

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

Date: May 30, 2025

29 Road Interchange at I-70, NEPA/1601 Project

Meeting Name: FHWA Project Review Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: May 29, 2025

Invitees:

Invitee	Organization	Attended?	Invitee	Organization	Attended?
Kevin King	Mesa County		Alex Pulley	FHU	X
Scott Mai	Mesa County	X	Amanda Cushing	FHU	X
Trent Prall	Grand Junction	X	Mark Bunnell	CDOT	X
Liz Cramer	FHWA	X	Zane Znamenacek	CDOT	X
Ajin Hu	FHWA	X			

TAC Meetings (April 29, 2022 to May 12, 2025)

Note: Comments and discussion brought up during the meeting are denoted as **blue** text.
Post meeting responses that were received following the meeting are denoted in **pink** text.

► TAC Meeting #1 (April 29, 2022)

○ What was presented?

- Listening Tour Summary
- Transportation Need Analysis Philosophy
- Looked at LOS, Select Link, and Select Node from Regional Travel Demand Model for 29 Road, 30 Road, Frontage Road, and F½ Road Connection
- Draft Purpose and Need



29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

- The links for the internal website (only TAC member access) and external website were shared.
- What were the decisions?
 - None—Presentation of approaches only
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - Set the foundation for the Methods and Assumptions Document

No questions or comments.

► TAC Meeting #2 (June 7, 2022)

- What was presented?
 - Looked at effects to I-70, Patterson Road, F ½ Road, and Major North/South Streets
 - Evaluated Local vs Longer Trips
- What were the decisions?
 - Follow up meetings decided there is a need for an interchange
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - Move to the next step of screening (29 Road vs. 30 Road)

- **Question:** FHWA is interested in hearing what kind of analysis was done to evaluate if people would use the proposed 29 Road interchange to access Horizon Drive via I-70.

Response: The proposed 29 Road interchange and Horizon Drive are approximately 1½ mile apart which is closer than the proposed 29 Road interchange and I-70B/Clifton. FHU reviewed local versus longer trips using a select link analysis. Based on that analysis, approximately 45% of people that are using westbound I-70 from the proposed 29 Road are exiting at Horizon Drive. We also looked at the frontage road that is coded into the RTP's model to evaluate the effectiveness of a frontage road and it did not attract as much system traffic.

- **Question:** What was the speed that was coded into the frontage road?

Response: The frontage road was a collector at 45 mph.

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

► TAC Meeting #3 (August 17, 2022)

- What was presented?
 - Level 1 Screening Methodology for comparing 29 Road and 30 Road, using categories Physical/Planning, Traffic/Safety, Travel Demand Management, Community Context, and Environmental
 - Presented Initial Level 1 results from analysis
- What were the decisions?
 - None, it appeared that 29 Road Corridor was more preferable, but more analysis was requested.
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - N/A

► **Question:** The PEL study included both 29 and 30 Road; when was the 30 Road option eliminated?

Response: It was eliminated at the end of Level 1 Screening.

► TAC Meeting #4 (September 23, 2022)

- What was presented?
 - Revised Level 1 Screening Results
- What were the decisions?
 - 29 Road is the most appropriate corridor to advance to Level 2
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - Only focus on 29 Road Corridor for remainder of project

No questions or comments.

► TAC Meeting #5 (November 14, 2022)

- What was presented?
 - "Finalized" Purpose and Need Statement (approved by Stephanie Gibson)
 - MPO Model Refinement needed for project
 - Focus on effects on I-70 LOS as final piece for advancing 29 Road to Level 2

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

- What were the decisions?
 - Move forward with 1601 Pre-Application Meeting
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - Advancing the project through the next steps

No questions or comments.

► TAC Meeting #6 (February 21, 2023)

- What was presented?
 - Outlined Level 2 Screening (Level 2A = exact location of interchange; Level 2B = Interchange configuration)
 - Presented Screening Criteria; interchange locations; interchange configurations
- What were the decisions?
 - No need to include options with fatal flaws and only focus on what layouts and locations are feasible
 - Advance three locations for interchange
 - Advance traditional diamond, roundabout diamond, diverging diamond interchanges
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - Focused additional analysis on items that are feasible

No questions or comments.

► TAC Meeting #7 (May 24, 2023)

- What was presented?
 - Presented results of Level 2A and Level 2B analysis
 - Presented plans for public meeting and public website
- What were the decisions?
 - Retained the Western Alignment
 - Approved to present the configurations to the public
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - Focused the interchange location

No questions or comments.



29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

►► TAC Meeting #8 (July 28, 2023)

- What was presented?
 - Public Meeting Summary
 - Additional analysis requested on I-70 Operations and Safety
 - Discussion of potential mitigations for traffic
- What were the decisions?
 - Roundabout configuration is advanced and preferred by public
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - Confirm the interchange configuration to move forward.

