



## Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/ SH 14 Relocation Study

# Meeting Notes

Meeting: Project Management Team #1

Date: October 10, 2000

Location: City of Fort Collins  
281 North College  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room B

### Attendees:

Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins  
Frank Hempen – UFRRPC

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Barry Schulz – PBS&J  
Nate – City of Fort Collins

### Agenda:

- I. Welcome/Introductions
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Study Structure
  - A. Team Structure
  - B. Study Scope
  - C. Study Schedule
  - D. Assumed Study Limits
- IV. Committees, Roles, and Meetings
  - A. Project Management Team (PMT)
  - B. Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)
  - C. Stakeholders Committee
  - D. Elected Official Updates
    1. City Council
    2. Transportation Board
    3. Larimer County Commissioners
    4. Town of Wellington
    5. Growth Management Committee
    6. Others?

- V. Study Outreach
- VI. Owl Canyon Tour and Meeting
- VII. Other?

---

## **I. Welcome/Introductions**

Introductions were made with a short description of roles. Each member of the project management team was asked to discuss their concerns coming in to the project and what they want to get out of the project.

Mark Peterson - Larimer County Thoughts and Questions

- This study is being imposed on the County by the City.
- The County has no funding for any route based alternatives and does not want to bring on anymore maintenance.
- What about the issue of whose road would it be? (State versus County swaps)
- How do you balance the new recommendations with previous recommendations?

Pete Graham – CDOT

- A new route is not economically feasible
- CDOT has no money.
- What about the NEPA process?
- This is really a City issue.
- Need to have buy-in from the Trucking industry.

Frank Hempen – UFRRPC

- No preconceived notions
- Interested in impact on Weld County
- How does this impact regional transportation needs?

Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins

- Need to meet mandate of ballot initiative
- Want to have open, interactive process.
- Need CMCA at the table

## **II. Meeting Purpose**

The purpose of the meeting was to kick-off the project management team and develop an understanding of issues from the members.

## **III. Study Structure**

The structure of the study was discussed including the following topics

### ***A. Team Structure***

PBS&J is the lead firm for the study. Carter & Burgess will provide technical support in the areas of funding, truck origin and destination, GIS, and TransCAD modeling. Poitra Visual Communications will develop and maintain the project website, and Intermountain/RKH will provide media outreach. Resolve is on the team to provide conflict management if necessary.

### ***B. Study Scope***

The scope of the study was discussed including the limits of the study and the components of the analysis. Phase 1 of the study will include non-route based strategies to encourage truck traffic to use the existing interstate system. Phase 2 of the study will focus on route-based alternatives 2 miles north of the City of Fort Collins Urban Growth Boundary. Phase 3 will analyze funding mechanisms to address the implementation of the recommendations. A history paper (see attached) and powerpoint presentation were distributed to discuss project history and the ballot initiative.

### ***C. Study Schedule***

A schedule was handed out (see attached) and a series of meetings and agendas was also presented.

#### **D. Assumed Study Limits**

A graphic was handed out discussing the limits of the study (see attached).

### **IV. Committees, Roles, and Meetings**

#### **A. Project Management Team (PMT)**

The role of the committee was discussed. This group will meet on a 4 to 6 week basis and will have input into the information that will be presented to the PAC, stakeholders, elected officials, and public. The meetings will be held at the City offices on College at 1:30pm and Tuesday afternoons.

#### **B. Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)**

The discussion occurred as to the need of this committee. Both CDOT and Larimer County felt that they could possibly be the representatives from their respective interests and that these additional meetings could be a waste of time. Both Mark P. and Pete was agreed to explore any interest in a policy committee with the County and CDOT. A decision will be made at the next meeting.

#### **C. Stakeholders Committee**

The role of the stakeholders committee was discussed. The stakeholders committee will be a diverse group of public and special interests with potential; elected official involvement. The committee will help shape the process and make recommendations, but not run the process. An initial list of stakeholders will be discussed at the next meeting.

#### **D. Elected Official Updates**

Elected official updates were discussed to determine frequency and logistics. The decision on the PAC will drive the approach to elected official updates.

1. City Council – Information Packet Updates, Presentations, Meet on Tuesday evenings
2. Transportation Board – Meet 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of the month, Updates include short presentations
3. Larimer County Commissioners – Typical presentation would be best in worksessions. Typical times and dates are not set.
4. Town of Wellington – Need to contact the new town manager
5. Growth Management Committee – Bi-monthly updates
6. Others – When and who from CDOT? Karla's involvement?

### **V. Study Outreach**

Outreach has begun with a number of stakeholders including the Citizens for a True Bypass, Owl Canyon Road Coalition, and Colorado Motor Carriers Association. Outreach will continue with informal meetings and phone conversations.

### **VI. Owl Canyon Tour and Meeting**

A handout was passed out for the flyer that was distributed for the meeting. Pete, Mark P., Mark J., R.A, and Dave Millar from PBS&J will attend the tour and meeting on October 18<sup>th</sup>. An update will be provided at the next meeting.

### **VII. Other?**

Need to more clearly define the parameters and outcome of the study.

Distribution:

Attendees

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: Project Management Team #2

Date: November 7, 2000

Location: City of Fort Collins  
281 North College  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room B

### Attendees:

Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Barry Schulz – PBS&J  
Nate – City of Fort Collins

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Further Study Definition
  - A. Project Name
  - B. Limits of Study
  - C. No-Build Alternative?
  - D. Policy Committee – In or Out?
  - E. Format and Direction of Recommendations
- IV. Schedule and Meeting Agenda
- V. Truck Origin and Destination Study
- VI. Key Stakeholders Messages
- VII. Study Outreach
  - A. Owl Canyon Road Coalition Meeting
  - B. Colorado Motor Carriers Association
  - C. Citizens for a True Bypass
- VIII. Public/Agency Involvement
  - A. News Articles
  - B. Stakeholder Letter
  - C. Newspaper Inserts and Advertisements
  - D. Agency Meeting Letter

- E. Public Open House and Agency Meeting
  - IX. Other?
- 

## **I. General Business**

Discussion regarding Project Management Team meeting times and notes from the last meeting were discussed. PBS&J will distribute notebooks with the notes and handouts from this meeting and the last meeting.

