

September 3, 2014 Public Meeting Comments and Responses						
Comment No.	Comment	Comment By	Date Received	Details	Response	Date Responded
1	Walls should look aesthetically pleasing. The increase in safety is good, but make the walls/barrier look nice.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Aesthetic decisions have not yet been made. This comment will be taken into account when aesthetics are considered.	
2	The gentleman who lives at 853 Fourmile asked how the limits of the south section were determined. He believes the limits should go to his house as there was severe flood damage in front of it. The road went from 58' wide to 22' wide in front of his house, and the stream increased in depth as measured from the top of the road from 11' to 15'. He can't permit his bridge until the road improvements are determined. He moved dirt into place in front of his house with a bobcat for parking.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	This project is addressing damage to Boulder County infrastructure. It was determined early on the infrastructure was not affected in this area. Infrastructure damage was determined by Boulder County by performing a site walkthrough after the flooding.	
3	There were concerns about how widening the road will affect bike use. Two residents in the area (don't believe they live on Fourmile, but they use it as bikers) have concerns that non-technical bikers will be encouraged to use this road if it's made safer for bikers. These residents also had the following comments:	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Boulder County Multimodal Transportation (BCMT) Standards dated July 1, 2012 call for 4' bikeable shoulders and 11' lanes on Collectors, and Fourmile Canyon Road is a Collector. Due to the mountainous area, we are providing only an uphill 4' shoulder as presented in 5.3.1.4.b of BCMT. Transitions to and from the proposed typical section will be evaluated for safety.	
3a	Concerned that only biker user groups' voices are being heard; not everyone wants a bike lane. The residents on Fourmile were mentioned as those who may not want a bike lane.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Boulder County Multimodal Transportation (BCMT) Standards dated July 1, 2012 call for 4' bikeable shoulders and 11' lanes on Collectors, and Fourmile Canyon Road is a Collector. Due to the mountainous area, we are providing only an uphill 4' shoulder as presented in 5.3.1.4.b of BCMT. Transitions to and from the proposed typical section will be evaluated for safety.	
3b	Concerned that widening the road will increase use and affect the privacy of those who live along Fourmile.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Based on current Boulder County Standards, and current standards set forth by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), this road is being evaluated for safety.	
4	The gentleman who lives at 4451 Fourmile has concerns about where the toes are shown in front of his house. It appears the toes would block his front door. He has a berm he created in front of his house in between his fence and the road, and he has concerns that his house won't be protected from flooding if we take out this berm. He also has sand bags he installed in 2010 that kept his garage from filling with mud in the most recent flood. He would like both the berm and sand bags to stay intact. He also has concerns about the prescriptive ROW and expressed that he and other residents would be very upset about their land being taken.	Robert Beebe	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Noted. The design is in a preliminary phase and existing roadway features are not currently collected for design. Your comments will be taken into account once existing roadway features are collected. If impacts to your defenses are required, alternative mitigation measures will be provided in accordance with Boulder County Drainage Criteria. Refer to the response to Comment 3b for roadway widening explanations. The preliminary roadway design was updated to shift the road away from your house to get as far away as possible from the flood defenses.	
5	The gentleman who lives at 4472 Fourmile mentioned he gets his water from a significant gulch that runs by his house. He has concerns that water will just flow across the road from the gulch.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	This gulch will be considered during drainage design.	
6	Many comments that barrier would be unattractive along the road and that barrier would change the roads character.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Concrete barrier has been removed from the preliminary roadway design everywhere where possible. Moving forward in design, concrete barrier and metal railing guardrail will be limited as much as possible; however, there will be areas where it is required for safety.	
7	One resident requested that this information be posted online. It was too much information to digest at once.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Boulder County will consider posting information online.	
8	There was a comment that a lot more bikers have started using Fourmile since Left Hand was shut down.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Noted. Boulder County Multimodal Transportation (BCMT) Standards dated July 1, 2012 call for 4' bikeable shoulders and 11' lanes on Collectors, and Fourmile Canyon Road is a Collector. Due to the mountainous area, we are providing only an uphill 4' shoulder as presented in 5.3.1.4.b of BCMT. Transitions to and from the proposed typical section will be evaluated for safety.	
9	One person commented that the crushed concrete installed by the County (mentioned during the general question session) is located near 4451/4472 Fourmile. This person also had the following comments:	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation		
9a	He liked where the north fire truck bump out was.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Noted.	
9b	He is a competitive biker and wanted horizontal curves to be increased when possible to make it easier for biking.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Curves within the project limits will be reviewed against appropriate engineering guidelines and codes to determine whether sufficient sight distance is met for cars or if curve adjustments are needed to provide sufficient sight distance. Improvements will be made where possible.	
