



Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/ SH 14 Relocation Study

Meeting Notes

Meeting: Policy Advisory Committee #1

Date: February 16, 2001

Location: 281 N College Ave
Fort Collins
Conference Room A

Attendees:

Karen Weitkumat, City of Fort Collins Council
Marc Engemoen (for Kathay Rennels, Larimer County Commissioner)
Tom Mason, City of Cheyenne MPO
Rick Gabel, CDOT-R4
Jay Gould WYDOT
Glenn Vaad, representing the Upper Front Range
Debbie Pilch, North Front Range MPO
Larry Lorentzen, Town of Wellington
Mark Jackson, City of Fort Collins Project Manager
R.A. Plummer, PBS&J
Barry Schulz, PBS&J
Carrie Cloud, PBS&J

Agenda:

- I. Welcome
- II. Study History and Parameters
- III. Study Structure and Committees
- IV. Study Process and Schedule
- V. Policy Advisory Committee Roles and Responsibilities
- VI. Truck Origin and Destination Study
- VII. Q&A

I. Welcome

A welcome was given by Mark Jackson, the project manager for the City of Fort Collins. Introductions were made by all in attendance.

II. Study History and Parameters

Mark Jackson discussed the history of the project. A white paper has been included in the handouts that details the project history. The project was initiated by Ballot Initiative 200 and includes three phases. The first phase looks at non-route based strategies to encourage through truck traffic to use the Interstate Highway System (I-25 and I-80). Through traffic is classified as trucks that access SH 14 from I-25 and use the SH 14 and US 287 route to get to I-80 in Laramie. The strategies will be developed and refined by working closely with the trucking industry, various stakeholders, and affected agencies. The second phase focuses on developing and analyzing alternate truck routes. As stated in Ballot Initiative 200, the alternate truck route must be located at least two miles north of the Fort Collins Growth Management Area. This requirement means that the southernmost alternate route that is eligible for evaluation in this study is County Road 58. Alternate truck routes will be developed through the alternative evaluation process with input from the various stakeholders. The third phase deals with developing a funding plan for study recommendations and evaluating next steps that need to be taken. Funding may include a combination of regional, state, Federal, and innovative sources.

III. Study Structure and Committees

R.A. Plummer (consultant project manager) presented the following teams and committees involved with the study:

- Consultant Team
 - PBS&J
 - Carter & Burgess
 - Poitra Visual Communications
 - Intermountain/Corporate Affairs
- Project Management Team
 - City of Fort Collins
 - Larimer County
 - Upper Front Range Regional Planning Commission
 - CDOT Region 4
- Policy Advisory Committee
 - Fort Collins City Council
 - Larimer County Commissioners
 - City of Cheyenne
 - CDOT Region 4
 - WYDOT
 - Weld County
 - Upper Front Range Regional Planning Commission
 - Town of Wellington
 - City of Laramie
 - North Front Range MPO
- Stakeholders Committee - Various representatives from affected agencies and the public



- Trucking Industry Workshops will be scheduled to determine non-route based strategies
 - Colorado Motor Carriers Association
 - Ports of Entry
 - Western Highway Institute
 - Law Enforcement
 - Private Trucking Firms
 - American Trucking Association
 - Railroad Industry Representatives
 - WYDOT
 - City of Cheyenne
 - City of Laramie
 - Local Agencies

- Other public/agency outreach will include:
 - Elected Official Presentations
 - City of Fort Collins Transportation Board
 - Larimer County Commissioners
 - City of Fort Collins City Council
 - Others

 - Special Group Presentations (HOA's)

 - Public Open Houses

- Other ways to stay informed include:
 - Project Web site (www.sh14truckingstudy.com)

 - Newspapers (Fort Collins Coloradoan and North Forty News)
 - Public Meeting Advertisements
 - Public Meeting Announcements and Informational Inserts

 - Contact Study Team
 - R.A. Plummer (Consultant Project Manager)
(800) 497-5529
 - Mark Jackson (City Project Manager)
(970) 416-2029

IV. Study Process and Schedule

Attendees were briefed on the project's historical background, structure, and anticipated schedule. R.A. Plummer, Consultant Team Project Manager for PBS&J, explained the study process discussing both the overall study process and the alternative evaluation process. These processes are highlighted in the attachments to those notes. The schedule for the study was also discussed, and is currently scheduled for completion in November 2001.

V. Policy Advisory Committee Roles and Responsibilities

A handout discussing the roles and responsibilities of Policy Advisory Committee members was distributed and discussed. Specific roles and responsibilities include:

- Provide insight into the planning process and elected officials concerns
- Help ensure that all ideas and concerns are being considered throughout the process
- Help disseminate study information to other board members

VI. Truck Origin and Destination Study

Paul Brown from Carter & Burgess discussed the preliminary results of a comprehensive Truck Origin & Destination Study performed in November and December 2000. R.A. Plummer explained the purpose of the study and how the results will be used. The purpose of this study was to clearly define through truck volumes that could be served by a non-route based strategy or alternate route. The results will serve as a means of evaluating the cost /benefit of various strategies and alternate routes. This data was collected through a license plate survey during daylight hours and vehicle descriptions during night. Vehicle classification counts were collected to supplement O&D data collected. The classification information was grouped into three categories; passenger vehicles such as cars and motorcycles, single unit vehicles such as two axle delivery vehicles, and multiple axle vehicles that consisted of any trucks with three or more axles. Two handouts were discussed, the first consisted of the origin and destination preliminary results along with a figure of the locations data was collected. The second packet included figures of average daily traffic (ADT) vehicle classification information averaged over five days (both weekdays and weekends) and line charts that showed average daily traffic by location and time. Preliminary analysis of the data shows approximately 20-25 percent of northwest bound truck trips and 25-30 percent of southeast bound truck trips are through trips. This equates to approximately 550 to 625 existing external to external daily truck trips that could possibly be diverted from the existing route. Committee members were also briefed on results of this effort compared to previous City, State, and citizen-led Origin & Destination efforts.

