

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:

Participants:	Representing:
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

Participants:	Representing:
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
<u>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.</u>		
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.		
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.		



DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
CSS Overview - 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: 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 Traffic Forecasting - 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.		
 Attendees noted the following related to the forecasting discussion: 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. 		
Alternatives Analysis Updates - 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.		
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.		
 Attendees noted the following related to the alternatives discussion: 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
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.		
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.		
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.		
Option A discussion:		
o 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 site 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.		
o Fraser Ave/Clayton Ct. is a full movement TWSC		



intersection

DISCUSSION		ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
o o o Option	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 B discussion: Kurt noted that Option B is the same as Option A, however with the following exceptions:		
0	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.		
0	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.		
0	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.		
0	General questions/comments: 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:		
0	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		



Fraser Awe. and Clayton Ct to right-in/right-out intersections. General questions/comments: Sensor as a section 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 neceded 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. Has a right-in/right-out at Elsenhower been considered? Change in access needs to be 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. Traffic Summary - What Does It All Mean? - 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 6, Elsenhower 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. Onclusions - Grant provided concluding statements to summarize the study status. Discussions surrounding funding: 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 reagarding whether this project was on the Northwest TPR priority list. Following the meeting it was confirmed that this project is not the TPRs priority list. This study effort can be used to keep this project high on the priority list to help priorities are within Steamboat. Grant said there are a lot of priorities for projects on US 40, but not sure why this intersection with Court Road 72 or anything in Fraser is not a priority. CDOT does not direct the actions of the TPR committee. Grant noted this study will make peo	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
There is a need to enhance transit, but transit works better with a	Fraser Ave. and Clayton Ct to right-in/right-out intersections. General questions/comments: Sas 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. 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. Traffic Summary - What Does it All Mean? - 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 Conclusions - Grant provided concluding statements to summarize the study status. Discussions surrounding funding: 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 reagarding whether this project was on the Northwest TPR prioirty 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 particpates 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	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
It is still too early in the process to host an open house for the pubic	offs for designing the project, these will be the backbone of how the corridor get developed. There is a need to enhance transit, but transit works better with a robust network that permits effective transit operations.		



DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
Open to comments and questions:		
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?		
o Jeff replied that frontage road is practical near Safeway but is		
tougher to fit within the downtown core area.		
o Grant stated the benefit of the Town as a partner means		
alternative access can be explored off of US 40. o The idea was raised to extend Railroad Avenue to County Road		
o The idea was raised to extend Railroad Avenue to County Road 72.		
o 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?		
 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.		
o 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.		
o 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?		
 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.		
, · · · · · <u> </u>		



DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS TO	DUE
 Grant said he is in favor of an Open House and PLT needs to think about how to present this information to public in a digestible manner. Question was asked if a traffic signal was installed first at CR 5, would this alleviate a more immediate need for a traffic signal at Eisenhower because this would create eastbound gaps. Kurt replied this would not be practical because the near-term Byers Peak Ranch development will generate a higher demand at the Eisenhower intersection triggering the need for it to be upgraded to a traffic signal. Suggested from high-level approach is to implement signals in this order: 1) CR 72; 2) Eisenhower; 3) CR 5. Jeff asked if the next PLT meeting would include discussions about Fraser Valley Parkway and County Road 522. Yes, when the PLT next meets in April the discussion will include Fraser Valley Parkway and messaging to public at open house. Request was made to share traffic study results with County commissioners and ask for their input to help create plan for how to share study results with TPR committee. Kurt offered to assemble a brief executive summary of the traffic report that could be shared with board of commissioners. Kurt explained that 2045 and beyond need a larger look at the US 40 corridor as a whole. Widening US 40 to 4 lanes between Granby and Fraser will likely be necessary. A larger study would be need to evaluate this. Kurt also explained that in 2045 the Rendezvous road signal begins to start becoming the bottleneck and starts to fail. There would likely be additional congestion East on US 40 in 2045 that may meter traffic further and require additional information to determine. There was a comment made that skier trips are down this year in Vail while they are up this year in Winter Park. This could suggest skiers are more willing to go to travel to Fraser because of traffic on Vail Pass. 		
Next Steps Jacob discussed the next steps for the PLT group. Jacob will compile the information gathered from the PLT #2 meeting along with the downtown core options and send this updated package out to the PLT group for review and comment.	Jacob Rivera	2-14-2020
An executive summary will be prepared for the TPR committee members from Fraser to present to the committee.	Kurt Kolleth	2-7-2020

These meeting minutes constitute the entire content of the discussion and agreements reached. If there are errors, omissions, or inaccuracies in the minutes as documented above, please forward comments addressing the specifics to the author responsible for the preparation of the meeting minutes not later than 7 days from the date of issuance listed above. Failure to comment within the 7 day open comment period constitutes acceptance by each participant of the minutes as written.