No questions or comments.

►► TAC Meeting #9 (October 10, 2023)

- What was presented?
 - 29 Road (between I-70 interchange and Patterson Road) cross section workshop results
 - The options will be presented to the public.
 - Upcoming Traffic Analysis
- What were the decisions?
 - Two cross sections for 29 Road were advanced (all cross sections have four travel lanes (effectively a five-lane facility), turn pockets, bicycle facilities (e.g., cycletrack), and sidewalks); [this resulted in various cross section widths.](#)
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - Narrow down the cross section design

No questions or comments.

►► TAC Meeting #10 (February 8, 2024)

- What was presented?
 - Traffic analysis of when Mitigation (e.g., auxiliary lane) is needed (2040 or when westbound I-70 has 3,500 vehicles/hour or when the Horizon Drive off-ramp has 1,850 vehicles /hour)
 - TDM Process
- What were the decisions?

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

- No decisions, but Jeff Bellen stated that any decrease in LOS on I-70 is not acceptable and FHWA will not approve the IAR.
- Requested clarification regarding “acceptable” but did not receive a definition.
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - N/A

No questions or comments.

► TAC Meeting #11 (April 18, 2024)

- What was presented?
 - The addition of the 29 Road interchange at I-70 would extend the functional longevity of the system’s roadways through an increased use of I-70 and a decreased use of the regional connections.
 - The 29 Road interchange would improve access to the future Matchett Park and associated recreation center (currently under construction).
 - The Preferred Alternative meets Purpose and Need.
 - TDM strategy review
- What were the decisions?
 - It was agreed by the TAC to advance the 29 Road Interchange at I-70 to the Transportation Commission.
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - Advancing the project through the next steps

► **Note:** The System Level Study was submitted on May 2, 2024.

► **Note:** The Revised SLS was submitted on July 16, 2024.

No questions or comments.

► TAC Meeting #12a (July 8, 2024)

- What was presented?
 - The number of predictive crashes on the I-70 freeway facility, the 29 Road corridor, with/without the auxiliary lane, and with/without safety performance functions.
 - Proposed mitigations including a braided ramp, a collector/distributor road, and an auxiliary lane.

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

- TDM Process
- What were the decisions?
 - No decisions were made; however, an action item for FHU included developing a toolkit of proposed mitigations.
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - N/A

No questions or comments.

►► TAC Meeting #12b (July 9, 2024)

- What was presented?
 - The proposed TDM strategies including:
 - Transportation Management Organization/Association;
 - Mobility Hub/Park and Ride;
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities; and
 - Schoolpool Program
- What were the decisions?
 - No decisions as CDOT wanted to internally review the data and the TDM memo.
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - N/A

No questions or comments.

►► CDOT Workshop (October 28, 2024; facilitated by Mark Bunnell, CDOT)

- What was discussed?
 - Review issues and develop solutions to solve the potential issues for lane changes on I-70 near the Horizon Drive curve. Solutions included the following:
 - Implement a toll for drivers using I-70 only to travel between 29 Road and the Horizon interchanges
 - Widen I-70 to a 6-lane roadway facility
 - Widen the inside roadway shoulder
 - Shift the proposed interchange farther to the east
 - Lower the speed limit to 65 mph

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

- Install curve warning signage for the Horizon Drive curves
- What were the decisions?
 - No decisions; however, an action item for FHU included completing a safety analysis through the implementation of the potential solutions.
 - It was stated that the safety analysis must demonstrate that the forecasted fatal and injury crashes on I-70 have not increased with the proposed 29 Road interchange. The intersection of I-70B and F½ Road can be included in that analysis since it is the first intersection before entering or after exiting I-70 at the I-70B interchange. It was also mentioned that the safety of the whole system (I-70, I-70B, and local roads) should not show an increase in forecasted fatal and injury crashes.
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - N/A

No questions or comments.

►► TAC Meeting #13a (February 20, 2025)

- What was presented?
 - Present results the safety analysis as requested in CDOT I-70 Workshop and present the results of the 29 Road and Patterson Road workshop.
- What were the decisions?
 - No decisions at this time.
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - N/A

No questions or comments.

►► CDOT Follow-up to TAC Meeting #13a (February 28, 2025)

- What was presented?
 - Review the safety and operational analyses completed for the proposed solutions included in the October 2024 workshop.
 - Selection of the traditional intersection layout for 29 Road and Patterson Road.
 - Review revised interchange concept locations to the east, as requested by CDOT.
 - CDOT shared the braided ramp with a slip lane concept.



