

## MINUTES

### PUEBLO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

SEPTEMBER 22, 2022

A meeting of the Pueblo Area Council of Governments was held on Thursday, September 22, 2022, at the Pueblo County Department of Emergency Management, 101 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Larry Atencio, PACOG Chairman, at 12:15 p.m.

#### ROLL CALL

Those members present were:

Larry Atencio  
Mike Cafasso  
Barbara Clementi  
Chris DeLuca  
Dennis Flores

Heather Graham  
Epimeno Griego  
Ed Gutierrez  
Vicente Martinez Ortega  
Doug Proal

Those members absent were:

Harry Hochstetler  
Regina Maestri  
Sarah Martinez

Garrison Ortiz  
Lori Winner  
Chris Wiseman

Also present were:

Eva Cosyleon  
Sabina Genesisio  
Nick Gradisar  
Terry Hart

Lorrie Marquez  
David Russell  
Louella Salazar

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Jennifer Holderman, a Pueblo resident since 1998, was asked to speak on behalf of her friends Rachel and Kris, who displayed large photographs of their children, McKenzie, Trenton, and Virginia. She let the PACOG members know that it was unfortunate that in February, Rachel and Kris lost all three of their children. She expressed concern that the intersection of Highway 50 at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane is extremely dangerous and is asking Pueblo County to address the situation. In January, another man and woman lost their lives at the same intersection. During the school year, the intersection becomes extremely dangerous while kids are leaving for home from Vineland Middle School and County High School. She thinks a stoplight at the intersection would help the situation, be a benefit to the community, and should be added immediately to avoid future accidents. She doesn't want to see anyone else in the community lose family members at that intersection. She explained the pain that Rachel and Kris have suffered due to the accident. Her children grew up with their children; she asked that the loss of the children not be in vain. She asked PACOG to please help, noting "our community needs this" (stoplight). If it's a matter of money, then cut cost somewhere; it needs to be done. We can't afford for another family to lose another child or family member."

Mr. Justin Fox, a Pueblo County resident and Rachel, McKenzie, and Trenton's uncle, commented on the increased traffic on County roads as the area expands. He stated that there are several intersections that need attention in the County, but specifically 36<sup>th</sup> Lane and Highway 50. He

stated that the horrible losses have had an unsurmountable impact to their family; their lives will never be the same. He stated, "with the ability to do something as simple as putting in a stoplight to be able to help save just one life is worth any amount of money, in this case it was three lives and others as mentioned". He added that this should not be an argument about money; it is not acceptable to have an intersection (U.S. 50 at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane) as dangerous as it is. He asked PACOG to take the request into consideration.

Ms. Diane Shumar, a resident of Pueblo County, commented on the horrific accident; the loss of the children was a devastation to Rachel and Kris and affected the entire community. She added that they have been forgotten; they don't feel like they have a voice. She asked for traffic lights to be put up. She doesn't want to see any more children or grandparents killed at that intersection (U.S. 50 and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane). She stated, "the intersection is really close to schools. We need to get this fixed. We on the Mesa do not feel like we are being heard or taken care of at all." She asked that PACOG find it in their heart to get this passed so that they can get a traffic light to save lives.

Chairman Atencio announced they are being heard. The traffic light request will be added to the next PACOG agenda to see what can be done. He thanked them for their comments.

### **CONSENT ITEMS:**

Ms. Louella Salazar, Secretary, summarized the three Consent Items for PACOG.

Chairman Atencio asked if there were any other additions or amendments to the Consent Items or if any of the members or audience would like an item removed or discussed that was on the Consent agenda. There were no other additions or amendments.

It was moved by Mike Cafasso, seconded by Vincente Martinez Ortega, and passed unanimously to approve the three Consent Items listed below:

- Minutes of August 25, 2022 meeting;
- Treasurer's Report (receive and file August 2022 Financial Report); and
- A Resolution Approving the Acceptance of the FY2023 Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) Rural Planning Grant in the Amount of \$7,400 from the Colorado Department of Transportation.

### **REGULAR ITEMS:**

#### **CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

A) Lunch Appreciation

Chairman Atencio thanked Salt Creek Sanitation District for providing lunch for today's meeting.

