

Boulder County Lower Fourmile Public Meeting – Notes by Nemovitz, Monks, McCarey – 07-28-15

Welcome by Gary

Ground rules

Emphasized 30% only

Made changes based on comments

“We will work through this together, though not everyone will get what they want:

Don't call things stupid, explain what doesn't work

Still in the process

Why we're here is major road damage

We're trying to prevent and reduce the likelihood it will happen again

Reviewed damaged areas which created North and South

Fourmile below Salina only, no Logan Mill

Rebuild road safely for our users

Restore road \$4-5 million to date but not engineered just putting back

We will lose road again with significant flood/water

Not doing project is not an option

Reviewed slides on purpose/goals/and previous comments

Trade-offs:

- Regulatory and getting funds reimbursed
- Don't argue about who pays for what now
- Trying very hard to not take any ROW but will need access
- ROW lines not clear
 - Design the best facility and work with individuals to make it work
- If people don't work with us, we will change and impact others “worse”
- Don't want to go through this again so need resiliency
- Trade-offs must happen
- Lots of things working together

Since 30%:

- 60% length reduction and 80% volume reduction in rock cuts
- Edge of pavement to rock wall measurement (clear zone)
- Rock catchment
- Colberson cut – minimal impacts
- No rock mesh unless a surprise is found during construction
- Working to further reduce rock cut
- Road width existing 11' lanes

- Reduced section dramatically from previous design
- Keep narrow where able
- 7' downhill clear zone to keep people out of creek
 - Reduce means guardrail
- Look at each location individually

Shoulder safety:

- No accidents, but lots of concerns about dangerous curves
- National research says tension is reduced with shoulder and place for bikes
- Road not dramatically different
- Moved to reduce impacts
- No flood impact can be done on any insurable structure
- Pros and cons of walls and rock cuts:
 - Walls worse for animals than cut
 - If creek is stabilized it will be rock riprap and covered in soil and re-vegetated
- Still refining design
- Historic is based on state
- Want to not impact iconic things either even though no state requirements
- CPW has no concerns
- Need homeowners help to use their property to make things go smoother
- BoCo does pay for use

Questions:

Valerie:

- Requests the road be put back to pre-flood
- Facts:
 - 2 significant floods in last 100 years
 - 1969 flood not catastrophic
- Question: county says no EIS required – why not?
 - Answer: We are following, and will continue to follow, all NEPA/FEMA regulations to the fullest extent.
- Process of blasting is like strip mining, very ugly
- Road is already reinforced against flood
- 19 trees removed? Not right
- Wildlife not yet impacted by OSMP, we need to protect the wildlife
- Improvements elsewhere in Boulder were all destroyed and not resilient
- Colorado Department of Natural Resources?
 - Where can we get this information that says we don't need the study, and what will be done?

Vermillion:

- Strongly feels that current road is not safe, rock cut is okay
 - Knocked handles off doors on old canyon walls
 - It is unsafe when there are large trucks!

- Do you want your kids to drive that road?
- Grandparents to drive?
- More bikes will come no matter what
- Wants 4' shoulder
- Wants pullouts for slower vehicles

Kristin, 6400 Fourmile

- What about rest of Fourmile – Boulder County just doesn't get it?
 - Answer: Will do repairs to all damaged areas only
- Are walls same as Jersey barriers?
 - Answer: No, jersey barriers are above the road, walls are below the road
- Why not back to pre-flood?
 - Answer: Drainage, resiliency, increased safety

Caroline, 1 mile up Fourmile

- Why safety concern now – its' been a year for temp paving, not mowed
 - Answer: Because we need to repair roads, and we have one chance now

Steve Johnson

- 4' shoulder is excessive, why not full 5 miles @ 18"-24"? You could even add a 4' pullout for passing at particular locations where damage would be limited/avoided

Unknown

- Rock mesh – do we need it or not?

Unknown

- Why don't we have to follow your own regs for floodplain development?
 - Answer: We do meet all floodplain regs

Beebe

- County says they have 60' ROW – where is that written?
- The 60' ROW is not consistent with current conditions (i.e. existing structures that were permitted through Boulder County throughout the years)
- 60' ROW only from 1896 statue along section line
- Disagrees that this is not a safe road
 - Never had a car/bike accident

David Gatten

- Not happy with plans, major flaws
 1. Safety – this will be less safe. Not compliant with multi-modal standards. Cyclists and cars actually safer if made closer together
 2. Meets 5 of 6 reasons not to apply multimodal
 3. Environmental damage, violation of Endangered Species Act with the Prebbles Jumping Mouse. 19 tree removals is preposterous, more like 900. Floodplain approvals with land-use requirements.
 4. Careful use in current condition it will be safe

5. Fiscally irresponsible. Assessor's office says rocks included in valuation of homes. Daily Camarea quote says millions of dollars spent for each rain – ridiculous.
6. Two major swaths of destruction. Rock destruction damages the canyon. Resiliency is just a buzz word, no real meaning.