Discussion regarding the involvement of Larimer County and CDOT and what expectations are desired. The intent from this study is to have the County and CDOT agree that the process was followed correctly and that within the parameters of the study, the recommendations make sense. A letter from each agency stating their position will be included in the final document expressing any concerns.

## **II. Meeting Purpose**

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss progress since the last meeting and on-going outreach and technical analysis.

## **III. Further Study Definition**

### ***A. Project Name***

The final name was under review with the legal department at the City of Fort Collins. Shortly after the meeting, the name was finalized. The project name is Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/SH 14 Relocation Study.

### ***B. Limits of Study***

Based on GIS and internal City discussions, the southernmost route that is eligible for evaluation is County Road 58.

### ***C. No-Build Alternative?***

Based on interpretation of the ballot initiative, a recommendation of a no-build alternative is not an option. A recommendation must be made two miles north of the Urban Growth Boundary.

### ***D. Policy Committee – In or Out?***

Everyone was in agreement that a Policy Committee does not make sense for this study. Certain individuals will be invited to be part of the Stakeholders Committee as necessary if they are interested.

### ***E. Format and Direction of Recommendations***

This issue was discussed at the first part of the meeting. Mark P. will determine when we can get on the County's agenda to discuss the study. Either sometime in December or the first part of January.

## **IV. Schedule and Meeting Agenda**

The meeting agenda and scheduled were reviewed. From now on, both the Gantt chart and meeting agenda spreadsheet will be presented and discussed.

## **V. Truck Origin and Destination Study**

Locations for vehicle classification tube counts and origin and destination stations were discussed. The County has traffic information available for many of the rural County roads that can be used to supplement information.

## **VI. Key Stakeholders Messages**

The stakeholders messaging information was distributed for review and will be discussed in more detail at the next PMT meeting.

## **VII. Study Outreach**

### ***A. Owl Canyon Road Coalition Meeting***

The Owl Canyon Road Coalition meeting was discussed. The meeting went pretty much as expected, but there was a need identified to determine a way to disseminate information to the County regarding certain road issues. The approach at this time will be to summarize this information and provide it to Mark P. for his use.

### ***B. Colorado Motor Carriers Association***

A meeting is scheduled with the CMCA to discuss their issues and the Truck Origin and Destination Study. They are still requesting a meeting with key decision makers at the City, but are willing to discuss Truck O & D methodology with us at this time.

### ***C. Citizens for a True Bypass***

Mark J. has continued discussions with the CFTB, and it was determined that a meeting should be setup to discuss their issues and thoughts in more detail.

## **VIII. Public/Agency Involvement**

### ***A. News Articles***

News articles regarding the Owl Canyon Road Meeting were distributed as well as an article that showed the problems in Fort Collins recently when both US 287 and I-25 were closed due to inclement weather.

### ***B. Stakeholder Letter***

A letter will be sent out in early December inviting certain individuals to attend the first Stakeholders Committee on December 19<sup>th</sup>. The time and location is yet to be determined.

### ***C. Newspaper Inserts and Advertisements***

One-page inserts and meeting advertisements will be placed in the North Forty News and Fort Collins Coloradoan to advertise the public meetings.

### ***D. Agency Meeting Letter***

An agency list will be developed and distributed to PMT members to determine invitees to the agency scoping meeting on December 13<sup>th</sup>. Mark J. will finalize the time and location.

### ***E. Public Open House and Agency Meeting***

The first round of public open houses is scheduled for the evenings of December 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>. One meeting will be held in Fort Collins and one will be held in Wellington. The agency scoping meeting is scheduled for December 13<sup>th</sup> and again, the time and location will be finalized.

## **IX. Other?**

The next PMT meeting is scheduled for December 12, 2000 at 1:30pm in Conference Room B at the City of Fort Collins building on North College Avenue. This is different than what was previously shown in the meeting agenda handout. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting.

Distribution: PMT members

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: Project Management Team #3

Date: December 12, 2000

Location: City of Fort Collins  
281 North College  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room B

### Attendees:

Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Catherine Hess – PBS&J  
Jared Moore – Carter Burgess

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Public Open Houses
- IV. Truck Origin and Destination Study
- V. Policy Advisory Committee
- VI. Other?

---

### **I. General Business**

Confirmation that PMT notebooks had been received by team members. Discussed public and agency meeting schedules and attendance.

### **II. Meeting Purpose**

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss progress since the last meeting, the public and agency meetings scheduled, truck origin and destination study, and the revised approach to the policy advisory committee.

### **III. Public Open Houses**

Copies of the presentation boards were handed out for review and discussion. The boards were reviewed and the general sentiment was that the implementation references gave too strong of a message in terms of building something and could be construed the wrong way by the public. PBS&J agreed to revise the boards.

#### **IV. Truck Origin and Destination Study**

Jared Moore explained the methodology regarding the truck origin and destination study and the preliminary results. The preliminary results show that the true through truck traffic is approximately 20 to 30 percent of the truck traffic using the existing SH 14 and US 287 corridor. There was some discussion regarding the discrepancy between these results and what has been presented in other studies. The next PMT will focus on the O&D results and include the vehicle classification data that was collected.

#### **V. Policy Advisory Committee**

Larimer County has requested a Policy Advisory Committee be formed as a better forum for discussing the policy related issues with this study. Invitations will be sent out by PBS&J and the City through staff representatives at various agencies to request membership on the committee. Pete mentioned that CDOT may not want to participate at this level. The goal is to have this committee meet in late January or early February.

#### **VI. Other?**

The next PMT meeting is scheduled for January 23, 2000 at 1:30pm in Conference Room B at the City of Fort Collins building on North College Avenue. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting.

Distribution: PMT members

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: Project Management Team #4

Date: January 30, 2001

Location: City of Fort Collins  
281 North College  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room B

### Attendees:

Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins  
Frank Hempen – Upper Front Range

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Paul Brown – Carter Burgess  
Tom Schilling - Intermountain  
Brian Rantala - Intermountain

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Truck Origin and Destination Study Results
- IV. Draft Problem Statement
- V. Draft Evaluation Criteria
- VI. Public/Agency Scoping Meeting Summaries
- VII. Other Business

---

### I. General Business

R.A. provided and update of the study including schedule issues and planned meetings over the next month. Future meeting agendas and the study schedule are attached. Frank provided Glenn Vaad's name to represent

the Upper Front Range on the Policy Advisory Committee. Frank also requested to be carbon copied on any communication with Glenn.