9c	Can a tangent section be placed instead of a curve from about 133+00 to 136+00? This might be easier for bikers.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	The preliminary roadway design was updated to place a tangent section between the requested stations. It should be noted that the adjacent curves no longer meet the 200' horizontal curve length minimum criteria as noted in the Boulder County Multimodal Standards dated July 1, 2012, section 5.3.3.1.c, but it has been determined that this redesign is still an overall improvement.	
9d	There is an old train depot at about 102+00 on the stream side that was covered up by the mine tailings.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	FEMA and Boulder County are identifying and evaluating cultural resources as part of environmental reviews for this project. Environmental reviews will be completed in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act and National Historic Preservation Act requirements. The design team will consider the depot and potential impacts to the property as the project advances.	

9e	There are many trees with exposed roots near Salina Junction. These will easily fall down if disturbed.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Noted. Impacts to vegetation will be minimized in coordination with factors and considerations.
9f	There are many trees in the vicinity of 141+00 to 144+00 that were damaged by fire and the flooding that should be cut.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	
10	Several comments that the bike lane is not favored.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Boulder County Multimodal Transportation (BCMT) Standards dated July 1, 2012 call for 4' bikeable shoulders and 11' lanes on Collectors, and Fourmile Canyon Road is a Collector. Due to the mountainous area, we are providing only an uphill 4' shoulder as presented in 5.3.1.4.b of BCMT. Transitions to and from the proposed typical section will be evaluated for safety.
11	Consider a roundabout at Salina Junction	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	A roundabout is not feasible because there isn't enough room without impacting properties.
12	A representative from the Fire Department made the following comments: Consider an additional shoulder/emergency turn-out near stations 206/207/208. Consider a creek side pull off option.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Staging areas will be considered and evaluated with the fire department and Boulder County as design progresses. Three staging areas where requested are currently included in the preliminary design.
12a	Can the guardrail be offset/overlapped to give pedestrians/bears breaks?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Proposed guardrail runs aren't considered long enough to necessitate breaks. The current typical section provides 3' between the edge of pavement and the face of the barrier/guardrail on the creek side.
12b	Concerns about blocking natural paths for the following animals: Bears, deer, black foxes, squirrels, lynx, fish, and yellow bellied marmot. Foxes are present in the south segment of the project.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Proposed guardrail runs aren't considered long enough to necessitate breaks. The current typical section provides 3' between the edge of pavement and the face of the barrier/guardrail on the creek side. The environmental team will review impacts to the post-flood aquatic and riparian environment, when necessary.
12c	Concerns about salt and water quality.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Treatment of drainage is not required in this area based upon the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment Water Quality Control Commission Regulation No. 61.
12d	Not interested in increased bike traffic. Doesn't believe there is a safety concern for pedestrians and bicyclists.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Boulder County Multimodal Transportation (BCMT) Standards dated July 1, 2012 call for 4' bikeable shoulders and 11' lanes on Collectors, and Fourmile Canyon Road is a Collector. Due to the mountainous area, we are providing only an uphill 4' shoulder as presented in 5.3.1.4.b of BCMT. Transitions to and from the proposed typical section will be evaluated for safety.
13	Context sensitivity is important. Don't urbanize the corridor.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Noted.
14	Consider that the vegetation in spring/summer decreases visibility; suggested keeping the vegetation trimmed back.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	This is a Boulder County Maintenance issue to address.
15	Peekar Gulch took out Logan Mill Bridge, not Fourmile Creek.	Chuck Gray	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Logan Mill Bridge will take into consideration the entire Fourmile Canyon Basin.
16	Restore the road and refrain from adding to it.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - after the main presentation	Based on current Boulder County Standards, and current standards set forth by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), this road is being evaluated for safety.
17	Is the County widening the entire roadway for bikes, or just in certain sections?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the general question session just after the main presentation. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document.	This project is addressing damage to Boulder County infrastructure. Infrastructure damage was determined by Boulder County by performing a site walkthrough after the flooding. Boulder County Multimodal Transportation (BCMT) Standards dated July 1, 2012 call for 4' bikeable shoulders and 11' lanes on Collectors, and Fourmile Canyon Road is a Collector. Due to the mountainous area, we are providing only an uphill 4' shoulder as presented in 5.3.1.4.b of BCMT. Transitions to and from the proposed typical section will be evaluated for safety.
18	Are there plans to increase culvert size where culverts were clogged during the flood?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the general question session just after the main presentation. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document.	Hydraulic analysis will accompany the roadway design within the limits of the flood damaged areas to determine whether culverts are properly sized and what their sizes should be if they're not.
19	Is the County going to remove the concrete fill used to shore up the roads?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the general question session just after the main presentation. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document.	
20	What is the plan for widening the road, given current right of way?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the general question session just after the main presentation. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document.	ROW impacts are being evaluated and will be minimized.
