forward with traffic signals and the next steps will be to make refinements to optimize the operations for a well-balanced corridor. Once the improvements are identified for US 40, the team will move forward with assessing the Fraser Valley Parkway, which is Scope B.</p> <p>Attendees noted the following related to the alternatives discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Backups in summer extend from the County Road 72 traffic signal west to Tabernash - what are we going to do about that? Kurt replied that west of CR 5 is outside of the study limits, however the team is in the process of analyzing a 4-lane traffic model along US 40 that assumes two lanes per direction to the west of the County Road 5. Adding this additional capacity to the US 40 mainline will have regional implications for traffic flow and operations, however no formal traffic evaluations west of CR 5 are included in this study. • Are roundabout more expensive than an enhanced traffic signal? Kurt replied that the answer depends on the existing conditions at the intersection site. A roundabout could be cheaper if there are no right-of-way constraints and the terrain is level. Roundabouts do not have the same maintenance or electricity requirements as signals, which makes their ongoing costs less expensive. 		



DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a question about if we are sacrificing safety by going with a signal vs. a roundabout. Kurt explained that there are other safety measure we can implement at the signal to make them safer. Additionally, congestion caused by the roundabout option would likely cause additional accidents as people start to take risks to enter the traffic stream. Signals help create gaps in the traffic stream to help cars enter the mainline from the side streets. <p>Grant spoke about Access. Access Permits are their own unique process that are driven by development. The preference is to provide access from developments to an existing connection, but if they don't have access somewhere else, they can apply for an access permit to the highway. If development is projected to cause at least a 20% increase in traffic to the roadway network, the developer is required to mitigate their impacts. Access permits are typically reviewed one at a time as developer access requests are submitted. Other communities try to develop an access management plans that looks comprehensively at all development and access needs along the highway system collectively.</p> <p>Kurt presented three options for access revisions to the Fraser Downtown Core limits between Clayton Court and CR 5. These options were presented to the group to generate discussion and solicit input only. Kurt noted the options are high level and have not been designed in detail to understand exact geometry and right-of-way impacts. Kurt requested attendees provide their feedback on these options and any other ideas that they have so that we can integrate these into our process of defining opportunities to improve access conditions along the Fraser Downtown Core limits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option A discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CR 8 originally appeared to be a good candidate for an innovative Continuous Green-T Intersection type, however now knowing that the Town has plans to route a regional trail to cross at the CR 8/ US 40 intersection, it makes sense to proceed with a conventional traffic signal to better allow for this pedestrian crossing. Kurt pointed out that because the CR 8 southbound to eastbound left-turn movement is so high, it makes sense to place the US 40 pedestrian crossing on the west side of the intersection to avoid conflict with this heavy left-turn movement. Jeff noted that the new CR 8 bridge over the Fraser River has the trail on the east side of road so some thought will have to go into how to make this happen, possibly a midblock crossing on CR 8 to switch peds from east to west side. ○ Park Ave. full movement Two Way Stop Controlled (TWSC) intersection that was realigned to line up with Railroad Ave. on the opposite side of US 40 and to be at 90-degrees rather than skewed for improved sight distance. Everyone agreed that this is an improvement intersection condition, and this is a preferred condition. ○ Eastom Ave. is a full movement, however Kurt pointed out that because Doc Susie Ave has a connection to Clayton Ct. this access may be a candidate for a right-in-right-out. ○ Fraser Ave/Clayton Ct. is a full movement TWSC intersection 		



DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eisenhower Dr. is designated with a new traffic signal. Northbound approach will need two lanes and this will be a tight fit with adjacent the gas station. Eastbound US40 right-turn storage is limited by the existing buildings up against right-of-way. ○ Doc Susie Ave. access is closed, and The Lift transit stop is positioned in its place. ○ Byers Ave. is a full movement stop controlled intersection that forces Clayton Ct to be converted to a right-in-rt-out. ○ Clayton Ct. is a right-in-rt-out intersection ● Option B discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Kurt noted that Option B is the same as Option A, however with the following exceptions: ○ CR 8 intersection with US 40 is closed and reroute to make connection with CR 5 thereby consolidating US 40 access to one signalized intersection than two. ○ Jeff commented about same type of scenario but with CR 5 relocating to combine with CR 8 on the Pole Yard property. It would mean relocating the railroad crossing from CR 5 to CR 8. There was a lot of favor among the group for this idea. ○ It was noted that there is a lot of existing truck traffic on CR 5. The Saturday traffic counts Jacobs Engineering collected would have missed the trucks from the gravel pit up CR 5 since they are closed on weekends. The County offered to provide truck counts that are current within the past year. ○ Doc Susie Ave. is converted to a right-in-right-out. ○ Byers Ave. and Clayton Ct. is combined into one full movement TWSC intersection that directly lines up with each other. ○ General questions/comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A question came up whether these access configurations and 4-lane improvements would fit within right-of-way? Grant answered that we do not know and that we are not at that point yet; in concept we are confident at this planning level that the widening can be achieved but several factors will have to be balanced to reach the ultimate configuration. ○ A truck width restriction was created with the new SRTS project through the curve; vehicles with tillers cannot move through the area; any oversize load can't go through; currently try to use Doc Susie to move around this restriction, but this path does not work very well due to narrow roads and snow banks. ● Option C discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option C is the same as Option B, however with the following exceptions: ○ Adds a new north leg of Eisenhower Dr. to create a 4-legged signalized intersection. This concept suggests significant right-of-way impacts, however could place more focus on Clayton Ct. as more of a frontage road and converting the flanking US 40 intersections at 		



DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
<p>Fraser Ave. and Clayton Ct to right-in/right-out intersections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o General questions/comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Is gas station accessed maintained? Yes, in concept the intent is to maintain gas station access for all three options. Design will refine details, but a landscaping wall may be needed since gas station is a little higher elevation than the adjacent road and a right turn lane is added. A more detailed assessment will determine if tanker trucks can maneuver in and out. o Has a right-in/right-out at Eisenhower been considered? Change in access needs to be considered by evaluating trade-offs. For example, converting this access would add more trips to Railroad Avenue and this intersection. 		
<p><u>Traffic Summary - What Does it All Mean?</u> - Kurt summarized the operations analysis and results. The study will move forward with 4-lanes on US 40 and traffic signals at County Road 5, County Road 8, Eisenhower Drive, County Road 72, Old Victory, and Rendezvous Road. The improvements would ideally be built at the same time, but the signals could be built in phases</p>		
<p><u>Conclusions</u> - Grant provided concluding statements to summarize the study status.</p> <p>Discussions surrounding funding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently no funding identified for projects in Fraser because the sales tax did not pass. • Region 3 Traffic Engineer Mark Bunnell confirmed that the asset management funding previously identified for the CR 72 signal replacement was reallocated to another location. • There was discussion regarding whether this project was on the Northwest TPR priority list. Following the meeting it was confirmed that this project is on the TPR's priority list. This study effort can be used to keep this project high on the priority list to help attract funding. • One attendee noted he participates on the TPR committee and stated most of the priorities are within Steamboat. • Grant said there are a lot of priorities for projects on US 40, but not sure why this intersection with County Road 72 or anything in Fraser is not a priority. CDOT does not direct the actions of the TPR committees. Grant noted this study will make people more aware that big issues are coming soon, if not already present today. <p>Grant noted the critical success factors will be used to balance trade-offs for designing the project, these will be the backbone of how the corridor get developed.</p> <p>There is a need to enhance transit, but transit works better with a robust network that permits effective transit operations.</p> <p>It is still too early in the process to host an open house for the public because recommended alternative is not far enough in design to estimate potential impacts.</p>		



DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
<p>Open to comments and questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connected vehicles will be impactful in the future and will allow more vehicles to travel through the study area. • With the recent SRTS project, people are concerned about throwaway work. Grant noted there was an immediate safety improvement gained by implementing the SRTS project and that these safety measures will function well into the future to reduce potential for accidents. The goal is to compose the US 40 Fraser build concept to minimize or avoid throw-away costs wherever possible. • What about use of Frontage Roads to help relieve US 40? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff replied that frontage road is practical near Safeway but is tougher to fit within the downtown core area. ○ Grant stated the benefit of the Town as a partner means alternative access can be explored off of US 40. ○ The idea was raised to extend Railroad Avenue to County Road 72. ○ Connect Clayton Court to Safeway intersection. Kurt replied a Clayton connection to Wapiti Dr. to a two-way frontage road would provide a “US 40-free” option to get to Safeway from north side of town and reduce volumes on US 40; improves CR 72 and operations on US 40; improves internal town circulation. • Kurt asked about the driveways on north side of US 40 for liquor/flooring/townhomes. Do we consolidate all this access to Old Victory with a frontage road? From a traffic perspective this would work well, however we do know there are environmental considerations for such an alternative. Kurt asked town if this is desirable to pursue this option further? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff replied that the Town would have to work out property acquisitions with Safeway which wouldn't be easy with current Safeway realty group. A new bridge over river behind Holiday Inn would be necessary. Would these costs be worth it? Route is doable, but is cost merited? Kurt replied we could highlight some pros/cons of having or not having this frontage road and consider this concept at a high-level. • Grant explained that he hasn't heard any of the Northwest TPR committee members talk about upgrading US 40 to a 4-lane section between Fraser and Granby. Grant suggested the Town and County start talking about this at the TPR meetings, especially if people are already seeing backups to Tabernash at the County Road 72 signal. ▪ Jeff asked for suggestions for how to approach this TPR group. Grant suggested using this traffic study report. CDOT sits at the table and listens/can make comments but are not the party dominating process and making the priority list. ○ Question asked if it will be easier to sell a signal than a roundabout for County Road 72. Grant noted his takeaway from this meeting to his higher ups is how to get 5 signals on the list for funding. ○ Grant asked: do we make a final draft of this study and put on shelf and refer to as needed, or take it through to public? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff likes open house idea and providing some form of a summary to the public. He envisions an Inter-Governmental Agreement with Grand County and Town of Fraser to work together toward implementation. May be some value to Fraser/Grand County/CDOT to endorse plan and work collectively toward solutions. 		