VII. Q&A

The Committee discussed several issues, including:

- The necessity of thorough Cost Effectiveness analysis
- Who pays for this new facility?
- Colorado v. Wyoming truck issues and insights
- Impacts to CDOT's investment to current facilities
- Decision making process for this study
- Analysis of Larimer County-specific truck issues and concerns
- Weather and its impact on truckers' route selection

The group decided that all meetings should be held on Friday afternoons, preferably the 2nd or 3rd week of the month. **The next Policy Advisory Committee meeting will be held on Friday, April 20th, 2001, in Conference Room A at 281 N College Ave, unless there are numerous conflicts.**

Thursday nights have been chosen to hold the Stakeholder Committee Meetings. The next Stakeholder Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, March 15th at 6:00 p.m. at the Streets Building, 625 9th Street, in Fort Collins. The first Trucking Industry Workshop will be held on Tuesday, March 6th, from 9-12, at the CMCA offices located at 4060 Elati Street in Denver.

Distribution: Policy Advisory Committee Members

Attachments

Please contact R.A. Plummer with PBS&J if there are any changes or questions with these meeting notes. These notes will be considered final, unless comments are received within seven days of distribution. Although comments will be incorporated, as appropriate, only major meeting-note revisions will be redistributed.



Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/ SH 14 Relocation Study

Meeting Notes

Meeting: Policy Advisory Committee #2

Date: April 20, 2001

Location: 281 N College Ave
Fort Collins
Conference Room A

Attendees:

Karen Weitkumat, City of Fort Collins Council
Chris Horn, FHWA
Larry Lorentzen, Town of Wellington
Jay Gould WYDOT
Tom Mason, City of Cheyenne MPO
Mark Sawyer, City of Laramie Planning
Rick Gabel, CDOT-R4
Mark Jackson, City of Fort Collins Project Manager
R.A. Plummer, PBS&J
Carrie Cloud, PBS&J

Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Truck Origin and Destination Wrap Up
- IV. Problem Statement Development
- V. Evaluation Criteria Discussion
- VI. Non-Route Based Strategy List
- VII. Alternate Route Development
- VIII. Other Business

I. General Business

An update was provided on the progress of the study including the Trucking Industry Issues Workshop held in March. This workshop was attended by many interested agencies within the trucking industry including Colorado Motor Carriers Association, Colorado State Patrol, Federal Highways Association, Colorado and Wyoming Departments of Transportation, Wyoming Ports of Entry and State Patrol, Colorado Department of Revenue, and different trucking companies. Existing conditions were discussed along with proposed improvements. A thorough discussion of the Triangle Project and non-route based strategies were also discussed, and lists of these strategies were revised for presentation at the different committees.

II. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to wrap up the truck origin and destination study, finalize the problem statement, evaluation criteria, and non-route based strategy list, and begin discussion about possible alternate routes.

III. Truck Origin and Destination Study Wrap Up

R.A. gave a wrap up of the truck origin and destination study. The purpose and use of the origin and destination study was to define the through truck trips through the study area and to give a basis for the benefit/cost analysis. The survey was conducted by a combination of data collection efforts that included a truck location survey and classification counts. The capture rate of the survey was 80-98 percent, and seasonal factors were incorporated into the weekday classification counts represent the highest and most conservative average traffic numbers. The results of the origin and destination study found that northwest bound truck traffic includes 20-25 percent through trips, southeast bound truck traffic includes 25-30 percent through trips, and the total through trips are 550-625 trips per day between the data collection points of SH 14 and I-25 to north of US 287 and Owl Canyon Rd (the forks at Livermore).

IV. Problem Statement Development

The most recent version of the problem statement was distributed to the group. No significant changes have been made since the addition of both an introductory and outcome statement that was suggested in previous Project Management Team and Stakeholder Committee meetings. No additional changes to the problem statement were recommended by the committee.

V. Evaluation Criteria Discussion

The evaluation criteria for both non-route based strategies and alternate routes was distributed. This list included each evaluation criteria, its measure of effectiveness, and a breakdown of both unrealistic and comparative alternative screening criteria. A comment was made to add economic criteria to the list, that it might fit in somewhere such as cost or route utilization, but it needs to be factored in to the alternate route criterion list. Another comment was made to change the wording of an *acceptable* overall benefit/cost ratio in the third cost measure of effectiveness for both non-route and alternate route criteria. Acceptable is more of a value judgment, and the actual benefit/cost ratio should be used. The concerns regarding the evaluation criteria were addressed and are included in the revised list of evaluation criteria that is attached to these notes.

VI. Non-Route Based Strategy List

The non-route based strategy list developed in the trucking workshop and revised in both the Project Management Team and Stakeholder Committee was distributed. The main concerns added from previous meetings to the original list were that capital costs needed to be addressed, construction costs need to be defined, other water resources should be included along with historic landmarks, and the inclusion of directly affected properties. Comments were made that some of the strategies would both discourage and encourage the use of the Interstate route, such as the addition of VMS signs to advise of weather conditions. These signs would also alert drivers if there were bad weather on I-80, directing them through town along the 287 route. Pre-pass in Laramie would also encourage the use of the existing route.

VII. Alternate Route Development

Alternate route design criteria was distributed to the group. These criteria are based on CDOT standard design criteria. The classification of any new route will be an expressway and any improvement of existing routes will be classified as regional highways. All additional design criteria such as access location and speed are based on the classification of the roadway. Access locations would be permitted at half-mile increments on either an expressway or regional highway. Design speed is the maximum safe speed that can be maintained under ideal conditions for a given section of highway. A desired design speed is typically set to determine particular design criteria for highway geometry. The design speed is ideally 10 mph greater than the intended posted speed limit

as a margin of safety. For level or flat areas (3 percent grade or a 3 feet vertical increase for every 100 feet horizontal) the design speed will be 70 mph, for rolling or slight inclines (4-5 percent) 60 mph, and for mountainous (6-7 percent) 50 mph. Additional criteria discussed was vertical clearances and minimum right-of-way requirements that include lane widths of 12 feet, shoulder widths of 8-10 feet, median widths of 30 feet, and a clear zone of 20-30 feet. Clear zone is defined as the area between the edge of the traveled way to a potential obstruction such as a mailbox. No revisions were made to the design criteria. Criteria will be finalized as alternate routes are further detailed.