Responsible for Minutes:		Date:	
	Jacob Rivera		2/11/2020
Revisions completed by:			





Meeting Attendance List

PROJECT NUMBER: WXXX8605

PROJECT NAME: US 40 Fraser

Meeting Subject: PLT Meeting #2

Date: February 2, 2020

Time: 12:00 pm to 3:00 pm

Name (please print)	Dept:	Email:
Grant Anderson	CDOT	Grant.anderson@state.co.us
Jacob Rivera	CDOT	Jacob.Rivera@state.co.us
Kurt Kolleth	Jacobs	Kurt.kolleth@jacobs.com
Jacqueline Dowds Bennett	Jacobs	Jacqueline.dowdsbennett@jacobs.com
Charles Wence	Jacobs	Charles.Wence@jacobs.com
Philip Vander No.	TOF	Philip @ OlCroative ion
Eleen Waldow	TOF	eileen waldow@ amail, com
Barry Yours	Stid 3	BINGUNGSY DO WAY Son
J DULASIN &	100	Jeugase town, traver co. U
TOOD HOLZWARTH	POST CRAND	FRE tolkleast grandlise. com
Savah Wisch	TOF	Swieck@ town. Fraser. co. 15
GO EN TRANSON	EWAPA	atrainere wagov.com
STEVE WALDORF	EGFPD	50 ALDORFO CAST GRADFIRE CON
BUSS CHAMEREN	TOF	ICHAMEROYO TOWN FRASERCAC
RUSSELL PENNINGTON	TOF	FRENNINGTONE TOWN. FrASER.CO.US.
Tim GAGNON	GRAND CONSTY	GAGNONE CORECIVIL. COM
EMMMLEE BLEWNER		PHONE - R3 TRAFFIC
MARK BUNNELL	COOT CON	(PHONE) R3 TRAFFIC
LESLIE MONRICK	ONUT CON	IPHONE) - R3 ENVIRO





Meeting Attendance List

PROJECT NUMBER: WXXX8605

PROJECT NAME: US 40 Fraser

Meeting Subject: PLT Meeting #2

Date: February 2, 2020

Time: 12:00 pm to 3:00 pm

Name (please print)	Dept:	Email:
Grant Anderson	CDOT	Grant.anderson@state.co.us
Jacob Rivera	CDOT	Jacob.Rivera@state.co.us
Kurt Kolleth	Jacobs	Kurt.kolleth@jacobs.com
Jacqueline Dowds Bennett	Jacobs	Jacqueline.dowdsbennett@jacobs.com
Charles Wence	Jacobs	Charles.Wence@jacobs.com
Philip Vander No.	TOF	Philip @ OlCroalive.
Eleen Waldow	TOF	eileen waldow @ gmail, cor
Barry Yours	5000	BINGUNGSY DO WAY,
J DUKASIN &	100	Jeuga se temptrace a
TOOD HOLZWARTH	POST CRAND	FRE toldhe east grandlise. com
Savah Wirt	TOF	Swiecka town faser co. 15
GY EN TRANSON	FWAPA	atrainere whoov.com
STEVE WALDORF	EGFPD	5DALDORFO EAST GADFIRE.
BUSS CHAMEREN	TOF	IZCHAMELOYO TOWN FRASELY
Kussell HENNINGTON	TOF	PENNINGTON C. YOWN. FrASER.CO.
Tim GAGNON	GRAND COUNTY	GAGNONE CORECIVIL COM
EMMYLEE BLEWNER	CDOTCON	PHONE) - R3 TRAFFIC
MARK BUNNELL	CDOT CON	(PHUNE) R3 TRAFFIC
LESLIE MONRICK	not lon	IPHONE - R3 ENVIRO
	The same was	