## **II. Meeting Purpose**

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss study progress to date, the results of the origin and destination study, and begin to assess a study problem statement and evaluation criteria.

## **III. Truck Origin and Destination Study Results**

Paul Brown discussed the preliminary results of a comprehensive Truck Origin & Destination Study performed in November and December 2000, 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. PMT members were also briefed on results of this effort compared to previous City, State, and citizen-led Origin & Destination efforts.

Several suggestions were made to support or validate the Origin and Destination survey including extending the assumed travel time for through trips from 45 minutes to 90 minutes, establishing a capture rate for the survey effort in relation to vehicle classification counts, and researching off-peak volumes and seasonal adjustments along the corridor. The increase from 45 to 90 minutes travel time through town had no significant impact in the results. Assessment of capture rates reflects between 80 and 98 percent capture along the corridor. Seasonal traffic adjustments ranged from 2 to 6 percent increase during the summer.

## **IV. Draft Problem Statement**

Specific issues related to developing a problem statement were discussed including the regional nature of the study, no predetermined conditions or decisions, truck industry needs in the region, business economic impacts, community interests, funding, and future NEPA documentation. The problem statement will be finalized at the next meeting.

## **V. Draft Evaluation Criteria**

Several evaluation criteria were brainstormed at the meeting including cost, right-of-way, traffic operations, community support, land-use, threatened and endangered species, historical resources, wetlands, cost/benefit, and climactic issues. These criteria will be discussed with the Stakeholders Committee and finalized at the next round of committee meetings.

## **VI. Public and Agency Scoping Meeting Summaries**

R.A. provided a summary of the public and agency scoping meetings. The public meetings were attended by approximately 75 people over both nights. The agency scoping meeting provided diverse insight into the study, and additional data resources.

## **VII. Other Business**

The next PMT meeting is scheduled for March 6, 2001 at 1:30pm in Conference Room B at the City of Fort Collins building on North College Avenue. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting. This meeting was rescheduled for March 13, 2001, at 1:30pm in Conference Room B at the City of Fort Collins building on North College Avenue to accommodate the Trucking Industry Workshop.

Distribution: PMT members

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: Project Management Team #5

Date: March 13, 2001

Location: City of Fort Collins  
281 North College  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room B

### Attendees:

Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Carrie Cloud – PBS&J

### Agenda:

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

---

### **I. General Business**

R.A. and Mark provided an update of the study including the recent Trucking Industry Issues Workshop. 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, go over the different issues addressed by the study, and revise and develop the problem statement, evaluation criteria, and non-route based strategy list.

## **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 to grow the numbers from winter to average traffic numbers. The results of the O&D found that northwest bound there were 20-25 percent through trips, southeast bound there were 25-30 percent through trips, and the total through trips were 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 problem statement developed from input from all interested committees in prior meetings was presented for comment. The additional changes that the project management team felt was needed included adding both an introductory statement and outcome statement. There was also a recommendation to address the usage of the word community, it was felt that the regional community should also be included. The revised statement developed at the project management team meeting was presented with the changes shown in italics:

*The overall mission of the Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/SH 14 Relocation Study is to address truck mobility issues within the parameters of Ballot Initiative 200. Truck mobility and traffic impacts have been an ongoing concern in the City of Fort Collins and northern Larimer County. To address these concerns, a fair and open process will be used that evaluates non-route based strategies and alternate routes. Non-route based strategies will include incentives to encourage through truck traffic, (i.e. trucks without a Fort Collins destination) to use the existing interstate system (I-25 and I-80). Alternate routes will be evaluated a minimum of two miles north of the City of Fort Collins Growth Management Area (GMA), which makes County Road 58 the southernmost available route.*

Both non-route based strategies and alternate routes will be developed to balance trucking industry needs with *regional* community (*Fort Collins and Northern Larimer County*) and environmental resource impacts. Educational opportunities will be provided to clearly define trucking industry issues and potential solutions. The analysis of solutions will be based on factual information and will include comprehensive stakeholder involvement. A thorough evaluation process will be used to develop safe solutions with the highest relative benefits that minimize impacts to environmental and additional resources and is a responsible use of taxpayer money.

*The result of the Northern Colorado Truck Mobility/SH 14 Relocation Study will be the recommendation of an alternate route within the study area (two miles north of the Fort Collins GMA), a list of non-route based strategies, funding sources for the recommendations, and a discussion of next steps.*

## **V. Evaluation Criteria Discussion**

The evaluation criteria that were brainstormed at the previous meetings were reviewed. It was decided that the general list of criteria should be split into two separate categories, one for non-route based strategies, and another for alternate routes. The main concerns 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 in the right-of-way criteria. The revised criteria were as follows:

## Non-Route Based Strategies

- ❑ Cost
  - Implementation
  - Ongoing
  - Cost/Benefit
- ❑ Strategy utilization
- ❑ Legality
  - Interstate commerce

## Alternate Route

- ❑ Safety
  - Design standards
- ❑ Cost
  - Capital (right-of-way, design, environmental studies, construction services)
  - Cost/Benefit
- ❑ Traffic operations/Route utilization
- ❑ Environmental resources
  - Prime farmland
  - Wildlife
  - Wetlands
  - Noise
  - Historic sites
  - Water resources
- ❑ Right-of-Way/Relocations
- ❑ Directly affected properties
- ❑ Community planning/Land use

## VI. Non-Route Based Strategy List

The non-route based strategies that were developed in the trucking workshop were discussed. The concerns with the list were to combine company incentives with the city tax increase, to add in information about CDOT's website, recognize that it might take more outreach to private trucking companies to receive information, to add in weight limit enforcement and other enforcement issues, to change the "Jake" brake" to compression brake, and to add in the use of the highway advisory radio (HAR). The revised list is as follows with changes in italics:

