

Public Meeting #1 Summary of Comments

The first public meeting for the 29 Road Interchange at I-70 Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study was held on February 28, 2019 at the Faith Heights Church in Grand Junction. This meeting was held from 4:00 – 6:00 PM in an open house format, with no formal presentation. Attendees were invited to learn about the study and give input regarding existing conditions. Approximately 125 members of the public attended the meeting.

To advertise the meeting, a postcard mailer was sent to nearly 3,000 property owners in the area, a news release was sent to the project email list and local media outlets, advertised on KREX news, and local agency partners distributed information on their websites, to their email list serves, and through social media.

Following is a summary of comments submitted from the beginning of the project through March 31, 2019. Comments were compiled from various sources, including those submitted via email and the project web page surrounding the meeting, and on comment forms and project team member notepads during the meeting.

Do you agree with the draft project Purpose and Need elements? What do you think the purpose of a new 29 Road interchange and any other transportation improvements recommended by this study should be?

Project Support

- I agree with the draft project purpose and need elements.
- I am in favor of building an interstate interchange at 29 Road. Let's build it!
- Build it.
- It is a needed change.
- Please complete this project. It has been needed for years.
- I definitely agree! This project is LONG OVERDUE. We need a new connection to I-70.
- I'm not opposed to it.
- I'm excited by the potential for improved convenience of access, not only to I-70 but also for sidewalks, bike paths along 29 Road.
- Yes. Yes. Widen and streamline 29 Road.
- Overall, I think a new interchange would be positive and help with access and traffic flow.
- I'd like to see it happen soon!
- Get it done.
- Hope project moves forward.

- Build it and people will travel more effective.
- It looks very promising — have to see how the plans develop.
- After attending the Public Meeting #1 Overview, it was educational to learn the master plan of the intersection project. Having lived in Grand Junction my entire life, it is a project that is desperately needed and a long time coming. Knowing that funding is always a major hurdle, it should be made clear to the parties involved for the funding options how important this project is to the future of the Grand Junction area and the positive impact it will have for future growth and economic development.
- We need this interchange. It's right in the middle of Grand Junction and would make it so much more convenient get to North Avenue to get to Orchard Mesa to get to Highway 50. I vote Yes to a 29 Road interchange.
- The need for a route connecting I-70 to Highway 50 has been an existence since the 60's. This project has been begged for for decades. At this point, with the eastern side of Grand Junction needing revitalization before it totally dries up, the need for 29 Road connection with I-70 is even more crucial. Completion of a 29 Road connection with I-70 will bring much need commerce into the area, increased tourism traffic, increased consumers headed towards points south on Hwy 50 and more efficient traffic flow north and south. Please do everything possible to make this long needed addition a reality.
- I am very excited that planning has FINALLY commenced for the 29 Road link to I-70! I live on the south side of Patterson just west of 29 Road, and I work on Horizon Drive. Turning left into heavy traffic on Patterson Road every day is difficult and dangerous! It would make life so much easier and less stressful if I could turn right onto Patterson and then left at the traffic light on 29 Road and be able to access I-70 to get to work on Horizon Drive. I wish this had been done decades ago!
- I like the idea of a 29 Road interchange at I-70 as long as residents who live in that area have all their concerns addressed. Growth is inevitable in our valley and access to 6 & 50 to Delta via 29 Road would be a boon to many. Along with other pro reasons for the development, I would hope it might bring more interest in revitalizing North Avenue east of 12th Street by having more business interest in that area. Right now it seems to be the forgotten child in the city.
- What a relief to receive a card in the mail about the 29 Road Interchange with I-70. This 29 Road and I-70 interchange has been sorely needed by the citizens of Mesa County and ALL TRAVELERS needing direct access from I-70 & 29 Road to Fruitvale, North Avenue, the Walmart area shopping, Orchard Mesa, and of course, Hwy 50 south to Delta/Montrose and beyond. Frankly, I'm very surprised that this project was not completed at least fifteen years ago! It's been obvious that this is a NEEDED exit from I-70 to service many thousands of locals and visitors to the Western Slope. With its completion, the use of the bridge on 29 Road over the Colorado River will see the increased use for which it was built. After completion, the savings in time, fuel, and yes, patience, would be HUGE. We cannot say strongly enough that this project should be put on the fast-track much sooner than later.
- I fully support the proposed 29 Road interchange. If approved, it will not only provide an additional link to I-70, but encourage economic growth. Businesses can take advantage of the undeveloped land north of the interstate paving way for future growth for the city. As a resident