#### **MANAGER'S REPORT**

A) ADA Advisory Committee Minutes

Ms. Salazar reported the August 4, 2022 ADA Advisory Committee meeting minutes were included in the packets.

This being an information item, no formal action was required.

B) Introduction of Lorrie Marquez

Ms. Salazar introduced Ms. Lorrie Marquez as her replacement upon her retirement sometime this year. She informed PACOG she would let them know once a date has been decided. Chairman Atencio mentioned that Ms. Salazar has been the heart and soul of PACOG for a long time, everything that happens with PACOG goes through her, and the care she takes for the organization will need to continue.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONER/CDOT REGION 2 DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Richard Zamora, State Transportation Region 2 Director, was pleased to report that the I-25 10-Year Plan was formally adopted by the State Transportation Commission at its September 2022 meeting. One of the larger projects they are working on is the U.S.50B/I-25 Interchange. The project is fully funded, and they are working to finalize the design. Construction will start late 2023 or early 2024.

Mr. Zamora reported the Greenhouse Gas Regulation policies were developed and accepted by the Transportation Commission. The North Front Range and DRCOG MPOs had an earlier timeline to comply with the rules and legislations. He stated, at the last meeting, reports were given by both MPOs as well as a Statewide report. They were able to meet the Greenhouse Gas Regulations as well as the legislation associated with it. He announced that PACOG and PPACG will have to reach requirements for the Greenhouse Gas Regulations and adopt long-range plans. Based upon what the Commissioners saw, they are confident that the two MPOs will meet the requirements and will have minimal impact to the projects discussed.

Mr. Terry Hart, CDOT Region 10 Commissioner, thanked Mr. Zamora for his report. He stated the Transportation Commission meeting was held last week; it was a joint meeting with the Colorado Transportation Investment Office (CTIO), who handles all the various types of projects that require different types of funding, specifically including toll lanes. The CTIO will help with creative ways to finance some of the newly required infrastructure including the conversion to an electronic vehicle fleet. He stated it was a good idea for the CTIO to meet with the Commission to brief them on what they do; the CTIO is basically under the same "house" but are independent by statute. The Commission had great reports from DRCOG MPO, Front Range MPO, and CDOT on their plans for meeting the statutory and regulatory requirements of the Greenhouse Gas Emissions and found them to be in compliance with the laws and regulations. The Commissioners were very excited about the acceptance of the 10-Year Plan. It's designed to be a bottom-up process. Local level participants will have the opportunity to add their thoughts about which projects they wish to prioritize with the limited amount of money that is available at the State level, then sort out and compare project requests with the money they have. The final version of the Plan will be presented to the Transportation Commission for adoption. The Commission also adopted the CDOT Planning and Budget Asset Management portion of the Plan, which is a critical part of the transportation system which functions to maintain and preserve our tunnels, traffic signals, rest areas, bridges, culverts, walls, geohazards, police buildings and other such things.

Mr. Hart reported the Commission went over the Budget Asset Management Plan to analyze how expenditures worked in the past, where they are statistically with the status of those various assets, and ultimately adopted the Plan. He spoke to the people in the audience from St. Charles Mesa to let them know that they do hear them. What happened at Highway 96 and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane was horrible; the State is working with County government regarding the situation. It has been a subject of detailed analysis. He stated, your voices are heard, work is being done, and please continue to let us know your thoughts and concerns. They will do their best to make sure the highway system is as

safe as they possibly can. Mr. Zamora added that a detailed report on U.S. 50B and C will be given as part of today's agenda.

#### STATE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (STAC) UPDATE

There was no report.