- ❑ Financial strategies
  - Tax credit for drivers
  - Shippers to pay for additional costs
  - *City tax increase to provide company incentives*
- ❑ Marketing/*Informational* strategies
  - Kiosks at truck stops
  - Radio ads
  - Safety meeting reminders
  - Paycheck mailers
  - Articles in publications
  - Variable message signs
  - *Additional outreach to private trucking companies*
  - *CDOT website-cotrip.org*
  - *Increased highway advisory radio (HAR)*
- ❑ Regulatory enforcement strategies
  - Inspections on US 287
  - Stricter speed limit enforcement
  - Enforce 5-mile radius from Port of Entry
  - City enforced *compression* brake law
  - Profiling
  - Mobile weigh stations

- Differential speed limits
- *Time of day restrictions, route restrictions*
- *Redesignate SH 14 (no longer truck route)*
- *Increase weight limits on Interstate*
- Physical strategies
  - Additional traffic control devices (signals and stop signs)
  - Wind socks
  - Variable message sign installation

## **VII. Other Business**

The next PMT meeting is scheduled for April 10, 2001 at 1:30pm in Conference Room B at the City of Fort Collins building on North College Avenue. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting. If there are any questions or comments on the revised materials from the Stakeholder meeting, please let us know and we will address your concerns.

Distribution: PMT members

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: Project Management Team #6

Date: April 11, 2001

Location: City of Fort Collins  
281 North College  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room B

### Attendees:

Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins  
Nate Allen – City of Fort Collins

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Carrie Cloud – PBS&J  
Frank Hempen – UFRRPC

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Final Problem Statement
- IV. Revised Evaluation Criteria
- V. Alternate Route Design Criteria
- VI. Alternate Route Development
- VII. Other Business

---

### **I. General Business**

An update of the study was provided.

### **II. Meeting Purpose**

The purpose of the meeting was review changes made by the Stakeholders committee to the problem statement and non-route based strategies, and to review alternate route design criteria and develop possible alternate routes.

### **III. Final Problem Statement**

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.

### **IV. Revised Evaluation Criteria**

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.

### **V. Alternate Route Design Criteria**

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. For level or flat areas (3 percent grade) the design speed will be 70 mph, for rolling (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. No revisions were made to the design criteria. Criteria will be finalized as alternate routes are further detailed.

### **VI. Alternate Route Development**

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.

## **VII. Other Business**

The next PMT meeting is scheduled for May 8, 2001 at 1:00 pm in Conference Room B at the City of Fort Collins building on North College Avenue. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting. If there are any questions or comments on the revised materials from the Stakeholder meeting, please let us know and we will address your concerns.

Distribution: PMT members

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: Project Management Team #7

Date: May 8, 2001

Location: City of Fort Collins  
281 North College  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room B

### Attendees:

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins

Frank Hempen – UFRRPC  
Carrie Cloud – PBS&J

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Evaluation Criteria Finalization
  - A. Non-Route Based Strategies
  - B. Alternate Routes
- IV. Unrealistic Screening of Strategies
- V. Unrealistic Screening of Routes
- VI. Alternate Route Development
- VII. Other Business

---

### **I. General Business**

An update of the study was provided, along with reminders for the Trucking Industry Issues Workshop scheduled for May 10<sup>th</sup> and Stakeholders Committee meeting on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

## II. Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to finalize the evaluation criteria for non-route based strategies and alternate routes and to begin the screening process of strategies and routes.

## III. Evaluation Criteria Finalization

The list of evaluation criteria was distributed to the group. Evaluation criteria was separated by non-route based strategies and alternate routes. Criteria gathered from many different sources was combined to form the list that was approved by the Project Management Team, Policy Advisory Committee, and Stakeholder Committee. The criteria is summarized below:

### Non-Route Based Strategies

- Safety
- Cost
  - Implementation/Capital
  - Ongoing/Maintenance
  - Benefit/Cost
- Strategy utilization
- Legality
  - Interstate commerce

### Alternate Routes

- Safety
  - Design standards
- Cost
  - Capital (includes right-of-way, design, environmental studies, construction services)
  - Benefit/Cost
  - Social
- Traffic operations
- Route utilization
- Environmental resources
  - Prime farmland
  - Wildlife
  - Wetlands
  - Noise
  - Historic sites
  - Water resources
- Right-of-Way/Relocations
- Directly affected properties
- Community planning/Land use
- Length of route

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. 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.

- A. Criteria used to screen unrealistic non-route based strategies were legality and safety. If any of the strategies violated legality or safety issues, they were removed from further consideration. Comparative screening will involve cost issues in starting and maintaining different strategies, and strategy utilization.
- B. 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 will involve cost issues, traffic operations, route utilization, environmental resources, right-of-way relocations, directly affected properties, community planning/land use, and length of route.

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

#### **IV. Unrealistic Screening of Strategies**

The non-route based strategy list was distributed to the group. Strategies that were eliminated from the list based on unrealistic screening were:

##### Regulatory Enforcement Strategies

- Profiling – Profiling was eliminated because of legality. A through truck cannot legally be singled out and treated any differently than any other trucks.
- Speed limits – Differential speed limits was eliminated because of safety. Lowering speed limits only for trucks on a primarily two-lane roadway would create safety hazards with smaller passenger vehicles trying to pass.
- Weight limits – Increasing weight limits on the Interstate was eliminated because it is not contributing to what the strategies are trying to accomplish.

##### Physical Strategies

- Scenic-by-Way – The idea of a scenic-by-way was eliminated from further consideration because there are no specific truck traffic regulations for this type of route.
- Traffic control devices – Added traffic signals were eliminated mainly because of safety reasons. Additional signals have to be warranted, not just put into place to stop the flow of truck traffic and make them find a different route.
- Pre-pass in Laramie – Pre-pass in Laramie was also eliminated because of the idea that a pre-pass at this location would encourage truck traffic on US 287 since the port in Laramie is located on the 287 portion of the highway.
- Bypass in Cheyenne – The idea of a bypass in Cheyenne was eliminated because it would not help to encourage the trucks to bypass Fort Collins, and also because there are not significant traffic issues in Cheyenne.

