



Public Meeting #1 Summary

The first public meeting, also known as a public scoping meeting, was held on Wednesday, October 3, 2007 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the Town of Parachute Town Hall. The meeting was attended by members of the project team, including representatives from the Town of Parachute, the Colorado Department of Transportation, and the consulting team. Twenty-six members of the public signed-in for the meeting. The meeting was held in an open house format. No formal presentation was given. Members of the public were invited to ask questions and discuss concerns with project representatives.

The following graphics were displayed at the meeting:

- ▶ Welcome
- ▶ Purpose of Tonight's Meeting
- ▶ DRAFT Purpose and Need
- ▶ Regional Map
- ▶ Project Study Area
- ▶ Project Schedule
- ▶ How Can You get Involved?
- ▶ What is an Environmental Assessment (EA)?
- ▶ Environmental Assessment Process
- ▶ Contents of an Environmental Assessment
- ▶ CDOT Policy Directive 1601
- ▶ Initial Interchange Ideas
- ▶ Potential Environmental Issues
- ▶ DRAFT Evaluation Criteria
- ▶ Please Give Us Your Comments
- ▶ What's Next?
- ▶ Thank You

These graphics are available to view on the project web site:
www.ParachuteWestInterchange.com.



Public Meeting #1 Summary

2 of 3

Eight comment sheets were turned-in at the meeting. Below are the comments that were made about the project:

1. We need it, the sooner the better. We live where the main street and road to DeBeque are Watson and 1st. There is a lot of truck as well as car traffic. However I feel, men need to make a living for their families just like we did in the 70's when my husband worked water projects, the Dillon Dam and the Eisenhower Tunnel. I also think CDOT does a good job and we have a good system in Colorado, compared to other states.
2. Project is definitely needed for Alternate access to I-70 for Battlement Mesa, Medical emergencies and fire and rescue efforts. On/off access in both directions needed. Adjacent multi-use trail is desirable for existing bicyclists and for future Lova trails projects.
3. If the bypass goes in before an interchange, how does that affect traffic coming east? Do they get off at DeBeque interchange? If so, is there plans to do anything there? It is already pretty busy. The trucks would have to access Highway 6 from there. With the proposed evaporation ponds and Roan Plateau drilling we will become just like the current situation here in Parachute except it would be almost instant!

Also, if there is an interchange before a bypass what happens at the intersection of First and County Road 250? Will there be a light or round about? That would just transfer traffic backups over there.

4. I understand it was part of Battlement Mesa's agreement with the county that the Company (Battlement Mesa) would eventually provide a second access out west that would access the west overpass and eventual interchange Battlement Mesa's feet should be held to the fire on that agreement with inclusion of a bridge over the railroad and river at that narrow point where the river is close to the west interchange. The studies should not go foreword without inclusion of a bridge connection to Battlement Mesa and all of this should be done in the immediate studies not as an eventual after thought.
 5. Battlement mesa needs to be held accountable for the short stretch of road (2 lanes from the waterfall to the bridge) The talk is of accidents on the I-70 Railroad overpass, back up on the I-70 etc. but what about that stretch of road. A bad access there completely denies access events to the bridge let alone to the north side of the river. There is no side wall. My nephew almost blind has had to walk that road. There are drop offs on the new pavement. This need to be dealt with.
 6. I am a 100% behind this project as an emergency response agency. Access on and off the interstate has always been a concern of our residents. With the addition of this interchange, especially on and of bound access from West side of interchange, access on and off for regular Town and Battlement traffic could be reduced. Other things have to happen as well, i.e. lights, round-about at the main interchange, the completion of Parachute Park Boulevard and at some time the extension of Cardinal way (formerly south Frontage Road).
-



Public Meeting #1 Summary

3 of 3

Another public education piece is that just because this group is pushing this issue ahead, there is no guarantee of funding, but not going ahead guarantee no funding! If the Grand Valley Fire Protection District can be of any help please contact me.

7. Keep on and off ramps simple so trucks/vehicles can move through easily and quickly. Purpose and Needs seem complete. This project needs to be put on the "fast track".
8. Parachute is in desperate need of traffic improvements. With only one exit, no traffic signals, you can wait as much as 30 minutes to make a left. Amount of traffic generated by gas fields is an extreme problem getting to main street. Dust and gravel from trucks impacts quality of life. Lived here 37 years, historic resources will not be impacted by project, nor wetlands; wildlife and vegetation have been impacted by oil and gas, hazmat is on US-6 in tankers. No visual effects anticipated. Growth can't be accommodated by current road system. Immediate need for traffic signal (no-round-a-bout!) at existing interchange. Parachute park bypass would be very beneficial for the Town, and would have no impacts (negative).

All input received at the meeting, including the comments above, will be considered to help understand local issues, to develop the alternatives, and to evaluate the alternatives.