21	Is the roadway plan only for the two sections on the presentation map?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the general question session just after the main presentation. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document.	Correct. This project is addressing damage to Boulder County infrastructure. Infrastructure damage was determined by Boulder County by performing a site walkthrough after the flooding.

22	What is the purpose of the new walls along the road, and how high will they be? What type of walls are being considered and for where? How far along is the planning?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the general question session just after the main presentation. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document.	The purpose of the new walls include the following: Protecting private property, protecting the stream, avoiding fill into the stream, avoiding cut into property. Wall height has not yet been determined. The height will be determined based on the location of the road as compared with property or stream locations adjacent to the road. Wall types have not yet been selected. The locations of walls considered in the preliminary design are shown on the roadway scroll plots. Roadway design is preliminary at this point.
23	Does the roadway project have a website? Where/how can people get more information and/or provide more input?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the general question session just after the main presentation. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document.	Boulder County will consider posting information online.
24	Will trees be cut down for roadway improvements?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the general question session just after the main presentation. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document.	Noted. Impacts to vegetation will be minimized in coordination with factors and considerations.
25	How are the roadway segments being prioritized?	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the general question session just after the main presentation. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document.	This project is addressing damage to Boulder County infrastructure. Infrastructure damage was determined by Boulder County by performing a site walkthrough after the flooding. This is being considered as a single project; other flood damaged areas have been broken out into separate projects. Priorities are established based upon need and ability to move forward with the project.
26	Need to ensure Poorman Road is secure during future floods, as it was the only access to town during the flood.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 1 (Boulder Canyon to Poorman Road).	This project is addressing damage to Boulder County infrastructure. It was determined early on the infrastructure was not affected in this area. Infrastructure damage was determined by Boulder County by performing a site walkthrough after the flooding.
27	Need clarity on when residents should try to get permits for construction of private bridges in order to coordinate with road reconstruction.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 1 (Boulder Canyon to Poorman Road).	
28	Road shoulders/bike lane: consider safety for bikes and visibility issues.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 1 (Boulder Canyon to Poorman Road).	Boulder County Multimodal Transportation (BCMT) Standards dated July 1, 2012 call for 4' bikeable shoulders and 11' lanes on Collectors, and Fourmile Canyon Road is a Collector. Due to the mountainous area, we are providing only an uphill 4' shoulder as presented in 5.3.1.4.b of BCMT. Transitions to and from the proposed typical section will be evaluated for safety. Curves within the project limits will be reviewed against appropriate engineering guidelines and codes to determine whether sufficient sight distance is met for cars or if curve adjustments are needed to provide sufficient sight distance. Improvements will be made where possible.
29	Safety issues: road speed.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 1 (Boulder Canyon to Poorman Road).	The design speed for this project is 25 mph and a minimum of 20 mph on curves.
30	Bike shoulder design – need to ensure residents are helping to inform decisions.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 2 (Poorman Road to Mile Marker 4).	Boulder County Multimodal Transportation (BCMT) Standards dated July 1, 2012 call for 4' bikeable shoulders and 11' lanes on Collectors, and Fourmile Canyon Road is a Collector. Due to the mountainous area, we are providing only an uphill 4' shoulder as presented in 5.3.1.4.b of BCMT. Transitions to and from the proposed typical section will be evaluated for safety.
31	Concerns/questions about impacts on existing emergency access route.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 2 (Poorman Road to Mile Marker 4).	
32	Need to address road stabilization issues.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 3 (Mile Marker 4 to 5 & Gold Run from Salina Junction to Summerville).	Noted. A temporary paving project was implemented to minimize safety and dust issues and to be a placeholder until permanent solutions can be reached. Other projects are in place to address road stabilization outside of the project limits.

33	Don't allow road improvements to destroy natural characteristics of the area.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 3 (Mile Marker 4 to 5 & Gold Run from Salina Junction to Summerville).	Noted.	
34	Road west of junction needs more of a meander, more vegetation.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 3 (Mile Marker 4 to 5 & Gold Run from Salina Junction to Summerville).	Noted.	
35	Concern that the junction will be too much hardscape – want more vegetation and natural look.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 3 (Mile Marker 4 to 5 & Gold Run from Salina Junction to Summerville).	Noted. Impacts to vegetation will be minimized in coordination with factors and considerations.	
36	There is a spring that comes up on the road.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 3 (Mile Marker 4 to 5 & Gold Run from Salina Junction to Summerville).	This will be considered during drainage design.	
37	Hope that road design will address how individual accesses meet the road.	N/A	9/3/2014	Received at 9/3/2014 Public Meeting - during the small group discussions. Note the watershed questions received are not answered in this document. This question was about Reach 3 (Mile Marker 4 to 5 & Gold Run from Salina Junction to Summerville).	The roadway design will work to match existing, but final access tie ins are the responsibility of homeowners.	