A draft alternate route map was distributed to the group. RA explained the development of the alternate routes. In the development of these routes, the first thing that was considered were constraints in the area. Major constraints include: mountains on the west side of the study area, interchange connections to I-25 on the east side, and bodies of water and development in the middle of the study area. Possible connections to the 287 route through the mountain constraint include on the existing county roads (CR 80, CR72), in the notch created by the Lien plant (CR 76 alternative), Horsethief Pass (CR 70 A alternative), the mountain pass north of the strip mine (CR 62/64 alternative), and the existing connection through the strip mine (CR 58 1 & 2 alternative). The existing interchanges and possible interchange locations were then matched up with the possible connections through to 287 avoiding major water bodies and development. Schematic routes were developed from these connections. Some existing roads were utilized for the routes (solid lines) as well as areas where no roads were present (dashed lines). Route designations are grouped by corridors and are separated by color: CR 58, CR 62/64, CR 70/72, CR 76, and CR 80/82. Each corridor has a number of different routes designated by origin point (number 1 thru 4) and exit point (letter A or B).

There was a question as to whether the CR 58 alternative 1 is outside of the study boundaries. The growth management area does move to the south once Douglas County Road ends, but further analysis is needed to see if this is a viable route. Another question was where the location of the Pinion ridge natural area was located, and if alternate routes would affect it. A map of zoning and natural areas is in the process of being produced, along with other information on the area. A concern was also expressed that a map of the entire area from Fort Collins to Wyoming should be presented for an overview of the entire area. There was also an issue with the discontinuity of the existing SH 14, and whether it made sense to move it any farther north. A request was also made for copies of the map to be made in black and white.

Additional routes suggested to be added are along CR 66, 68, and 78. The suggestions regarding additional alternate routes were addressed and are included in the revised alternate route map that is attached to these notes.

VIII. Other Business

This study has been involved in many outreach presentations such as the North College Business Association, Fort Collins Chamber of Commerce, Larimer County Commissioners, Transportation Board, Fort Collins City Council, and the Trucking Industry Issues Workshop with much more planned. If anyone is interested in having a presentation for their groups please let the project team know. The next step in the process will be to eliminate unrealistic non-route based strategies and to further evaluate alternate routes. **The next Policy Advisory Committee meeting will be held on Friday, June 29th, 2001, in Conference Room A at 281 N College Ave, unless there are numerous conflicts.**

The next Stakeholder Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, May 17th at 6:00 p.m. at the Streets Building, 625 9th Street, in Fort Collins. The second Trucking Industry Workshop will be held on Thursday, May 10th, from 9-12, at the CMCA offices located at 4060 Elati Street in Denver.

Distribution: Policy Advisory Committee Members

Attachments

Please contact R.A. Plummer with PBS&J if there are any changes or questions with these meeting notes. These notes will be considered final, unless comments are received within seven days of distribution. Although comments will be incorporated, as appropriate, only major meeting-note revisions will be redistributed.



Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/ SH 14 Relocation Study

Meeting Notes

Meeting: Policy Advisory Committee #3

Date: July 20, 2001

Location: 281 N College Ave
Fort Collins
Conference Room A

Attendees:

Karen Weitkumat, City of Fort Collins Council
Jay Gould, WYDOT
Tom Mason, City of Cheyenne MPO
Rick Gabel, CDOT-R4
Debbie Pilch, North Front Range MPO
Glenn Vaad, Upper Front Range
Mark Jackson, City of Fort Collins Project Manager
R.A. Plummer, PBS&J
Carrie Wallis, PBS&J
Chris Primus, Carter & Burgess

Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Evaluation Criteria Finalization - Non-Route Based Strategies
- IV. Non-Route Based Strategy Evaluation and Recommendation
- V. Evaluation Criteria Finalization – Alternate Routes
- VI. Comparative Evaluation Information for Routes
- VII. Other Business

I. General Business

An update was provided on the progress of the study including the Stakeholder Committee meeting held the night before. As the routes are narrowed down, more citizens become interested in the study because of the fear of a route coming close to their home. Many citizens, mainly from the Waverly area, attended the Stakeholder meeting wanting more information on the project. They were taken into a separate room and given answers to their questions, while the Stakeholder committee continued. Additional members from this group of citizens were chosen to be on the committee, since they did not feel that their issues were being addressed.

A copy of the Origin and Destination report was distributed to the group. This report is similar to the report distributed earlier in the study, with some slight modifications and revisions.

A copy of the project schedule was then distributed to the group, along with a list of the non-route based strategies and alternate routes that have been removed through the screening of unrealistic strategies and alternatives. Both the alternate route and non-route based strategies handout describe each of the strategies/alternate routes, along with a discussion of why certain strategies/routes were removed.

R.A. then reviewed which of the non-route based strategies were removed from the list during the unrealistic alternative screening process. The following strategies have been removed from further consideration as seen on the attached handout:

Regulatory enforcement strategies

- Inspections on US 287
- Mobile weigh stations
- Profiling
- Scenic-by-Way
- Speed limits

Physical strategies

- Bypass in Cheyenne
- Pre-pass in Laramie
- Port of Entry relocation
- Traffic control devices

R.A. also reviewed the alternate routes that have been removed from the list during the unrealistic alternative screening process. The following alternatives have been removed from further consideration as seen on the handout attached to these notes:

- CR 82 Alternatives A & B
- CR 80 Alternatives A & B
- CR 78 Alternatives A & B
- CR 76 Alternative B
- CR 70 Alternative A
- CR 68 Alternative
- CR 66/68 Alternative
- CR 64 Alternative
- CR 58 Alternatives C & D

The group also received a copy of the alternate route map. Routes that have been eliminated from further discussion are shown in gray. Complete descriptions of each route are shown on the backside of the map. In addition to the map, attendees were given a list of alternate route lengths.