Financial and marketing/informational strategies remained on the list for further consideration. Strategies that were added to the list in the Trucking Workshop were billboards, video, weather stations, and an emergency bypass. Strategies removed from the list in this workshop include inspections on US 287, mobile weigh stations, and relocation of the port of entry.

#### **IV. Unrealistic Screening of Routes**

A map of preliminary alternate route alignments was distributed to the group. In addition to the map, a packet of route lengths and profiles were also handed out. The first page of the packet included distances of each route for three different segments; from the interchange of I-25 and SH 14 to the beginning of the alternate route, from the interchange at I-25 to the intersection at US 287, and from the intersection at US 287 to I-80 in Laramie. Each route is shown by alignment and profile along with a full-scale map. Routes that were eliminated from the list based on unrealistic screening were:

- CR 82 Alternatives - The CR 82 alternatives A and B were eliminated based on both safety and length of route criterion.
  - Over three miles of sustained grades in excess of nine percent
  - Seven miles longer than the existing SH 14 route
  - Out of direction of travel
- CR 80 Alternatives - The CR 80 Alternatives A and B were eliminated based on both safety and length of route criterion.
  - Over four miles of sustained grades in excess of six percent
  - Five miles longer than the existing SH 14 route
  - Out of direction of travel
- CR 78 Alternatives - The CR 78 Alternatives A and B were eliminated based on both safety and length of route criterion.
  - Over four miles of sustained grades in excess of six percent
  - Five miles longer than the existing SH 14 route
  - Out of direction of travel
- CR 70 Alternatives, Alternative A - The CR 70 Alternative A was eliminated based on safety criterion.
  - Over a mile of sustained grades in excess of seven percent
- CR 68 Alternative - The CR 68 Alternative was eliminated based on safety criterion.
  - Sustained seven percent grades on the connection through Horsethief Pass
- CR 66/68 Alternative - The CR 66/68 alternative was eliminated based on safety criterion.
  - Sustained seven percent grades on the connection through Horsethief Pass

- CR 64 Alternative - The CR 64 alternative was eliminated based on safety criterion.
    - Spacing of proposed interchange near CR 62E interchange
  - CR 58 Alternatives, Alternatives A, C and D - The CR 58 Alternatives C and D were eliminated based on length of route criterion.
    - Location to GMA
    - Length of route between I-25 and US 287
    - Sustained seven percent grades on the connection through Horsethief Pass
- The CR 58 Alternative A was re-added to the list because it could not be verified as inside the 2-mile buffer of the GMA.

## **VI. Alternate Route Development**

There was not enough time to begin route development.

## **VII. Other Business**

The next PMT meeting is scheduled for June 5, 2001 at 1:00 pm in Conference Room D at the City of Fort Collins building on North College Avenue. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting. If there are any questions or comments on the revised materials from the Stakeholder meeting, please let us know and we will address your concerns.

Distribution: PMT members

Attachments: Evaluation criteria, Non-route based strategies

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: Project Management Team #8

Date: June 26, 2001

Location: City of Fort Collins  
281 North College  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room B

### Attendees:

Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins  
Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Chris Primus – Carter Burgess

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Phil Lidov – Carter Burgess  
Nate Allen – PBS&J  
Kathy Dwyer – Stakeholders

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Comparative Evaluation Criteria Finalization
- IV. Comparative Evaluation of Strategies
- V. Comparative Evaluation Information for Routes
- VI. Other Business

---

### **I. General Business**

An update of the study was provided.

### **II. Meeting Purpose**

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

### **III. Comparative Evaluation Criteria Finalization**

The list of evaluation criteria was distributed to the group. The unrealistic strategy screening has been completed and is shown in gray on the handout. It was agreed that the comparative evaluation criteria should serve as a relative tool for comparison of all of the alternatives.

The stakeholders group had expressed concern that the Horsethief Pass route was eliminated from further consideration. The group agreed that there was a justifiable reason for the dismissal of the Horsethief Pass route. If this alternative were 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. A Cheyenne Bypass would not be possible because it is out of the jurisdiction of the project. The question was posed as to whether the non-route based strategies would work to move truck traffic from the existing route. This aspect will be evaluated within the strategy utilization.

The city attorney determined that CR 58A is still eligible for consideration as an alternate route within the bounds of the initiative.

Cost/ benefit ratio was discussed and a clarification was provided. Cost/benefit will be quantified as a cost per truck removed from the system. The issue of quantifying social cost was also discussed. The group decided to come back to the social cost issue at the next meeting. The stakeholders group had expressed concerns that the people issue was not being looked at within the criteria. The project management team agreed that the people issue was being dealt with through other evaluation criteria. There is no need to add the people issue as a separate criterion.

A question was also raised regarding the comparison of alternate routes with new interchanges versus existing interchanges and how they are handled. The PMT agreed that the cost criteria would address this issue and that there are currently no restrictions on new interchanges.

An updated map showing the eliminated alternatives and the remaining alternatives was distributed to the group. A copy of this map is attached to the notes. R.A. emphasized that the same approach would be used to evaluate the alternatives routes as for the non-route based strategies. Mark J. noted that the Fort Collins Police Department has expressed interest in the enforcement strategies.

The group discussed economic impacts for the alternatives routes. Some of these issues are already factored into the utilization. A definition of air quality impacts was requested. Moving traffic out of Downtown Fort Collins would be a potential air quality benefit for Fort Collins. While moving this traffic to northern Larimer County would have a negative air quality impact on that area. Kathy Dwyer noted that higher elevations and higher prevailing winds could provide for greater dispersion of emissions on northern routes.

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

### **IV. Comparative Evaluation of Strategies**

Compression brake law, speed limit enforcement and weather stations were moved to a list of supporting measures. Each of these strategies could assist in moving trucks onto the interstate. A copy of the revised list of Non-route based strategies is attached to these notes.

Mark P. addressed the issue of redesignation of SH 14. If the State Highway designation was taken off of SH 14 then CDOT would most likely give the route back to the county and the county would be responsible for maintaining it. Pete clarified that added lane miles to the state system are defined as actual lane miles, so one mile of four-lane road would be equal to two miles of two-lane road.