Woody Eaton

- Sunshine Canyon is way worse than Fourmile, why spend money here when money could go to Sunshine or Fourmile?
- Fourmile is easy to bike comparatively

Mike, on Wall St. since 1980

- Widening not safer – bikes can use road
- Can't believe retaining walls are being considered

Paul Fisher

- Chooses Fourmile over Sunshine because it's better/safer
- Safety issues are due to unsafe driving, not the road
- Why is ROW on the table?
- Why is bike lane needed?
- What is the true agenda of this project? It's not the canyon. Doesn't feel like county has best interest
- Don't turn it into Boulder Parks, it belongs to the homeowners
 - Answer: No plans for a bike park

3075 Fourmile

- Drives big truck and has no issues
- How many more bikes do we expect if shoulders widened?
 - Answer: Number of bikes expected to increase no matter what
- Who relocates utilities?
 - Answer: Boulder County

Dave Mitchell

- Widening not done in Lefthand due to public feedback– why won't the County listen to the owners now?

Ana Koepke

- Why so much concern given to bike lane?
- Why not give in to people's comments?

Carrie

- Rides a bike and doesn't need a bike lane
- No safety concerns with canyon as is
- Don't mind being behind cyclists going up the hill

Lori Maghess

- Lane won't help

Donna Jean

- No walls blasted needed
- Concerned this is just the beginning, conspiracy
- Surveyors not allowed on her property
- What is your intent and when will we know?
 - Answer: Intent is to restore flood-damaged road. Next 2 years will finish construction.

Carrol, 3644 Fourmile

- Why aren't bikes licensed? Bikers in canyon are a nuisance
 - Bikers peeing and worse on side of road
 - Majority of bikes don't care about the canyon
 - 22 group the other day
 - They get everything in county and city

Unknown

- Improving bike lanes, previously told no bikes in Salina, county can't be trusted
- Road is functional today as is
- Money should go to Gold Run, not here
- Impacts haven't been minimized
- Why was Sunshine given choice to repair and Fourmile wasn't? Different choice for different canyon?
- Residents not being given more voice, not people who don't live in canyon

Unknown

- Likes the idea of emergency pull-out
- What about residents parking – will they lose parking ability?
 - Answer: Work with owners
- What is expected of family displacement?
 - Answer: Shouldn't be a significant impact, and we'll work with homeowners
- Won't rock fall without blasting?
- Can county do staking/marketing of rock excavations in the field for visualization of removals?
- Is there a point to this meeting? Where do we go from here?
 - Answer: Boulder County will take consideration and apply them; plans will be revised even more; meeting with independent property owners. Recording comments and will re-evaluate, will minimize impacts.
- Need different mailing strategy for elderly without e-mail

Molly

- Dog walker, completely happy with current conditions
- Road construction is least safe
- No more construction

Todd Short

- Can improvements be made without impacts?

- Answer: No
- Providing more access safety/widening will cause more speeding
- Is there a way to fix floodplain without widening road?
 - Answer: It is a challenge

Unknown

- FEMA funding is for in-kind replacement only, not for improving multi-modal
 - Answer: Previously intended use
- Better to raise road rather than widen, resiliency rather than capacity
- Repair road so that it's safe from flood. Why spend money when it's already safe?
- Use boulders instead of retaining walls
- Why can't this go to a vote to all Boulder County residents?
- Why can't Boulder County find a better way to get to the two major parks (singletrack offroad)
- Can there be an alternative path for the bikes on public lands?

Jim

- Why start bike lane at project and neglect first mile? There will be more cyclists on first mile of canyon but no improvements. That will make it more dangerous in that section.

Unknown

- What is ROW process for this project?
- Does the county consider themselves to have a 60' ROW?
 - Answer: County will work with homeowners
- What is county's long-term plan? Residents don't have much say, apparently.
- County does what it wants

Andrea Borruta

- County has been lying from the beginning
 - George said no plans to add shoulder but Master Plan map shows planned bike lanes
 - We can make flooding better by not widening
 - Lying about safety because accident data shows no history in these stretches
 - Don't believe anything the county tells you
- It's going to make canyon more dangerous, prove it's safer.

Unknown

- Priority:
 - Why is Lower Fourmile higher priority than Gold Run?
 - Why is Lower Fourmile higher priority than Upper Fourmile?
 - Misplaced use of resources

Michelle Granger

- No cyclists are asking for this
- 4' is bad because bikers will just take advantage of more space, ride side by side
- 1' shoulder downhill is a waste
 - Answer: No intention for bikes to use the 1' shoulder

- Rebuttal: Be careful on wording, don't say it's for bikes or not
- Doesn't want impacts to county

AJ Grant

- Not canyon resident but doesn't want impacts
- Works in public process, says this public process needs improvement
- Went to website, not OK to not have info on site.
 - Answer: PowerPoint on website will be emailed out
- Recommends recording meetings
- Boulder County needs to provide better definition of timing and who makes decisions

General Audience

- Can we simply put road back?
- Better to use money for future repairs
 - Answer: No, FEMA money can't be banked
- Resiliency is wrong to say since flood would have destroyed current design