There were additional concerns from the Stakeholder Committee that were resolved by the Project Management Team. The stakeholders group had expressed concern that the Horsethief Pass route was eliminated from further consideration. The Project Management Team agreed that there was a justifiable reason for the dismissal of the Horsethief Pass route. If this alternative were to be re-evaluated then all of the other alternatives would need to be re-evaluated. The Horsethief pass alternative was not brought back for further consideration. There was also a question as to whether the CR 58 alternative A is within the 2-mile buffer of the growth management area (GMA) for Fort Collins. The city attorney determined that CR 58A is still eligible for consideration as an alternate route within the bounds of the initiative.

II. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to finalize the evaluation criteria for non-route based strategies and alternate routes, review strategy issues and recommendations, and begin to discuss comparative evaluation information for routes.

III. Evaluation Criteria Finalization - Non-Route Based Strategies

The list of evaluation criteria was distributed to the group. Evaluation criteria are separated by non-route based strategies and alternate routes. Each of the individual criterion was given a measure of effectiveness, phrased in question form, that was used to assess each of the routes and strategies. Criteria from each list were then divided based on whether they were for the unrealistic alternative screening or comparative screening. The first phase of screening is referred to as unrealistic alternative screening and is used to eliminate alternatives from the list that do not need to be evaluated on a comparative level. This phase of screening has been completed and is shown shaded in gray. Unrealistic criteria are measures that would make a route or strategy unfeasible/unrealistic and eliminate impractical alternatives. The second phase of screening is comparative screening which is used to do more of a route-to-route or strategy-to-strategy comparison to determine the most feasible option.

Criteria used to screen unrealistic non-route based strategies were legality, safety, and consistency. If any of the strategies violated legality, safety, or consistency issues, they were removed from further consideration. Comparative screening involved cost issues in starting and maintaining different strategies, and strategy utilization.

A copy of the evaluation criteria is attached to these notes.

IV. Non-Route Based Strategy Evaluation and Recommendation

The matrix of non-route based strategies was distributed to the group. This matrix details the comparative evaluation of each strategy broken down into four categories: financial, marketing/informational, regulatory enforcement, and physical. For each strategy the cost of implementation, operation/maintenance, first year cost per through truck removed, percent of through trucks removed, and number of through trucks removed is shown.

The number of through trucks removed is found by multiplying the estimated percentage of through trucks that would use the Interstate due to a particular strategy by the number of through trucks in town per day (600 from the Origin and Destination study). The first year cost per through truck removed is then found by dividing the sum of the estimated implementation and first year maintenance cost by the number of through trucks removed from the existing route per day.

Some comments on the non-route strategies included:

- Lowering the overall speed limit on US 287 – lowering the speed limit would require a speed study to be done. This study could have adverse affects causing CDOT to raise the speed limits in the area.
- What is the amount of trucks that are repeat business?
- Billboards - Outdoor advertising laws in Fort Collins may have strict regulations
- Possibility of installing a new variable message signs closer to the port of entry.(POE)
- Possibility of changing signage on the local streets in Ft. Collins, the City of Ft. Collins does not discourage truck traffic on any of its roads

The list of non-route based strategy recommendations was also distributed to the group. This preliminary list of recommendations includes:

Financial Strategies

- No strategies recommended.

Marketing/Informational Strategies

- Develop a marketing committee to develop messages highlighting the benefits for using the Interstate system over the existing route
- Prioritize the media used to communicate the message

Regulatory Enforcement Strategies

- Continue current practices regarding safety and weight inspections, ticketing for speed limit infractions, and enforcement of port-of-entry requirements
- Provide training to local law enforcement regarding compression brake law conformance in the City

- Evaluate potential for redesignation of existing route including restrictions if a reasonable alternate route is identified

Physical Strategies

- Establish an Incident Management Program to address traffic in and around Fort Collins during road closures
- Install variable message signs (VMS) as necessary to support potential marketing/informational strategies

The complete list of recommendations and non-route based strategy matrix is attached to these notes.

V. Evaluation Criteria Finalization – Alternate Routes

As stated previously, evaluation criteria have been broken down into two categories, non-route based strategies and alternate routes. Criteria used to screen unrealistic alternate routes were safety and length of route. If any of the routes violated established design criteria or added excessive miles to the existing route, they were removed from further consideration. Comparative screening involved cost issues, traffic operations, route utilization, environmental resources, right-of-way relocations, directly affected properties, community planning/land use, and length of route.

Some issues and concerns that were brought up at the stakeholders meeting were presented to the group. These included social costs, economic impacts to businesses along the proposed route, benefit/cost ratio of an alternate route, and the impacts of sprawl. This group felt that all of the evaluation criteria in question were being covered within other criteria, and that these criteria were going further into detail than this study needs to.

VI. Comparative Evaluation Information for Routes

The handout detailing the alternate route evaluation approach was then distributed to the group. The approach that is described details each evaluation criteria and the sources used to find the data that will be used to evaluate each criterion. Chris Primus discussed the 2020 traffic volumes obtained through the travel demand model runs. A handout of the slides used in the route utilization presentation is attached to these notes

Cost will be evaluated by capitol costs including right of way, and cost per traffic utilization. Traffic operations evaluation will use projected traffic volumes to predict the lane requirements. Route utilization will also utilize the projected traffic volumes, determining the total traffic along with the total traffic removed through town. Environmental resources evaluation will be based on the acres of potential affect and the number and type of resources potentially impacted. Right of way and relocations and directly affected properties will be determined by the acres of right of way needed and the numbers of business and residence within the right of way needed or along the route path. Community planning and land use will be evaluated on the consistency with regional planning efforts and consistency with zoning and land use. The length of route will be evaluated in comparison to the existing SH14 lane miles and the overall length of route.