#### STATUS ON FRONT RANGE PASSENGER RAIL DISTRICT

Mr. Dennis Flores, PACOG representative to the Front Range Passenger Rail District, reported that they established a retreat date for the first part of December 2022. They will meet for the first time in person as they have been meeting via Zoom. He feels this will provide them the ability to organize themselves a little bit better as far as getting goals and a template and put them in a place to move forward. The current chairman and vice chairman of their board agreed to go before the Colorado Transportation Commission at a hearing held last week; he was able to attend via Zoom audio. The chair and vice chair gave the State Legislature a report as to where they are as a District and the basics of the formulation of the District. He went on to report that they are currently in better shape as an entity. They have hired an interim director who is a CDOT employee, and in the next 60 days, they plan to hire a permanent director to lead the District. He also reported that the only thing that really came out of the hearing was that everyone including State legislators concluded that whatever public rail system they will put together between the northern and southern parts of Colorado is to use the existing rail lines. He added that the decision to use the existing rail lines is significant and will avoid having to do environmental studies and take rights-of-way; the decision is not set in stone yet but is the most logical decision.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EPAC) UPDATE

Mr. Ted Lopez, Jr., EPAC Chairperson, a member of the committee since June 1994, gave an overview of EPAC. PACOG created EPAC to provide public input on recommendations and information regarding federal grants. He explained the composition of the Committee includes Pueblo County residents who serve staggered three-year terms and represent public interest groups such as nonprofits, and citizen representatives including any person or company who is likely to incur a financial gain or loss greater than that of an average homeowner, taxpayers, or consumer. It also includes members from groups who are inspected by the Pueblo Department of Public Health and Environment, including farmers, representatives of ditch companies, persons who serve in supply services for profit recreation programs or equipment, large water consumers, manufacturers, and commercial establishments. He stated that EPAC meetings are held the first Thursday of every other month starting in February and ending in December at the Pueblo County Planning and Development offices located at the corner of 12<sup>th</sup> and Court Streets. EPAC provides recommendations and information to PACOG regarding environmental issues, generates reports, formulates goals and objectives, and gives presentations and recommendations to PACOG regarding environmental policy issues. Currently, EPAC is obtaining information from a consultant regarding reducing nonpoint source pollution. Unlike regular pollution from industrial and sewage treatment plants, nonpoint source pollution comes from many sources spread out from large areas and is caused by runoff resulting from rainfall or snow melt. As runoff moves over and through the ground, it picks up, carries away, and deposits natural and human made pollutants into lakes, rivers, wetlands, and groundwater. Common categories of nonpoint source pollution include urban areas, agricultural areas, forestry areas, and abandoned mine lines. The Nonpoint Source Program works with local communities to reduce nonpoint source pollution. EPAC is receiving information from the consultant regarding a study that they are doing in four areas of the State including Pueblo, El Paso, Weld, and Rifle counties. The nonpoint sources are not regulated. The Nonpoint Source Program

provides both funding and technical assistance to communities to voluntarily control these pollutant sources. The focus for the funding and technical assistance can be on restoring water rates that are already impacted by the nonpoint source pollution while protecting water quality from degrading from nonpoint source pollution. Some types of nonpoint pollutants are E.coli from domestic and wild animals, seeping from inner shale which is probably prevalent here. EPAC hopes to gather information from Dr. Michael Bartolo with the CSU-Extension Office in Rocky Ford. Dr. Bartolo is also a resident of St. Charles Mesa and is concerned about the cumulative impact septic systems have on groundwater quality on the St. Charles Mesa. Some of the projects EPAC has been involved with are the development of a comprehensive waste management plan through a grant obtained in the late 1990s which gave EPAC the ability to establish an environmental coordinator position and generate a waste study to get an idea of constituents in Pueblo County's waste stream. EPAC was also able to establish a landfill user fee of 25¢ per cubic yard of items disposed of at the landfill. About 10 years later, Pueblo City Council increased the fee to 50¢ per cubic yard. EPAC receives reports from the Public Works Director of the types of materials and quantities of items disposed at the City of Pueblo RecycleWorks. He would like EPAC to investigate water, as water is under stress worldwide.

#### MPO STAFF REPORT

Chairperson Atencio introduced Ms. Eva Cosyleon as the new MPO Manager.

#### A) 2023-2027 Draft TIP for Information and Release for Public Comment

It was moved by Dennis Flores, seconded by Vincente Martinez Ortega, and passed unanimously to approve the 2023-2027 Draft TIP for Information and Release for Public Comment.

