

# MEETING NOTES



**Project:** Evergreen Lake North Trail – Phase 2 Planning Study

**Date and Time:** 05/07/2018 (3:30 pm to 4:30 pm)

**Subject:** Stakeholder Meeting #2

**Meeting Place:** CDOT, 425A Corporate Circle, Golden, CO 80401

## Participants:

- Bobby VanHorn (CDOT)
- Yelena Onnen (Jeffco T+E)
- Ellen O' Connor (EPRD)
- Stephen Harelson (CDOT)
- Brad Eckert (Denver Mountain Parks)
- Liz Cohen (EPRD)
- Jana Spiker (CDOT)
- Dave Lighthart (EMD)
- Chris Vogelsang (OV)
- Dean Dalvit (EV Studio)
- Brian Welch (EV Studio)
- Fernando Abbud (OV)

---

## Introduction

The purpose of the meeting was to update the stakeholder group with the input received during the Community Meeting #1, share with the group the progress on alternative development and screening as well as discuss the community meeting #2 preparation.

## Key Takeaways

- The stakeholder group was updated with the input from the community meeting #1. Highlights included the trail separation from vehicles as well as separation between pedestrians and bicycles.
- The stakeholder group was walked through the 5 system alternatives and their screening process. The five system alternatives include two decoupled systems, two coupled systems, and one hybrid. Decoupled means that the trail is for pedestrian use only and bicycled. Coupled means that there is on shared use trail to meet all user needs.
  - Decoupled Systems
    - (1) Bikes (road) & pedestrians (trail low)
    - (2) Bikes (road) & pedestrians (trail high)
  - Coupled Systems
    - (3) bikes/ped (trail low)
    - (4) bikes/ped (trail high)
  - Hybrid
    - (5) Bikes (trail high) & pedestrians (trail low)
- The screening criteria and approach were presented to the group. It was explained that the criteria was divided into three categories: system criteria (technical understanding), public criteria (community input) and constraints (fixed elements).
- It was explained that the hybrid system alternative was selected as the recommended alternative because it met the screening criteria the best of all five alternatives considered.

# MEETING NOTES



- The group discussed the possibilities of moving or replacing the guardrail to gain space for the trail.
  - CDOT stated that the option of using a wire rope safety fence in place of the guardrail would not meet the desired performance characteristics since it is designed to deflect to safely stop vehicles and therefore would not provide protection to an adjacent trail.
  - Based on the posted speed and design speed of this section of SH 74, installing 6" barrier curb would be an acceptable edge treatment for the roadway. Replacing the guardrail with curb and gutter is a viable option since this the design criteria for roads with a 30mph speed limit allows for a curb and gutter. This treatment could also match better with the downtown Evergreen character to the east.
  - The opportunities discussed for the space gained by replacing the guardrail with curb and gutter include a vertical separation (wood fence), some green space (amenity zone), signing and other trail or lake markers or ID elements.
- The segments and phasing options for the recommended alternative system were discussed:
  - Option 1 – Lowest Initial: segment B (phase one) and segments A+C,+D (phase two)
  - Option 2 – : segment A+B (phase one) and segments C+D (phase two)
  - Option 3 – : segments A+B+C+D (phase one)
  - We would like to construct the trail per Option 3 but are recommending Option 2 at this time due to timing, schedule, and funding constraints.
- Denver Mountain Parks mentioned the replacement of the upper trail in the same location and format as exists today would work better for the approval process. Yet, the lower trail, since it is a different trail, could require a different approval process that is not yet determined.
- Denver Mountain Parks mentioned that the upper trail replacement with new materials or aesthetics will require a management approval process.
- CDOT mentioned that if there is a curb and gutter without significant roadway widening, the upper trail should be a shared use path rather than having the bikes on the road.
- Jeffco mentioned the recommended alternative aligned with regional planning goals
- EMD would prefer asphalt against concrete for the material of the upper trail for maintenance ease. Removable sections are another possibility.
- Denver Mountain Parks discussed fishing opportunities and the importance of accommodate fisherman on the lower section. This area is a popular fishing area.
- The project will require a 3-way IGA between CCD/CDOT/EPRD as it moves forward.
- The group discussed funding source possibilities and requirements:
  - If there are any federal funds involved, PROWAG may need to be incorporated into the design of those elements.
  - In Option 3 of construction phasing, Phase two for the lower pedestrian only trail could be covered with other funding pools. For example, GOCO, water quality program from section 319 of CDPHE which is by watershed and a 4-year cycle.
  - TIP funding opportunities are divided into regional and local