Another stakeholder concern was brought to this group's attention. The way that the study is quantifying a business has come into question. Residents who own and operate farms in the study area fear that their business, farming, is being overlooked. The project team feels that with the zoning and other data sources, these farms will be taken into account in the evaluation process. This committee agreed with the project management team.

VII. Other Business

The next Stakeholder Committee meeting will be held on Thursday, Aug 16th at 6:00 p.m. at the Streets Building, 625 9th Street, in Fort Collins. The second Trucking Industry Workshop will be held on Thursday, Aug 16th also, from 9-12, at the CMCA offices located at 4060 Elati Street in Denver.

The public meetings are scheduled for:

*August 29th, 4:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Eyestone Elementary School
4000 Wilson Avenue, Wellington*

*August 30th, 4:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Streets Building
625 9th Street, Fort Collins*

The next Policy Advisory Committee meeting will be held on Friday, Sept 21, 2001, in the Community Room at 215 N Mason, unless there are numerous conflicts.

Distribution: Policy Advisory Committee Members, Stakeholder Committee Members

Attachments: schedule, alternate routes list, non-route based strategies list, alternate route map, evaluation criteria, non-route based strategies matrix, non-route based strategies recommendations, route utilization presentation, and alternate route evaluation approach

Please contact R.A. Plummer with PBS&J if there are any changes or questions with these meeting notes. These notes will be considered final, unless comments are received within seven days of distribution. Although comments will be incorporated, as appropriate, only major meeting-note revisions will be redistributed.



Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/ SH 14 Relocation Study

Meeting Notes

Meeting: Policy Advisory Committee #4

Date: October 26, 2001

Location: 300 Laporte Ave
Fort Collins
CIC Room

Attendees:

Karen Weitkunat, City of Fort Collins Council
Bill Bertschy, City of Fort Collins Council
Tom Mason, City of Cheyenne MPO
Larry Lorentzen, Wellington
Rick Gabel, CDOT-R4
Jay Gould, WYDOT
Glenn Vaad, Upper Front Range
Debbie Pilch, North Front Range MPO
Kathay Rennels, Larimer County Commissioners

Mark Jackson, City of Fort Collins
R.A. Plummer, PBS&J
Carrie Wallis, PBS&J
Helen Boggs, Stakeholder
Mike Doten, Stakeholder
Larry Stroud, Stakeholder
Len Roark, Stakeholder
Randy Hensley, City of Fort Collins
Kathy Dwyer, Stakeholder
Joe Gerdom, FCPD

Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Study Update
- IV. Funding Discussion
- V. Non-Route Based Strategy Recommendations
- VI. Comparative Evaluation of Alternate Routes
- VII. Alternate Route Recommendations
- VIII. Other Business

I. General Business

Introductions were made by all in attendance.

II. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to evaluate the funding options available for alternate routes, review the non-route based strategy recommendations, and introduce alternate route recommendations.

III. Study Update

An update was provided to the committee in regards to the large amount of outreach that has been carried out since the last meeting. The next round of open houses are scheduled for

*November 13th, 4:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Eyestone Elementary School
4000 Wilson Avenue, Wellington*

*November 14th, 4:30 – 7:30 p.m.
Streets Building
625 9th Street, Fort Collins*

IV. Funding Discussion

Carla Perez, a subconsultant for the study, presented the funding information for the project. A handout was distributed dealing with the funding process and the steps that would need to be taken to have a project funded.

A copy of the process is attached to these notes. The process is as follows:

1. Identification of a project and the need
2. Project Sponsorship
3. Project Inclusion in Transportation Plans
4. Plan Amendments
5. Project Prioritization by Regional Planning Commissions
6. Project Funding
7. Environmental Review
8. Inclusion in Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)
9. When Funds Are Not Available

A handout detailing the potential funding sources was distributed to the group. Funding sources discussed included Federal, State, County, City, and innovative sources.

Federal Sources

- Federal Highway Formula Funds
 - Interstate Maintenance
 - National Highway System
 - Bridge Program
 - STP Metro Funds
 - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Funds (CMAQ)
 - Transportation Enhancement Funds
- Federal Highway Funding Earmarks
- Border/Corridor Discretionary Funds

Summary Analysis

A significant portion of the funding sources listed above are already committed to projects in regional and statewide plans. Attaining funding in any of the above categories would require a reprioritization of projects and/or significantly coordinated federal lobbying efforts with Colorado Congressional members.

State Sources

- Other Regional Priorities Funding
- Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF)
- TABOR Surplus Funding at State Level
- State Infrastructure Bank
- Undesignated SB 97-1 Revenues

Summary Analysis

A significant portion of the funding sources listed above are already committed to projects in regional and statewide plans. Attaining funding in any of the above categories would require a reprioritization of projects. Due to the uncertainty of the state funding for transportation, competition with already programmed projects would be extremely difficult.

County Sources

- County Capital Improvement Programs
- County Road and Bridge Funding
- Highway User Trust Funds
- Rural Transportation Authority
- Dedicated Transportation Sales Tax at Local Level
- Intergovernmental Agreements

Summary Analysis

Funding availability at the County level is limited given already established priorities with the majority of county roadway funding dedicated to maintenance and system preservation. A new source of funding (tax) would most likely be required for any significant capital investment.

Local Sources

- Local Capital Improvement Programs
- Highway User Trust Funds
- Special Improvement Districts and Local Improvement Districts
- Dedicated Sales Tax
- Dedicated Property Tax

Summary Analysis

Most of the funding identified in the categories listed above is already committed to existing municipal priorities. SID/LID would require solid support for the proposed project in order to generate substantive financial benefit. Local sources often do not generate revenues at the level that would be necessary to fund a substantive portion of the study recommendation.