who has to get around through Patterson Road to access I-70 via the business loop, having a 29 Road interchange would help me reduce 10 minutes of travel time. Furthermore, even after the construction of the 29 Road interchange, I presume the majority of commuters traveling west from Palisade will frequently still use the I-70B Clifton exit as a means to reach Highway 50. However, commuters traveling east from Horizon Drive in addition to many residents and tourists coming from GJ regional airport, will realize the benefit of a direct route to Hwy 50 from 29 Road interchange, which saves travel time, instead of long way detours via Hwy 50 GJ exit, or I-70B Clifton exit.

- Agree - would improve Matchett Park & Rec Center access off I-70 and take pressure off Patterson Road and Horizon Drive.
- It would reduce traffic on Horizon Drive and 27 ½ Road and provide direct access to I-70B and Highway 50.
- The city of Grand Junction needs to prepare for its future growth and transportation is key to that overall need. We know the city will continue to grow. We don't know where the millions of people living on our three coasts who will be displaced as the seas rise will want to live but all inland cities like Grand Junction need to prepare. So my take is that the purpose of the new 29 Road Interchange must be to prepare for increased volumes of transportation. I commend the results of this study.
- To save energy moving traffic from point A to point B. Today we burn a tremendous amount of energy. Stop and go. Example: before when we stopped at a stop light and we wanted to turn right we had to wait for the light to turn green. Now we can turn right on red.
- The existing conditions seem to strongly confirm the need for the project. The potential issues, if any, are not immediately obvious to a layman like me.
- As our airport connects with more cities directly the traffic volumes in and out of the airport will grow rapidly. Several main arteries are already stressed with airport traffic and the new road into the airport is an essential need. This new airport artery is a brilliant addition and is a tribute to those who proposed it.

Residential Impact Concerns

Traffic Impacts

- What is projected increase of highway traffic count on 29 Road south North Avenue? There is a lot of residential impact. Access to Hwy 50 is already available on Exit 37.
- Looks like traffic on N. 29 Road (north of F 1/2 Road) will increase from 500 to 26,000 cars per day. Residents off Brodick Road will not be able to get out of their neighborhood and onto 29 Road with this amount of cars. There is no other way (at this time) to get out of this neighborhood. Cars at stop signs at F 1/2 Road would also have a tough time trying to get onto 29 Road.
- When the interchange is in, the area to the north will expand causing a lot of truck traffic on the residential area of 29 Road.
- Concern that this project will bring increased traffic to the area where people are walking in the neighborhoods.

- It is going to cause too much noise.
- Noise will be an issue.
- We have a house on 29 1/2 Road. It is a nice country road where people enjoy the quiet and walk their dogs. I'm concerned what new traffic and noise impact might be with the new interchange and would like to see the traffic study impact to include 29 1/2 Road. Thanks.
- Some impact from extra traffic but I think we can live with it.
- I heard comments from other attendees regarding traffic and noise — increased traffic, more noise. The project will affect 29 Road residences.
- I already know that I cannot stop this project, but needs to have some way to slow people down also. Too many people use it as a race track to get to the desert already.

Right of Way

- I would like to know if/how much they plan to widen the street? We have a gravel area in front of our house that I am sure they are going to take some of it for this project.
- Concern regarding the amount of room 29 Road improvements would require and encroachment into yards.
- Will 29 Road be widened onto my property? Will there be barriers put up for traffic noise?