A handout of typical road sections was distributed to the group. Pete will get back to the group regarding CDOT's typical road dimensions. Pete will also get back to the group on whether to investigate an asphalt or concrete roadbed. The question was also asked if CDOT obtains enough ROW for a four-lane road when only a two-lane road is currently needed. Pete will get back to the group with this information. The group addressed the sprawl issue. Sprawl will be looked at in the evaluation process but it will not be used as a differentiator.

A copy of the typical sections is attached to these notes.

## **V. Comparative Evaluation Information for Routes**

A handout showing the data sources for the alternate routes was distributed to the group. A copy of this sheet is included with the notes. Phil Lidov went through the different data sources and added a brief explanation of each. The American Farmland Trust Database will be used in addition to the data sources listed, for analyzing farming/environmental impacts. Chris Primus briefly discussed the traffic demand model that he is currently working on. 2020 land use projections are being utilized for the model, which encompasses the entire north front range region. The model will only be capable of evaluating 5 different alternate routes. The routes will be grouped into CR 76, CR 70/72, CR 66, CR 62/64 and CR 58.

## **VI. Other Business**

Mark P. will see about scheduling another meeting with the Larimer County Commissioners. The next PMT meeting is scheduled for July 17, 2001 in Conference Room B at the City of Fort Collins building on North College Avenue. The next PMT meeting will be at 2:00pm. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting. If there any questions or comments on the revised materials from the Stakeholder meeting, please let us know and we will address your concerns.

Distribution: PMT members

Attachments: List of Evaluation Criteria, Non-Route Based Strategies, Alternate Routes (List & Map), Alternate Routes Data Sources, Typical Sections

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: Project Management Team #9

Date: July 17, 2001

Location: City of Fort Collins  
281 North College  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room B

### Attendees:

Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins  
Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Chris Primus – Carter Burgess

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Carrie Wallis – PBS&J  
Nate Allen – PBS&J  
Kathy Dwyer – Stakeholders

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Non-Route Based Strategy Recommendations
- IV. Comparative Evaluation of Routes
- V. Other Business

---

### **I. General Business**

An update of the study was provided.

### **II. Meeting Purpose**

The purpose of the meeting was to finalize the comparative evaluation criteria for the alternate routes and to go through the non-route based strategy recommendations.

### **III. Non-Route Based Strategy Recommendations**

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.

## **IV. Comparative Evaluation of Routes**

A handout detailing the comparative evaluation criteria was distributed to the group. Stakeholder Committee members have brought up different issues with removing evaluation criteria for routes that have to do with social cost/benefit ratio, economic impacts, and sprawl.

- **Social Cost, Benefit/cost ratio** - The group decided that social cost will not be a differentiator in picking an alternate route but it will taken into account in the final report. The question of whether to use a benefit/cost analysis or the cost/truck removed was asked. This group recommended using cost/truck removed for the cost criteria.
- **Economic Impacts** - The definition of economic impacts was discussed. Are we concerned with the economic impacts to businesses on the existing route or the economic impacts to businesses on the proposed route? The ballot initiative precludes further study of the existing route so only economic impacts on the proposed route can be considered. The group decided to remove economic impacts as a differentiator. Economic impacts are taken into account within the environmental resources and the ROW/relocations criteria.

- **Sprawl** - The issue of sprawl was raised at the stakeholders meeting. It was emphasized that this is only a feasibility study and a lot is already being done to analyze the routes. The definition of sprawl is very subjective and there are many different ways to try and quantify it. For these reasons the group agreed that sprawl should not be used as a differentiator.

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 clarification was made as to the difference in traffic on the two CR 58 alternatives. A large amount of traffic uses Alternative A to travel from the La Porte area to I-25. A summary of the route utilization information 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 businesses and residences within the right of way needed or along the potential route. 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.

Information was requested regarding Larimer County and CDOT setback standards for houses. Mark Peterson and Pete Graham will get back to the group on this. Level of Service C will be required for the alternate route. Mark Peterson suggested adding floodplains and major hydraulic structures to the evaluation process.

A handout was also distributed with the alternate route evaluation matrix. This matrix will be used to evaluate each of the potential routes based on the criterion listed on the evaluation criteria handout.

## **V. Other Business**

The next PMT meeting is scheduled for Wednesday August 8 at 1:30pm in **Conference Room 1A at 215 N Mason**. This meeting will be held at the New City of Ft. Collins building on North Mason. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting.

Distribution: PMT members

Attachments: Non-Route Based Strategy Comparative Evaluation, Non-Route Based Strategy Recommendations, List of Evaluation Criteria, Alternate Route Evaluation Approach, Route Utilization Summary

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: Project Management Team #10

Date: August 9, 2001

Location: City of Fort Collins  
215 N Mason  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room 1B

### Attendees:

Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins  
Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4  
Frank Hempen – UFRRPC

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Carrie Wallis – PBS&J  
Nate Allen – PBS&J

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Comparative Evaluation of Routes
- IV. Other Business

---

### **I. General Business**

An update of the study was provided.

### **II. Meeting Purpose**

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the comparative criteria for the alternate routes and to discuss the assumptions used for the evaluation of the alternate routes.

### **III. Comparative Evaluation of Routes**

A handout detailing the evaluation criteria was distributed. The darkened portion of the sheet represents analysis that has already been completed. Another handout was distributed that shows the evaluation criteria with the information for each of the routes. Also, a map detailing alternate route laneage, intersection/interchange improvements, and typical sections was discussed. R.A. discussed the assumptions that went into the cost estimates for the alternate routes:

- CR 76A
  - New interchange at I-25 that will include a grade separation structure for the railroad.
  - Western portion will be a 3 lane section with a climbing lane in the westbound direction
  - Approach to the Colorado Lien plant will include a half-mile section of 7 percent grade. This alternative will require no cut at the top of the grade but will require some fill to achieve a smooth slope.
  - Is this grade acceptable by CDOT standards?
  - Get the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) opinion on the grade issue.
- CR 72A
  - New interchange at I-25
  - Same western section as CR 76A
  - 3 lane section for entire route
- CR 72B
  - New interchange at I-25
  - 3 lane section for entire route
  - Will utilize most of existing Owl Canyon Rd. except for ¼ mile of new alignment
  - 2 percent grade for western portion
- CR 70/72 A&B
  - Improvements to existing interchange at I-25.
  - 3 lane section for entire route
  - New alignment for connection of CR 70 & CR 72
- CR 70B
  - Improvements to existing interchange at I-25
  - 3 lane section for entire route
  - ¼ mile of new alignment for western portion
- CR 66
  - New interchange at I-25
  - 3 lane section for entire route
  - Western portion will be a 3 lane section with a climbing lane
  - Western portion will include a 1.5 mile section of 5 percent grade and a 1/2 mile section of 6 percent grade
  - Is this grade acceptable by CDOT and FHWA standards?
- CR 62E/64
  - Improvements to existing interchange at I-25
  - 5 lane section through Wellington with four 11ft. lanes and one 12ft. left turn lane
  - No additional ROW or roadway through Wellington
  - Will 11ft. lanes through Wellington be sufficient for large trucks?
  - 3 lane section for the rest of the route
  - Same western section as CR 66

A change was made to the Wellington typical section. The typical section now consists of four 11 foot lanes with one 15 foot WB/EB left turn lane, 6 foot bike lanes, and 6 foot sidewalks. The revised typical and laneage map is attached to these notes.

- CR 62E
  - Improvements to existing interchange at I-25
  - 5 lane section through Wellington with four 11ft. lanes and one 12ft. left turn lane
  - No additional ROW or roadway width through Wellington
  - Will 11ft. lanes through Wellington be sufficient for large trucks?
  - 3 lane section for the rest of the route
  - Same western section as CR 66
- CR 58A
  - New interchange at I-25
  - 4 lane section for entire route
  - Minimal grades for western portion
- CR 58B
  - New interchange at I-25

- 4 lane section for SH 1 portion
- 3 lane section for rest of route
- The western portion will be a 3 lane section with a climbing lane
- The western portion will include a 1 mile section of 4 percent grade and a 1/2 mile section of 7 percent grade
- Is this grade acceptable by CDOT and FHWA standards?

Environmental resources were reviewed through GIS mapping. Maps were shown for farming resource impacts, threatened and endangered species, wildlife impacts, wetland and riparian areas, zoning and public lands, parcel land use, water resources, and planned paving projects. A copy of these maps are attached to these notes.

### **Overall Comments**

A road base of 8" of asphalt and 6" of aggregate base course was used on top of 24" of R40 fill material. All cost estimates were done assuming an at grade non-signalized intersection with US 287. The group recommended looking at an interchange at US 287. Traffic volumes will help determine whether an interchange at 287 is warranted. A fixed environmental cost was recommended rather than a percentage of the total cost.

The comment was made that the interchange costs might be too low. It was recommended to assume that any existing interchange bridge would have to be replaced to be suitable for the projected traffic volumes. A higher railroad crossing cost was also suggested. The study team should get FHWA's opinion on railroad crossings.

A clarification was made regarding the Upper Front Range Regional Transportation Plan. Only improvements listed as fiscally constrained should be used in the evaluation. The question was asked as to how you handle farm relocations within the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process. It was suggested to show SH 1 on the route map and to show the farming layer within the GIS maps and route evaluation matrix.

### **V. Other Business**

The next PMT meeting is scheduled for Wednesday September 12 at 2:00pm in **Conference Room 2A at 215 N Mason**. This meeting will be held at the New City of Ft. Collins building on North Mason. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting.

Distribution: PMT members

Attachments: Evaluation criteria for alternate routes, alternate route fact sheet, laneage map with roadway typicals, alternate route evaluation matrix, GIS resource maps

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: Project Management Team #12

Date: October 17, 2001

Location: City of Fort Collins  
215 N Mason  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room 1B

### Attendees:

Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins  
Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J  
Carrie Wallis – PBS&J  
Carla Perez

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Route Identification
- IV. Funding
- V. Issues for Report
- VI. Other Business

---

### **I. General Business**

An update of the study was provided, including the letters written to Mark Jackson from the Colorado Department of Transportation and Larimer County Commissioners. A copy of this letter is attached to these notes.

### **II. Meeting Purpose**

The purpose of the meeting was to evaluate the funding options available for alternate routes, review the identification of an alternate route, and go over the outline for the final report.

### **III. Route Identification**

The study recommendations were distributed to the group along with a revised study area map.

## Non-Route Based Strategy Recommendations

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Articles in publications</li><li>– Brochures</li><li>– Map routes</li><li>– Private trucking company outreach</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– CDOT website: Cotrip.org</li><li>– Highway advisory radio</li><li>– Internet advertising</li><li>– Safety meeting reminders</li><li>– Variable message signs</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Billboards</li><li>– Kiosks at truck stops</li><li>– Paycheck mailers</li><li>– Radio ads</li><li>– Video</li></ul>
- 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

Two of the recommendations for strategies were left off of the handout distributed:

- Conduct workshop with local law enforcement regarding compression brake law
- Assess potential for future redesignation and restrictions if a reasonable existing alternate route is identified or new alternate route built

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

## Alternate Route Recommendations

The complete evaluation matrix was also distributed to the group to show the detailed evaluation process. 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

There was some discussion on whether to remove the CR 58B alternative due to its potential impacts in relation to County Road 58A including; cost, change in vehicle miles traveled, right-of-way, directly affected properties, and compatibility with planning. It was decided in this group that the corridor options should be utilized rather than specific routes within each alternative.

Based on the remaining routes after the screening process has been completed, if a NEPA study convened, the following corridors should be considered among the full range of alternatives, as seen on the route map:

- 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.

## 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.

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.

#### **IV. Funding**

Carla Perez, a subconsultant for the study, presented the funding information for the project. A handout was distributed dealing with the funding process. This process was reviewed by the group, and some revisions were made to the order of the steps. A revised 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 County, State, and Federal sources.

#### **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.

#### **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.

## 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.

It was suggested to add City and private sources to the list. It was also suggested that for each funding source, it may not be appropriate to describe whether or not the alternate route would receive funding, but that a summary of each category of funding should be given in relation to the funding category. A revised copy of the Federal funding, State funding, County funding, and City and Innovative sources funding are attached to these notes.