Innovative Sources

- Public/Private Partnership Initiatives

Summary Analysis

Private partners are most interested in projects that can apply some type of user pay system (tolls) to recover the initial capital investment.

Additional funding issues in regards to the selection of an alternate route were discussed, and are detailed in a handout that was distributed, and is attached to these notes. Some of the issues are as follows:

- Swapping lane mileage
- Rural Transportation Authority Proposal
- NFRT & AQPC and Upper Front Range boundaries
- Federal funding stability
- Shortfall in State Legislative budgets
- Funding shortfall in planning regions

Comments (not necessarily statements of fact)

- The cost of maintenance for turning the existing SH 14 over to the City or County should be considered in the cost estimates
- Currently no precedent in Colorado for a group funding a project outside it's boundaries
- The North Front Range planning area includes the Fort Collins, Greeley and Loveland planning areas extending north to CR 58, and the Upper Front Range extends from CR 58 north.

V. Non-Route Based Strategy Recommendations

A handout detailing the non-route based strategy recommendations was distributed to the group. These recommendations emerged out of input from the different committees and trucking industry workshops. The non-route based strategy recommendations were as follows:

- Develop a marketing committee to create messages
 - Prioritized media (developed through trucking industry workshops)

High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority
– Articles in publications	– CDOT website:	– Billboards
– Brochures	– Cotrip.org	– Kiosks at truck stops
– Map routes	– Highway advisory radio	– Paycheck mailers
– Private trucking company outreach	– Internet advertising	– Radio ads
	– Safety meeting reminders	– Video
	– Variable message signs	

- Conduct a study to address local and regional truck traffic including outreach with local businesses to reduce congestion in the downtown area
- Conduct an incident management study
- Conduct workshop with local law enforcement regarding compression brake law
- Assess potential for future redesignation of SH 14 if a reasonable new alternate route is constructed

A copy of the non-route based strategy recommendations is attached to these notes.

Comments (not necessarily statements of fact)

- How many road closures were on I-25, I-80 and US 287 last year?
- Proposition of an eight state traffic operations center (Wyoming involved, possibly CDOT maintenance)

VI. Comparative Evaluation of Alternate Routes

The Wellington Alternatives have been eliminated from further consideration based on typical section width constraints. The Project Management Team comprised of the City of Fort Collins, Larimer County, CDOT and the Upper Front Range Regional Planning Commission unanimously voted for the elimination of the Wellington routes.

Evaluation Methodology

Individual Criteria were designated least favorable, moderate, or most favorable, represented by an open circle, half circle, and full circle, respectively. Each value is compared to other values within the same category to determine the affectiveness of the route meeting the specific evaluation criteria. The legend describes the values used to determine whether a value is most favorable, moderate, or least favorable. For example, capital cost values greater than or equal to 90 million are considered least favorable, values between 63 and 90 million are considered moderate, and values less than or equal to 63 million are considered most favorable. Handouts for evaluation of cost, traffic operations, route utilization, right-of-way/relocations, environmental relocations, directly affected properties, community planning/land use, length of route, and the overall symbol matrix are attached to these notes.

Cost

A handout was distributed that detailed the cost evaluation. R.A. went over the cost evaluation. CR 76 A and CR 72 A were much greater than other routes so they were designated least favorable. CR 70/72 B, CR 70 B and CR 58 A were substantially less so they were all designated most favorable, while the remaining routes were designated moderate.

Traffic Operations

A handout was distributed that detailed the traffic operations evaluation for each of the routes. R.A. explained that any route with a change of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) greater than 15,000 was designated as least favorable while all other routes were designated as moderate. The clarification was made that VMT is a daily value for the entire area as a whole and traffic volumes are for 2020. Travel time was not evaluated because all the times are within 4.3 minutes.

Route Utilization

A handout was distributed that detailed the route utilization for each of the alternate routes. The weighted average of the traffic utilization numbers was used for CR 70/72 A, 70/72 B, CR 70 B, CR 58 A, and CR 58 B due to the large amounts of traffic on each of these routes near I-25. Through trucks on proposed route was not evaluated because the amount of through trucks is the same on each route. R.A. explained that routes with more than 9,000 vehicles per day were designated most favorable, while routes with less than 7,000 vehicles per day were designated as least favorable. All other routes were designated as moderate.

Environmental Resources

A handout was distributed that detailed the environmental resources evaluation. The modified LESA analysis was used to evaluate the farming resources. The Land Evaluation (LE) portion was based solely on soil type and ability to grow crops. The Site Assessment (SA) portion was based on farm size and distance to annexed boundary. A larger farm that is further from the nearest annexed boundary is given a higher score. The modified LESA score represents the combination of the LE and SA score. R.A.

explained that the routes with a modified LESA score greater than or equal to 130 were designated as least desirable while routes with a score less than 115 were designated as most desirable. All other routes were designated as moderate.

Federal and state protected species were evaluated based on acres of potential effect. All routes with more than 50 acres of potential effect were designated as least desirable while all routes with less than 25 acres were designated as most desirable. All other routes were designated as moderate. CNHP conservation areas were designated least desirable if they had greater than or equal to 15 acres of potential effect. Routes with no effect were designated most favorable and all other routes were designated as moderate.

Routes with more than three acres of potential effect to riparian areas were designated as least favorable while routes with no effect were designated as most favorable. All other routes were designated as moderate. Wetlands were evaluated based on the national wetlands inventory. All routes with greater than or equal to ten acres of potential effect were designated as least favorable while routes with less than three acres of potential effect were designated as most favorable. All other routes were designated moderate.

Noise analysis was conducted using a time-related stamina model that used average values for the FHWA criteria. All routes with ten or more affected residences were designated as least favorable, while all other routes were designated as moderate. No routes were designated as most favorable because none of the routes had zero affected residences. Noise impacts to businesses were not evaluated because all of the routes had no effect on businesses. The clarification was made that the noise analysis was based on 2001 numbers of households and businesses.