Property Values

- I was wondering if there will be any study on the impact of residential property values for the homes in the study area.
- As a property owner who backs up to 29 Road I have a serious concern in regards to the loss of value to a home I have owned for 20+ years. What is the plan to compensate those who will lose value with the increase in traffic?

Multiple Concerns/Other

- I question the need for this project given that the Clifton exit is 2 miles or so east and also connects directly to Hwy 50. I appreciate what's been built so far on 29 Road, but if it's designed to be a major thoroughfare why wasn't it designed to be a 4-lane road rather than 2 lanes? From Patterson north to I-70 I don't see how it's possible to have 4 lanes and so you have a high volume of traffic, including trucks, going through a 2 lane residential area. I know this has been in the planning stages for a number of years, but I don't see that you've done any planning for what the effects of this project might be for residents along 29 Road. Unless I get much better information I'm opposed to this project.
- Living on 29 Road, I would like to see more about what is being done to protect my home value, sound issues, traffic coming through my front yard, etc.
- I think it makes sense but living on 29 Road makes me very nervous.
- I feel that there is no consideration for residents who want a quiet neighborhood to live and raise children.
- An interchange will bring thieves, vandals and transients into the neighborhoods along 29 Road.

Please share your thoughts regarding existing conditions and/or issues in the project study area.

- I live near [info redacted] Patterson and Partee, one block from 29 Road and I have been waiting years for this project that started at Highway 50 to be finished. I look forward to this being completed. Traffic on my residential street has been impacted only because traffic cannot turn east onto Patterson without going to the 29 Road exit so they make a u-turn on Partee. Please take into account the amount of traffic on 29 Road and change the light for north and south traffic so that it stays green longer. That actually needs to occur now.
- Patterson very busy. 29 Road moderately busy. Project long overdue.
- Has the new residential area east of 29 Road been considered?

School Concerns

- I am concerned about the school that is on 29 Road. My house faces 29 Road and my address looks like it would have a 29 Road address. I would like to make sure there are going to be sidewalks from at least the school to Patterson Road. I see kids walking on the street all the time and I am afraid someone is going to get ran over.
- I was unable to make the public meeting, but I am concerned about the volume of traffic and the effect on subdivisions along 29 Road. Most subdivisions do not have a second exit onto Patterson. In the morning and afternoon the traffic is very congested with parents shuttling their children to the Charter school near the canal. It is very difficult during those time to enter 29 Road. When the traffic accessing I-70 is added to this school traffic it will be impossible for the residents to access 29 Road and Patterson. Some can access Patterson via Partee, but trying to turn left without a stop light is very hazardous. I have lived on Bonito for over 50 years and am very concerned about the large increase in traffic. When I walk my dog in the morning or afternoon during the school start/end time I cannot cross 29 Road on foot.
- What's planned for Brodick Way which is across from Independence Academy? It's already difficult to get onto 29 Road from Brodick Way during school drop off and pick up time and then to add traffic from I-70 could make it next to impossible to get onto 29 Road.
- Worried about school traffic.
- Concerned about excessive speed, especially with school.
- Many folks commented on the school and kids and traffic. However, have heard from others that only two kids currently walk to school.
- The school will fight school property acquisition.
- Right now we need sidewalks all the way to Patterson Road. The road needs to be repaired and more turn lane space put it in at Patterson Road to accommodate the school traffic.
- We own a house on Darla Drive and are against a 29 Road interchange at I-70. Why would you want to put an interchange to I-70 in a residential area and on a road where two schools are located? The traffic on 29 Road is already bad in the morning and afternoon when school starts and finishes.

What suggestions do you have regarding a new 29 Road interchange at I-70?

Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations

- At the public open house meeting on February 28, it was mentioned that as part of this proposed development 29 Road would be expanded to five lane from Patterson Road to I-70. This road would also include bike lanes "and/or" a detached paved multi-modal trail. I put "and/or" in quotes because I wasn't able to catch if the plan was for a detached trail and bike lanes, or just one or the other. It's very possible that this hasn't even been determined yet. I'd like to provide the perspective of a long time local cyclist [affiliated with Mesa County Bicycling Alliance]: The users of a detached trail are not the same group of cyclists who prefer a bike lane, and in fact, due the speed differential, are actually incompatible. Detached trails attract slower moving traffic, commonly including walkers and children, while more experienced utility and recreation cyclists much prefer bike lanes due to the increased safety at intersections and the ability to travel more quickly (also bike lanes tend to be better maintained, but that's another story). Given that this project includes a frontage road on the north side of I-70 that connects to H Road at the airport, I anticipate that this portion of 29 Road will be very popular with utility and recreation cyclists. It will allow cyclists in the eastern part of Grand Junction to much more easily go to and from norther Grand Junction and the farm roads in the Fruita area. Therefore, I strongly recommend that both bike lanes and detached (or attached) paved multi-modal trails be included in the design for 29 Road, and that at least bike lanes be included for the entire length of the frontage road that accesses H Road. Thank you.
- Will there be any projection/recommendations for increased public transportation and safe bike lanes in the study area?
- Hope it includes bike lanes.
- Keep bike lanes on 29 Road, keep the bike lanes south or north clean.
- I would welcome the 29 Road interchange IF it includes pedestrian and bicycle amenities/improvements. Right now it is deplorable!!
- Hikers, bikers, and school children need walkways, paths, and accommodations.

School-related Improvements

- Pedestrian improvements/bicycle access for schools. Particularly if traffic will increase due to the interchange.
- Need light at school intersection.
- Need turn lane to accommodate school traffic, when they get out in the afternoon.
- Today the traffic from Independence Academy and Walnut Estates have a conflict at the intersection with 29 Road. We need a stoplight/turn signal, and sidewalks.

29 Road Improvements within the Study Area

- Stoppages and slow down on 29 Road need to be minimized. 29 Road should be planned as a 5 lane road and all necessary easements obtained even if only 3 lanes are initially built. The study should make sure the existing property owners along 29 Road are dealt with fairly.

- Need to widen 29 Road. Should lessen Patterson Road traffic.
- Need to widen 29 Road.
- Link it to H Road and airport.
- 29 Road will need traffic calming elements (like Horizon) and lower speed limits.
- Largest concern for 29 Road being calmed and lower speed (30-35 mph).
- No roundabouts please those things are confusing and dangerous!

Other

- Hopefully the final design and improvements will not impinge on the Grand Valley Power Facility, including the solar farm.
- Build it and they will come.
- Be sure to prepare for a huge volume of truck, auto and bus traffic. I believe the volume will be greater than anticipated.
- Like every proposal there will be those who oppose it and will seek cutbacks. If forced to make some cutbacks I strongly suggest that the new airport road must not be cut. I also suggest that rather than cut any part of the proposal it would be better to stretch out the construction time frame because every part of it is needed.

General suggestions and comments

29 Road Improvements Outside of the Study Area

- I just want to know if 29 Road will be 4 laned all the way through to Highway 50? If that's not part of the plan, you are only asking for increased disaster. As somebody that drives 29 Road every day, there are major issues when it transitions from four lanes to two lanes at the Riverside and 29 Road intersection. During heavy volume times of transit traffic 29 Road can be backed up from the Riverside intersection all the way to the 6 and 50 overpass. Has anyone actually gone out and done a study on the amount of vehicles that utilize 29 Road on the southern end? I believe it could be a huge asset to Mesa County if it's done properly. Thank you for all your time and energy and effort being put into this matter.
- First, why not finish 29 Road (4-lane) from D Road to Highway 50? Second, 4 lane 29 Road from North Avenue to Patterson Road. Third, finish 29 Road, 4 lane from Patterson including an interchange. You should not start at I-70 and go to Patterson Road will contribute massively to more congestion on the whole length of 29 Road.