29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

- What were the decisions?
 - No decisions; however, an action item for FHU included completing a benefit cost analysis for the interchange and an I-70 6-laning option.
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - N/A

No questions or comments.

►► TAC Meeting #14 (April 7, 2025)

- What was presented?
 - Reviewed the I-70 future congestion and the proposed mitigation measures:
 - Auxiliary Lane
 - Collector-Distributor (C-D) Road
 - Braided Ramps
 - 6-lane I-70 freeway
 - Reviewed safety mitigation measures and revised predicted crashes at the “I-70 Curve”
 - Widen the I-70 inside shoulder.
 - Lower the I-70 speed limit.
 - Add enhanced warning signs at the I-70 curve.
 - Move the proposed 29 Road interchange to the east.
 - Reviewed safety on the overall network due to adding the proposed mitigation measures listed above (e.g., auxiliary lane, C-D Road, etc.)
- What were the decisions?
 - The 6-lane I-70 option is not necessary to be included in the 29 Road Interchange Project and will not be advanced further.
 - The TAC reached agreement that the auxiliary lane is not warranted, especially when considering safety and will not be evaluated further.
 - The TAC felt that some congestion in 2045 modelling was acceptable because the overall 2050 volumes are decreasing and safety is a higher priority.
 - Prepare a BCA to include the No Action Alternative, the Build (Base) Alternative (the proposed 29 Road interchange with no aux lane) and Build (Base) Alternative with the braided ramp with slip lane scenarios. The BCA

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

will be used to evaluate if the reduced crashes with the braided ramp outweighs the additional costs.

- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - N/A

No questions or comments.

►► CDOT Follow up to TAC Meeting #14 (May 12, 2025)

- What was presented?
 - The project background and history, the purpose and need, and a summary TAC meeting #14.
 - Review of revised safety results for the remaining scenarios:
 - No Action Alternative
 - Build (Base) Alternative
 - Build (Base) Alternative with the braided ramp with slip lane
 - Proposed approach to the state Transportation Commission including a request for conditional approval. Formal approval would occur in 2026 following completion of 30% design and the final system level study (SLS) and Interchange Access Justification Request (IAJR).
 - Review of statement provided by the previous FHWA representative.
 - Review of revised predicted crashes on I-70 and the arterial network.
 - Review of the benefit cost analysis
- What were the decisions?
 - No decisions; however, action items included the following:
 - Sending the BCA to CDOT
 - Set up a meeting with FHWA to review the project.
 - Send project website link to FHWA to access TAC meeting summaries.
- How do the decisions affect the Project?
 - N/A

No questions or comments.

Discussion

- **Question:** Regarding the current status of the SLS, there are outstanding comments, but the final SLS won't be submitted until Summer 2026; is that correct?

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

Response: Before final revisions to the SLS are made, the project team must have an agreement on the Proposed Action (e.g., I-70 roundabout interchange, I-70 roundabout interchange with a braided ramp and slip lane); however, 90% of the comments have been addressed and the document could be considered as a “draft final”.

- ▶ **Question:** The BCA was not a factor in the Methods and Assumptions (M&A) document, correct?

Response: That is correct, the BCA was developed to help evaluate the return on the investment of the braided ramp and slip lane.

- ▶ **Question:** When was the M&A document accepted by FHWA?

Response: We received approval via email from Jeff Bellen on February 14, 2022.

- ▶ **Statement:** Reviewing the fatal and injury results, it appears that the braided ramp has the lowest amount, and 6-laning I-70 has the second lowest with the build (base) being much greater.

Response: We have re-evaluated safety using countermeasures throughout the entire system (i.e., study area). Countermeasures included protected left turns, retroreflective back plates on signals, etc. which had crash modification factors associated with those countermeasures. The results that are seen here are results prior to those CMFs being applied. However, the braided ramp does have the fewest fatal and injury results.

- ▶ **Statement:** There is congestion between the proposed 29 Road and I-70B/Clifton; is there a graphic for No Action Alternative?

Response ACTION ITEM: FHU will submit the graphic to FHWA for the No Action Alternative that shows operations between the proposed 29 Road and I-70B/Clifton.

- ▶ **Statement:** FHWA is focused on safety and operations on I-70; the braided ramp has better operations compared to the other alternatives. Is that correct?

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

Response: That is correct from a safety and operations perspective. However, there is also a consideration for access that is included in the Purpose and Need that helps strike the balance.

- ▶ **Statement:** The M&A document discussed the Purpose and Need but did not discuss safety, operations, and/or network need. It also discussed that this project would complete a connection that the City/County has been planning. Safety and operations must be addressed. Thus, adding an interchange to the interstate through the IAJR, FHWA will ask the question:

▶▶ Is the project making I-70 worse for operations and/or safety?