Air quality was evaluated using the additional CO on route. All routes with more than 0.30 tons per day additional were designated least favorable while all other routes were designated moderate. Diesel emissions were not evaluated because they are a direct representation of CO on route. CO on SH 14 after relocation was not evaluated because the focus of the evaluation is on the effects to the proposed routes, not to the existing route.

Alternate routes with ten or more ditch/canal crossings were designated as least favorable while all other routes were designated as moderate. Routes with 15 or more acres of potential effect on FEMA floodplains were designated as least favorable while routes with less than five acres of potential effect were designated as most favorable. All other routes were designated as moderate.

Historic resource site impacts were based on sites that are currently listed with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Routes with listed sites were designated as least favorable while all other routes were designated as moderate. Potentially significant site resource impacts were based on sites where significant resources have been found in the past. All routes with three or more potential impacts were designated as least favorable while all other routes were designated as moderate since additional historic resources could be found on each route in the future.

Right-of Way/Relocations

A handout was distributed that detailed the right-of-way/relocations evaluation. No additional ROW was assumed on the south edge of CR 58. Any route with 300 or more acres of additional ROW was designated as least favorable while any route with 200 or less additional acres of ROW was designated as most favorable. All other routes were designated as moderate. Residential, business, farming and ranching relocations were evaluated in one combined category. Any route with ten or more relocations was designated as least favorable while all of the other routes were designated as moderate. The most favorable designation would only apply to an alternate route with no relocations.

Directly Affected Properties

A handout was distributed detailing the evaluation of the directly affected properties. A directly affected property was assumed to be any property with current (2001) direct access to one of the proposed routes. Any route with 45 or more residences with direct access was designated as least favorable while any route with less than 20 residences with direct access was designated as most favorable. All other routes were designated as moderate. Any route with directly affected businesses was designated as moderate while all other routes were designated as most favorable.

Community Planning/Land Use

A handout was distributed detailing the evaluation of community planning and land use. Larimer County present and future road designations were used to determine compatibility with County and regional transportation planning. Roadway designations include highways, freeways, arterials, major and minor collectors, and local roads. There are many other road classifications. Any route with local roads or minor collectors was determined to be non-compatible, while combinations involving major collectors or portions of state highway were determined to be compatible with. None of the routes were found to be consistent with the roadway classifications. Non-compatible roadways were designated as least favorable while any route consisting of roadways considered compatible were designated as moderate. None of the routes were considered most favorable. Percent of total land use was not evaluated because all routes are similar in relation to existing land uses.

Length of Route

A handout was distributed detailing the evaluation of length of route. Length of proposed route, length of proposed route compared to existing route, length of proposed route, length of proposed route compared to shortest route, and proposed route lane miles were not evaluated because most provided information only, and the range of some values is close to the existing route. Additional state highway lane miles were used to evaluate length of route. Greater than ten additional lane miles was considered least favorable, and moderate was considered less than ten additional lane miles. None of the alternatives were most favorable due to the fact that all routes have additional highway lane miles.

Matrix Discussion

A handout showing the complete evaluation matrix and the criteria designations was distributed to the group. The question was asked as to whether the criteria would be weighted for the final determination of a route. R.A. responded that the separate criteria would not be weighted. The matrix is used as a tool for the decision making process.

VII. Alternate Route Recommendations

A handout detailing the alternate route recommendations was distributed to the group along with an alternate route map. These recommendations emerged out of input from the different committees and affected agencies. The alternate route considerations and recommendations were as follows:

Alternate Route Considerations

Alternate route considerations were discussed and are included in position statements from CDOT and Larimer County that were handed out. After the comparative evaluation of routes was completed, it was found that a more detailed analysis is needed to assess the potential impacts of the remaining alternate routes. This increased level of detail would be an environmental analysis based on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This level of analysis would be required based on the need for federal funding. Under a NEPA analysis, all reasonable alternatives must be considered including a no-action alternative and potential routes south of the CR 58 boundary. The current conflict between the language of the Ballot Initiative and the requirements of NEPA would need to be resolved within the City before the environmental analysis could begin. The question was asked as to whether or not if an alternate route was chosen and approved in the past if the next step would have been to go through the NEPA process. R.A. responded that NEPA would have been the next logical step, and that all alternatives would have to be re-evaluated, including a no action alternative.

An alternate route solution would require the full cooperation of CDOT, Larimer County, and Fort Collins. As stated in the letter received from CDOT:

- Fort Collins and Larimer County must agree on a preferred solution and its priority to move forward
- NEPA study must be conducted including all reasonable alternatives
- CDOT's policy regarding new and improved interchanges including desirable and minimum spacing
- Potential for additional centerline miles be considered including additional cost to either Larimer County or the City of Fort Collins to take on additional miles of the alternate route over the existing route

Larimer County must also be in full cooperation, and their position is as follows:

- Not appropriate to express a preference of any alternate routes
- Concern that not all potentially feasible routes have been considered because of the limitations of the ballot initiative
- At this time, do not support the relocation of SH 14

Joint submission of the project to Upper Front Range and North Front Range by Larimer County and Fort Collins would be a likely first step to move an alternate route forward. To solidify support for the pursuit of an alternate route, CDOT's Project Priority Planning Process should be used including establishing the project as a high priority in both Upper Front Range and North Front Range Transportation Planning Regions.