Improve Other Roadways

- The same type of planning was done for North Avenue. Stage 1 of that project was supposed to address issues that were at the top of the list of most importance... being traffic congestion, speeding, installation of bike lanes.... And after millions were spent, all we got was an oversized sidewalk and some plants. Now not only is North Avenue as unsafe as it was before, but now the sidewalk is unsafe as well. I have been hit by people racing down the sidewalk while I was walking....and cars now zoom off North Avenue into and out of business parking lots...without a

care as they cut across the sidewalk. This project has not reduced the speeds, or the congestion, or given more access with bike lanes to get students and citizens out of cars and onto bikes in the heart of the city.... So why would this new 29 Road be any different.... follow up and fix the failed project on North Avenue, then I would give this new project my blessing to move forward.

- G Road should be 5 laned from Hwy 6 & 50 all the way to 29 Road. We badly need another east - west corridor.
- Simply widen 29 Road and build a frontage road to Horizon Drive utilizing the existing 29 Road/I-70 Bridge. No exit is necessary. Just build "G" Road or one frontage road to connect Horizon Drive to Clifton. Make I-70 a toll road from DeBeque to Utah and build up enough money to pay cash for the improvements. Privatize I-70 and allow tolls. Reduce traffic on Patterson Road – it's already too much!
- A lot of interest in seeing F 1/2 Road completed through to the east and west.
- Issues with no connection across F ½ Road to the east. Would like sub-divide property, but can't without that.
- Why don't you expand the current interchanges of 32 Road and 24 Road to truck traffic and make those 4 lane roads. They are already in place and would cause the taxpayers a lot less to upgrade. (D Road to Highway 50) and all 24 Road.
- Freight from Utah to Denver, going to Delta and Montrose can easily use 32 Road interchange. Why isn't 32 Road completed (4-lane) from D Road to Highway 50?
- Need road repair, sidewalks to Patterson Road.
- The interchange will add to the congestion that already exists on Patterson Road. Your study said 11,800 cars/day below Patterson on 29 Road.
- Why are improvements/paving upgrades being completed on Riverside when 29 Road is such a mess?

Zoning and Commercial Development

- Multiple comments have been made regarding future commercial zoning south of the interstate adjacent to the residential zoning.
- Please make certain, wherever possible, that future development minimizes non-arid tolerant landscaping. The Colorado River is already oversubscribed.
- Concerned about commercial development at interchange.
- I would like to see all commercial zoning north of I-70; not south of I-70 close to school and neighborhoods. We don't want gas stations, etc. in this area.
- Sewer and water and utilities to the proposed commercial development are a key problem.
- I can't see the need for an interchange. It will only benefit business above I-70, without the necessary roads to Highway 50.

Cost and Funding

- How much funding is now approved and designated for this interchange from the Fed. Hwy. Trans. and CO. Trans. departments? What is the plan to get this money approved for construction? What is the timeframe for getting this money? Thank you.
- The study appears fairly complete — you have touched on numerous areas of concern. Just didn't hear anything about COST!!
- I feel that this project will cost taxpayers millions at the expense of the current residents of the area.
- Who will pay for the interchange and improvements to 29 Road to US 50?

Public Involvement

- Info share was good at the meeting. Will continue to follow progress of development.
- Very informative and helpful to talk to people involved in it.
- If you do another meeting have oral presentations along with a “map browsing” line. Your last meeting was too confusing and crowded. Give some handout copies of the proposal. The last meeting would have been more informative with handouts. If this proposal is needed you need to do a better job of selling it.
- A separate meeting for residents impacted.

Other

- You don't really care what we think!!
- Some items which need studied are: 1) Why is this interchange needed? 2) How is this to be funded? A public vote? 3) Will noise and light pollution be controlled? 4) How will traffic from proposed schools, community center, and residents be incorporated? 5) Where will people go who exit the new 29 Road interchange?