Response: The Purpose and Need was finalized after the Methods and Assumptions document was published. It is our understanding that it is not a requirement of the project to select the alternative that reduces crashes the most. We have shown improvement over the No Action Alternative.

- ▶ **Statement:** Were there other alternatives that could have been chosen that did not make the project worse for operations and/or safety. Or is there anything the project will do to mitigate degraded operations and/or safety? Those are the big picture questions FHWA is asking now and that will need to have answers when we get to the IAJR.

FHU has pointed out several places where FHWA has made definitive statements about what we will and will not accept. There are more technical requirements and criteria and everything in our process, but that is the big picture of the IAJR.

Response: We believe that there is a balance between all the elements. Looking at the build (base) scenario, it shows that the fatal and injury predictive crashes improve over the No Action Alternative. The braided ramp has better operational benefits; however, is that a feasible alternative? FHU has been given the direction to focus on the fatal and injury crashes.

29 ROAD INTERCHANGE

Next Steps/Action Items

- ▶ FHU will submit the graphic to FHWA for the No Action Alternative that shows operations between the proposed 29 Road and I-70B/Clifton.

Decisions Made

- ▶ None at this time.

Schedule

- ▶ Due to Executive Director Lew's leave of absence, the goal is to present the project status at the TC Workshop in July 2025.
- ▶ Complete environmental tech memos (NEPA decision document will come later).
- ▶ Update the SLS following the preferred alternative selection.
- ▶ Complete conceptual design and the NEPA decision document (documented Categorical Exclusion or an Environmental Assessment).
- ▶ Initiate the IAJR.

Amanda Cushing

From: Bellen, Jeff (FHWA) <Jeff.Bellen@dot.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 1:47 PM
To: Alex.Pulley
Cc: Paul.Brown; Amanda.Cushing; kevin.king@mesacounty.us
Subject: RE: 29 Road / I-70 Interchange - Final Methods and Assumptions document

Hi Alex,
You addressed our comments so we have no further issues with the traffic analysis.

Jeff Bellen
Region 3 Area Engineer
Federal Highway Administration
12300 W. Dakota Ave.
Lakewood, CO 80228
(720) 963-3438
jeff.bellen@dot.gov

From: Alex.Pulley <Alex.Pulley@FHUENG.COM>
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2022 1:07 PM
To: Bellen, Jeff (FHWA) <Jeff.Bellen@dot.gov>
Cc: Paul.Brown <paul.brown@fhueng.com>; Amanda.Cushing <Amanda.Cushing@fhueng.com>; kevin.king@mesacounty.us
Subject: FW: 29 Road / I-70 Interchange - Final Methods and Assumptions document

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jeff,

I wanted to follow with you on whether or not FHWA had any additional comments on the Methods and Assumptions Document. We have received comments from CDOT and others, but wanted to make sure there are not any more we can expect. Getting this approval is important because we want to be sure that all parties are comfortable with the approach prior to collecting traffic counts.

Please don't hesitate to let us know if you have any questions.

Take care,
Alex



ALEX PULLEY, Certified Sr. Ecologist
Principal
office: 303.721.1440 x8943 cell: 303.601.0371

6400 S. Fiddlers Green Circle, Suite 1500,
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
alex.pulley@fhueng.com
www.fhueng.com

From: Paul.Brown <paul.brown@fhueng.com>
Sent: Friday, February 4, 2022 2:22 PM
To: Kevin King (kevin.king@mesacounty.us) <kevin.king@mesacounty.us>; Daniel Larkin <daniel.larkin@mesacounty.us>; Trent Prall <trentonp@gjcity.org> <trentonp@gjcity.org>; Eric Mocko <ericmock@gjcity.org>; Smith - CDOT, Jason <jasonc.smith@state.co.us>; zane.znamenacek@state.co.us; mark.bunnell@state.co.us; jeff.bellen@dot.gov; rachel.peterson@mesacounty.us
Cc: Alex.Pulley <Alex.Pulley@FHUENG.COM>; Amanda.Cushing <Amanda.Cushing@fhueng.com>
Subject: 29 Road / I-70 Interchange - Final Methods and Assumptions document

All –

FHU has finalized the Methods and Assumptions document for the 29 Road / I-70 Interchange 1601 / IAR effort based on comments received to date. Please see attached. We have also attached a copy of our comment resolution matrix that outlines comments received and our responses.

Please let us know if you have further comments by next Friday, February 11th. If we do not receive further input, we will assume that the M&A document is approved and we will proceed with our traffic work accordingly.

Thanks!

Paul



Paul F. Brown, P.E., PTOE

Associate

office: 303.721.1440 x8937

6400 S Fiddlers Green Circle, Suite 1500, Greenwood Village, CO 80111

paul.brown@fhueng.com

www.fhueng.com