Alternate Route Recommendations

Although the initial goal of the study was to develop a single alternative, given the nature of the issues and need for further analysis as part of an environmental evaluation, selection of one alternative is not feasible. The following alternatives were removed from further consideration during the comparative screening process:

- County Road 76A is eliminated from further consideration based on the high cost and issues with access through the Colorado Lien plant
- County Road 72A is eliminated from further consideration based on the high cost and issues with access through the Colorado Lien plant
- County Road 72B is eliminated from further consideration based on its potential impacts in relation to other County Road 70/72 and County Road 70 alternatives including; cost, right-of-way, directly affected properties, and compatibility with planning and the proximity of new interchange to existing interchange
- County Road 70/72A is eliminated from further consideration based on its potential impacts in relation to other County Road 70/72 and County Road 70 alternatives including; cost and right-of-way and issues with access through the Colorado Lien plant

Based on the remaining routes after the comparative screening process and if a NEPA study convened, the following corridors should be considered among the full range of alternatives:

- County Road 70 and 70/72 corridor
- County Road 66 corridor
- County Road 58 corridor

A copy of the alternate route recommendations, alternate route map, and evaluation matrix are attached to these notes.

Comments (not necessarily statements of fact)

- What is the next step in this current process, who can resolve the conflict with the ballot language and NEPA?
- Full buy-in is needed from all affected jurisdictions before funding is secured
- Federal and State funding may not be possible with the current funding shortfalls
- Does a state highway require NEPA if no federal funding is acquired?
- The three year update was recently completed for the NFR

VIII. Other Business

WYDOT proposing to widen US 287 to 4 lanes to the Colorado border, funding bills being proposed including a specific bill for the US 287 section.

The next meeting will be set up via e-mail in the coming weeks for after December 18th.

A handout detailing the upcoming schedule was distributed to the group.

The public open houses are scheduled for November 13th and 14th as seen previously in these notes.

Distribution: Stakeholder Committee, Policy Advisory Committee, and Project Management Team

Attachments: Agenda, getting a project funded and built, potential funding sources (4), additional funding issues, non-route based strategy recommendations, alternate route recommendations, alternate route map, Wellington letter, CDOT letter, Larimer County letter, comparative evaluation matrix for routes, schedule update, and stakeholder notes.

Please contact R.A. Plummer with PBS&J if there are any changes or questions with these meeting notes. These notes will be considered final, unless comments are received within seven days of distribution. Although comments will be incorporated, as appropriate, only major meeting-note revisions will be redistributed.



Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/ SH 14 Relocation Study

Meeting Notes

Meeting: Policy Advisory Committee #5

Date: December 21, 2001

Location: 215 N Mason
Fort Collins
Community Room

Attendees:

Karen Weitkunat, City of Fort Collins Council
Bill Bertschy, City of Fort Collins Council
Rick Gabel, CDOT-R4
Jay Gould, WYDOT

Mark Jackson, City of Fort Collins
R.A. Plummer, PBS&J
Carrie Wallis, PBS&J
Kathy Dwyer, Stakeholder

Agenda:

- I. Study Update
- II. Non-Route Based Strategy Recommendations
- III. Alternate Route Recommendations
- IV. Funding Recommendations
- V. Other Business

I. Study Update

An update was provided to the committee in regards to the recent Fort Collins City Council meeting. On December 18, 2001, the Fort Collins City Council approved a resolution to accept the findings of the Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/SH 14 Relocation Study and also instructed City staff to pursue implementation of the non-route based strategies. The resolution also directs the City Manager to meet no less than yearly with County officials to try to identify the most feasible route of the remaining alternatives that could then be recommended to CDOT. A copy of this resolution is attached to these notes.

II. Non-Route Based Strategy Recommendations

A handout detailing the non-route based strategy recommendations was distributed to the group. These recommendations as shown on previous handouts include:

1. Marketing committee
2. Downtown truck operation study
3. Incident management study
4. Compression brake workshop
5. Potential future redesignation

Non-route based strategy recommendations added since the last meeting in October include:

6. Continued regulatory enforcement. Continuing enforcement of speed limits, random mobile weigh station inspections, and enforcement of the five-mile radius requirement for trucks to clear the Port of Entry (POE)
7. Measure of effectiveness. Establishing a mechanism to measure the effects that the non-route based strategies have on moving truck traffic to the Interstate

A copy of the revised non-route based strategy recommendations is attached to these notes.

III. Alternate Route Recommendations

A handout detailing the alternate route considerations/recommendations was distributed to the group along with an alternate route map. These considerations were as follows:

- After the comparative evaluation of routes was completed, it was found that a more detailed analysis is needed to assess the potential impacts of the remaining alternate routes
- This increased level of detail would be an environmental analysis based on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- Under a NEPA analysis, all reasonable alternatives must be considered including a no-action alternative and potential routes south of the CR 58 boundary
- The current conflict between the language of the Ballot Initiative and the requirements of NEPA would need to be resolved within the City before the environmental analysis could begin
- An alternate route solution would require the full cooperation of CDOT, Larimer County, and Fort Collins

Based on the remaining routes after the comparative screening process and if a NEPA study convened, the following corridors should be considered among the full range of alternatives:

- County Road 70 and 70/72 corridor
- County Road 66 corridor
- County Road 58 corridor

A copy of the alternate route recommendations and map are attached to these notes.

IV. Funding Recommendations

A handout detailing funding recommendations was distributed to the group. Funding sources discussed included Federal, State, County, City, and innovative sources.

V. Other Business

Questions and comments (not necessarily statements of fact) on the study included:

- Could the City and County agree on a NEPA study without the restriction of the ballot initiative, with the understanding that the best route could end up in either area?
- Major mobility issues in northern Larimer County
- Many rooftops going in the Wellington area with little planned transportation improvements
- Purpose and need statement necessary first step to move any kind of mobility project forward
- Flaw in the language of the study using "truck route"
- Wyoming Transportation Commission may earmark funds for widening of US 287 in Wyoming if the proposed ordinance to increase gas tax does not pass

Distribution: Stakeholder Committee, Policy Advisory Committee, and Project Management Team

Attachments: Resolution 2001-169, non-route based strategy recommendations, alternate route recommendations, alternate route map, funding recommendations, and November Stakeholder notes.

Please contact R.A. Plummer with PBS&J if there are any changes or questions with these meeting notes. These notes will be considered final, unless comments are received within seven days of distribution. Although comments will be incorporated, as appropriate, only major meeting-note revisions will be redistributed.