



PROJECT:	Boulder County Transportation Flood On-call
PROJECT #:	Lower Fourmile, 138067
PURPOSE:	Public Meeting #5, Record of Public Comments
DATE/TIME HELD:	May 25, 2016, 5:30pm-7:30pm
LOCATION:	Boulder County Commissioners Room
ATTENDEES:	Boulder County: Andrew Barth, Dan DeLange, Clarissa Hageman, George Gerstle, Mike Thomas Michael Baker: Luke Babbitt, Tamara Keefe, Mary Monks, David Nemovitz, Derek Webb Pinyon: Mark Serour TRS: Richard Pittenridge, Kalan Falbo CDR: Laura Sneeringer, Ryan Golten Public: See Meeting Sign-In (held by Andrew Barth)

Meeting Minutes

Purpose of the meeting:

- Share the latest version of designs for flood recovery-related reconstruction of the damaged sections of lower Fourmile Canyon Drive
- Provide an overview of key aspects of the project, including how community input was used
- Respond to residents' questions

Comments observed by: *George Gerstle, Mike Thomas, David Nemovitz, Tamara Keefe, Derek Webb, Mary Monks*

- Overall:
 - General sentiment was positive
 - Ensure no rock cuts
- Typical Roadway Section:
 - The majority of individuals were in-favor of the 4' uphill shoulder
 - There were a number of people that were under the impression that the previous design has a much larger "bike lane" that was separated or barrier protected from the roadway. These folks were genuinely surprised to find out that wasn't ever proposed.



- There were some questions as to the laws regarding bike safety (i.e. can they ride side-by-side or in the lane, how much space are cars required to provide in going around them). George helped answer some of these.
- There was still some opposition to the project as a whole from one individual. It was suggested that cars typically cross lane lines toward the inside of the curve on blind corners, so when this is towards the uphill shoulder it might be beneficial to protect the shoulder. Concepts for this might be flexible ducks or rumble strips placed along the white line.
- People liked introducing the curve near the south end to slow down traffic.
- One resident had many detailed questions and concerns: about space for pedestrians between guardrail and wall; concerned about higher speeds of vehicles through the corridor since we're widening; bikes or peds getting hit within the 4' uphill shoulder on the inside of blind curves (requested adding delineators on the white stripe to push vehicles away from the shoulder on these curves to avoid cutting the curve through the shoulder, and personally volunteered to remove the delineators during the winter so they wouldn't be damaged by snow plows)
- Shoulder-specific questions/comments
 - Received a question regarding funding for the Poorman 4' shoulder extension. Since this area was not damaged during the flood they wanted to know if the funding was able to come through FEMA. They also asked why this extension was being added to an area that was not flood damaged. I answered that the funding was most likely from Boulder County and not FEMA and that the extension was to create a consistent road section through to a more logical stopping point.
 - Concerns about loss of parking with the 4' shoulder widening next to the fire station. Ideas that were discussed among residents were to add a pipe along the wall where there is currently a ditch to add more parking. Also to come up with some way to encourage people to park in at an angle, or even delineate spots, to maximize parking. Said that we would work with them further to solve this problem.
- Signage – for transition between improved road and non-project areas of road:
 - Suggestion to put in a sign at the end of the project alerting users that the 4' shoulder is ending, specifically so that cars know to look for bikes now using the same lane.
 - Suggested sign at Poorman indicating end of shoulder (separate comment).
- Aesthetics:
 - Strong/overwhelming support for the aesthetics, particularly the stone veneer.
 - No negative comments or suggested changes recorded.
- Guard rails:
 - Some resistance to amount of guard rail.
 - Need to evaluate impact of guard rail on flooding/debris catcher.



-
- How are we going to handle safe place for pedestrians along road/guardrail access to mailboxes?
 - Some others really liked the look of the brown guardrail as well versus the standard galvanized.
 - Many others I spoke with lived in Cristman or Logan Mill and were generally happy with what we were showing (this comment may also have applied to aesthetics/walls).
 - Construction & traffic control:
 - Lot of questions about when the project would go to construction and how long it would take. Generally folks seemed bummed by the length of construction, but folks seemed to understand; no one reported being too upset by it.
 - Quite a few people asked about how traffic would be handled during construction. Explained that:
 - We're still working on it, so if they have any specific comments they can share with Andrew (seems doubtful we will get any).
 - We don't anticipate any long-term closures or short-term longer than 3 hours.
 - We are anticipating one-way alternate traffic for a large majority of the construction duration. This may be handled with signals or pilot cars, but we're not sure yet.
 - Again, the general sentiment was quite understanding and accepting after some discussion.
 - Trees:
 - Concern for number of trees lost.
 - Interest in limiting tree takes as much as possible. 'I like that Boulder County took the time to look at all the trees.'
 - Heard concerns about how the newly planted trees would be maintained. Will they be watered? Will measures be taken to prevent the deer from ruining them? Will the county plant fruit bearing trees to help feed the wildlife? The new trees at the EPA site are now all dead due to lack of maintenance and they don't want a similar issue.
 - 'I don't mind you taking the trees that are along the river, because the river corridor needs to be cleaned out anyway.'
 - 'Can the tree impact sheets be posted earlier or do we have to wait until the next set of design plans is posted?'
 - 'Will there be deer protection of some sort around the replacement trees? The deer will kill the newly planted small trees.'
 - Is Boulder County going to water the trees? If so, for how long?
 - 'Can you plant trees that are fruit-bearing to feed the bears? Since the flood there have been more bears leaving the canyon and heading into the city of Boulder to find food in garbage cans. We need to find a way to keep the bears in the canyon.'



-
- 'Are you going to talk to each homeowner about the trees that are in front of their property, even though you say it is in the ROW? Who came up with the ROW line?'
 - ROW:
 - A number of questions about how prescriptive ROW was determined.
 - Many people had questions as to how the prescriptive ROW was delineated. One comment I overheard was to try to fight some of the larger rock outcroppings and move the ROW line closer to the road because the county had to pay them for their land not just claim it. Another commented about if the delineation was based on pre-flood or post-flood topography because the county can only claim historic maintenance/use based on the road pre-flood.
 - Environmental:
 - I think that you are following the process that you need to for the environmental work.
 - One resident voiced concerned about noxious weeds spreading throughout the canyon and wanted to know what we would do about them.
 - Would be space for prebble's mouse to move with the provision of areas for it to walk across culverts, etc., in the creek. Also expressed concern for sand from the road getting into the creek and whether the creek was "self-cleaning" or not. Luke addressed several of these concerns.
 - Overall design:
 - I heard a couple of people comment that they wish the impacts were not into the "truly natural" feature (the creek) and instead were more into the "man-altered" feature, the rock faces.
 - I heard wide support of the change to flip-flop the road and fire-pullout near MM1