

Meeting Summary

Date: June 10, 2025

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

Meeting Name: I-70/29 Road Draft State Transportation Commission Presentation

Meeting Date: June 9, 2025

Invitees:

Invitee	Organization	Attended?	Invitee	Organization	Attended?
Trent Prall	Grand Junction	X	Alex Pulley	FHU	X (virtual)
Scott Mai	Mesa County	X	Amanda Cushing	FHU	X (virtual)
Herman Stockinger	CDOT	X	Zane Znamenacek	CDOT	X
Jason Smith	CDOT	X			

This meeting was intended to be a presentation review prior to the project's status presentation to the State Transportation Commission (STC). The meeting slides, except for the background photograph in slide 13, have been previously presented during TAC meetings. Thus, the details that were included in the presentation are not shown in this summary; however, comments and discussion brought up during the presentation are included; discussion is denoted as [blue](#) text. Meeting materials can be found at the end of this meeting summary.

Meeting Goal:

Provide the Transportation Commission with an update on the 29 Road at I-70 Interchange Project.

Meeting Summary

Agenda:

- ▶ Why Now?
 - ▶▶ Request conditional approval to advance through 30% design and finalize NEPA
 - ▶▶ Utilize Congressional Directed Spending specified for Next Steps
 - ▶▶ Develop a refined cost estimate
 - ▶▶ Review of voter decisions on bond measure
 - ▶▶ Finalize TDM Plan
- ▶ Project Study Area
- ▶ History of the 29 Road Corridor
- ▶ Project Purpose and Need
- ▶ Activities Completed to Date
- ▶ Project Process
- ▶ Interchange and 29 Road Improvements
- ▶ Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Analysis

Questions/Discussion

Question: When was the SLS initially submitted to CDOT and FHWA?

Response: The SLS was submitted in early May 2024 and comments were received on May 23, 2024. Comments were addressed and a revised SLS was re-submitted in mid-July 2024 with comments received in mid-August 2024. Since the second submittal, the project team has held off on fully addressing the entirety of the second round of comments as CDOT has requested to address future congestion and safety on I-70. Types of mitigation have included the following:

- ▶ Adding an I-70 auxiliary lane
- ▶ Adding a Collector-Distributor (C-D) Road
- ▶ Expanding I-70 to six lanes

Meeting Summary

- ▶ Adding a braided ramp (this would add at least \$30 million to the project costs)
- ▶ Adding a braided ramp **with a Slip Lane** (this would add at least \$30 million to the project costs)
- ▶ Moving the interchange location as far east as possible

Additionally, the project team has prepared a benefit-cost analysis to compare the Build (Base) Alternative (the proposed interchange without an auxiliary lane), the No Action Alternative, and the Braided Ramp with a Slip Lane Alternative.

Question: What does the project team need to complete the SLS?

Response: The project must determine the Preferred Alternative that would be moved forward. If the Preferred Action includes a braided ramp with a slip lane, the location of the interchange would move to the west to help decrease project costs.

Statement: CDOT does not feel that operations and safety have been addressed.

Question: Is the Proposed Action less safe than the No Action Alternative?

Response: No, the project team has reviewed adding multiple safety countermeasures to the alternatives that reduces predicted fatal and injury crashes. Those safety measures include the following:

- ▶ Widening the I-70 inside shoulder
- ▶ Lowering the I-70 speed limit to match the design speed
- ▶ Adding enhanced warning signs with flashing beacons before drivers enter the I-70 curve
- ▶ Moving the proposed 29 Road interchange to the east
- ▶ Adding lighting on I-70
- ▶ Adding overhead signage

Request: CDOT would like the safety model inputs and outputs that demonstrates that the Proposed Action is safer than the No Build. CDOT will review the information within 30 days of receipt.

Meeting Summary

Response: FHU will submit the safety model inputs and outputs for CDOT to review.

Question: What does the project team need from the STC?

Response: The project team would like to have the “blessing” of the STC such as a letter of support from CDOT Region 3. This would allow the City and County to confidently utilize the Congressional Directed Spending grant money that has been received to advance the interchange project.

Request: Please submit the most recent SLS and the comment matrix for CDOT to review. CDOT will review within 30 days of receipt.

Response: FHU will submit the requested information.

Decisions Made

The project team will postpone the intended July presentation to the STC.

Next Steps

- ▶ FHU will submit the safety model output that shows the Base Alternative and Braided Ramp with Slip Lane Alternative have few fatal and injury crashes than the No Build Alternative.
- ▶ FHU will submit the most recent SLS and the comment matrix for CDOT to review. CDOT will review within 30 days of receipt.
- ▶ The people who attended this meeting will reconvene in July to discuss the reviewed documents.