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

## V. Issues for Report

A copy of the report outline was distributed. If anyone has comments on this outline, please let us know in the next couple of days, so the outline and report can be revised. The PMT will receive a copy of the draft report Thanksgiving week, November 20<sup>th</sup>. Comments should be received back by December 3<sup>rd</sup>.

## VI. Other Business

The schedule update was distributed. Upcoming meetings for various groups are listed. A request was made for the website address to the Northern Larimer County Alliance website, <http://www.nlc-alliance.org/>. Also, the PMT members are welcome to attend both the open houses and the Fort Collins City Council meeting on December 18<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. at City Hall.

The next PMT meeting is scheduled for Tuesday November 6, 10:30 – 12:00 in **Conference Room 1B at 215 N Mason**. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting.

Distribution: PMT members

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

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: Project Management Team #13

Date: November 6, 2001

Location: City of Fort Collins  
215 N Mason  
Fort Collins  
Conference Room 1A

### Attendees:

Mark Jackson – City of Fort Collins  
Mark Peterson – Larimer County  
Pete Graham – CDOT Region 4

R.A. Plummer – PBS&J

### Agenda:

- I. General Business
- II. Meeting Purpose
- III. Matrix Evaluation of Routes
- IV. Other Business

---

### **I. General Business**

No real general business was discussed.

### **II. Meeting Purpose**

The purpose of the meeting was to review recommendations for non-route based strategies, alternate routes and funding options and the report outline.

### **III. Study Update**

An update of the study was given to the committee. R.A. and Mark discussed the responses from the Policy Advisory Committee and Stakeholders Committee regarding the study recommendations. Mark J. discussed the City's position from his opinion. He feels that the City will agree that the mandate of the ballot initiative has been met and that they may pursue the non-route based strategies. Mark P. discussed the Larimer County position in relation to the Larimer County Commissioners that they do not endorse the study because of the limitation of the study. CDOT issues were discussed similar to what has been discussed in the past in relation to the need for a NEPA study.

In terms of a schedule update, the final Policy Advisory Committee meeting will be held on December 21<sup>st</sup>, from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. at 215 N. Mason. The Fort Collins City Council study session will be held on December 11<sup>th</sup>, and the final presentation of study results will be December 18<sup>th</sup>. Committee members were asked to plan on attending the December 18<sup>th</sup> Council session.

A copy of the study update is attached to these notes.

#### **IV. Recommendations Review**

Recommendations for non-route based strategies, alternate routes, and funding were reviewed as follows:

##### **Non-Route Based Strategies**

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:

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

<b>High Priority</b>	<b>Medium Priority</b>	<b>Low Priority</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Articles in publications</li><li>– Brochures</li><li>– Map routes</li><li>– Private trucking company outreach</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– CDOT website: Cotrip.org</li><li>– Highway advisory radio Internet advertising</li><li>– Safety meeting reminders</li><li>– Variable message signs</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Billboards</li><li>– Kiosks at truck stops</li><li>– Paycheck mailers</li><li>– Radio ads</li><li>– Video</li></ul>
2. Conduct a study to address local and regional truck traffic including outreach with local businesses to reduce congestion in the downtown area
3. Conduct an incident management study
4. Conduct workshop with local law enforcement regarding compression brake law
5. Assess potential for future redesignation and restrictions if a reasonable existing alternate route is identified or new alternate route built
6. Continue existing 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.
7. Investigate establishing control of local arterials to restrict truck traffic.
8. If implemented, establish a mechanism to measure the effects that the strategies have on moving truck traffic to the Interstate.

Mark J. discussed the details of arterial restriction in the City of Fort Collins and what the City's rights are and what the issues are. Some of the issues include uniform application for all streets, the Interstate Commerce Act, and local business concerns.

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

##### **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 recommendations were as follows:

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. Based on the remaining routes after the screening process has been completed, if a NEPA study convened, the following corridors should be considered among the full range of alternatives, as seen on the route map:

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

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

## **Funding Recommendations**

A handout detailing the funding recommendations was distributed to the group. The funding recommendations were as follows:

### Innovative/Private Funding Sources

A user pay system (tolls) could be used to recover the initial capital investment, but a detailed revenue assessment required to evaluate the likelihood of generating adequate revenue. Another key issue is that typical tollways have very limited access which do not meet the features or needs of the alternate routes that have been developed.

### County and Local Funding Sources

Most County and local funding sources are committed to existing priorities, so a new source of funding (tax) would most likely be required. The idea of a Special or Local Improvement District would require solid support of adjacent property owners to generate substantive financial benefit. The best option for funding from County and local sources would potentially be environmental planning efforts.

### State Funding Sources

A significant portion of state funding sources are already committed to regional projects. There is an existing \$4.0 billion shortfall for prioritized projects in the North and Upper Front Range Planning Regions already. A reprioritization of projects would be required to move forward and there would be strong competition with already programmed projects.

### Federal Funding Sources

A significant portion of the Federal funding sources are already committed to regional and statewide plans. A reprioritization of projects would be required. A coordinated federal lobbying effort with Colorado Congressional members could be helpful to pursue Federal earmarks, but agreed upon local support from the City, County and CDOT would be crucial

A copy of the funding recommendations is attached to these notes.

## **V. Alternate Route Corridor Issues**

The pros and cons of the various alternate routes were discussed including grade issues versus the potential need for signals or grade separations. Other issues discussed included visual impacts, interchange spacing, the amount of new roadway, and impact on major intersections. Many of these issues would be addressed in either the NEPA stage or design.

## **VI. Other Business**

There are certain other issues that will be discussed in the report that were not covered in this study based on the feasibility level of analysis. These issues were developed from the other committees and reviewed with the PMT. PMT members were asked to send any other issues to the study team by Friday for inclusion. The draft report will be distributed the 19<sup>th</sup> of November and the committee will have until December 11th to review the report. The next PMT meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 11 at 3:00 p.m. in **Conference Room 1B at 215 N Mason**. This meeting will be held at the New City of Ft. Collins building on North Mason. A meeting reminder will be sent out via e-mail prior to the meeting.

Also attached are the latest stakeholders and policy committee notes.

Distribution: PMT members

Attachments: Agenda, non-route based strategy recommendations, alternate route recommendations, alternate route map, funding recommendations, other report discussions, latest stakeholder and policy committee 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.