#### B) CDOT Region 2 Request for PACOG MPO/TPR TIP Amendment FY 2022-2025--Administrative Notification

Ms. Eva Cosyleon, MPO Manager, this project is U.S. 50 West, which is to further the construction issues that continue to come up in the footprint of the project. The request addition of Permanent Water Quality Improvements funds in the amount of \$2,157,684 will be used to fund the unexpected dewatering costs for construction of Pond F in the project.

This being an information item, no formal action was required.

#### C) CDOT Region 2 Request for PACOG MPO/TIP Amendment FY 2022-2025 SDS Trail Funding Request--Administrative Notification

Ms. Cosyleon reported the project, in the amount of \$75,000, is the Pueblo West SDS Trail North Park located at Purcell Boulevard and Industrial Boulevard. The project generally includes additional curb and gutter, handicap ramps, asphalt paving, and traffic signal modifications that would allow safe passage across Pueblo Boulevard at the Industrial Boulevard intersection.

This being an information item, no formal action was required.

#### D) Highway 50C and B and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane CDOT Safety Study

Mr. Richard Zamora, CDOT Region 2 Director, explained the reason for today's presentation is due to the tragedy that occurred at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane and U.S. 50. CDOT has undertaken a lot of engineering analysis, performed a school zone study, and has reached a completion of the study. The findings

will be presented. He reported that the safety study was presented this morning to the Board of County Commissioners at a special work session. He turned the presentation over to Mr. Matt Jagow, CDOT Traffic Unit, who analyzed a lot of the data.

Mr. Jagow reported he led the study and did the primary work of both intersections. He proceeded to give a detailed review of the PowerPoint presentation. He explained the photographs which showed the intersections U.S. 50B and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane and U.S. 50C (Business) also known as Santa Fe and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane on the southside near Vineland Elementary, Vineland Middle School, and Pueblo County High School. He reviewed the key points of the study for both intersections. He explained that they worked with CDOT's HQ Traffic and Safety Branch for the school zone study conducted at U.S. 50C. He continued to review the highlights of the overall study, which included collecting traffic turn movement data during typical peak periods (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.) on March 1, 2, and 3, 2022 at both intersections, and collection of 24-hour volume counts at all approaches at both intersections and field observations on March 1, 2022. The field observations looked at the existing site conditions of both intersections and collection information from existing signs, pavement markings, check sight distance, roadside conditions, and any issues that were not obvious by the data. He reported that CDOT conducted a signal warrant study for both intersections using traffic data collected and accident history from their headquarters in conjunction with the Department of Revenue. They collected all the accident data from July 1, 2015, until February 28, 2022, and a safety analysis to identify, if any, crash patterns to mitigate via improvements. Some highlights noted from the field investigation of how both intersections were performing, that at U.S. 50B and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane there was heavy traffic on all legs; also, drivers on 36<sup>th</sup> Lane drivers had difficulty seeing around 50B right turn vehicles during morning and evening peak volume times and that drivers on 36<sup>th</sup> Lane had difficulty finding gaps to cross eastbound U.S. 50B lanes to complete a left turn. At U.S. 50C (Business) and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane, near Vineland Elementary and Middle Schools, they also noticed that there was heavy traffic on all legs, drivers had difficulty seeing around right turning vehicles off U.S. 50C during morning and evening peak volume times, drivers had difficulty finding gaps to get across U.S. 50 to complete a left turn especially because of traffic backups into the intersection during the morning and evening peak periods causing vehicles to cut through parking lots of Loaf 'n Jug and Family Dollar to continue on their way. He explained the photograph provided of U.S. 50B and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane, which show the northern intersection from the perspective of someone sitting in their vehicle looking east to see oncoming vehicles. Also noted was that vegetation in front of the Loaf 'n Jug was blocking the view of anyone making a left-hand turn who were not able to see very well. At the Loaf 'n Jug, vehicles were parked along the outer edge of the lot, which were also blocking the view of people seeing westbound approaching vehicles. Anyone trying to make a left-hand turn was not able to see very well. The field investigation of U.S. 50B at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane was sight distance; they noticed that the existing road signage along the eastbound side was impairing vision of drivers stopped on CO 231. The outside right shoulder guardrail made it challenging to pick-up low-profile oncoming vehicles. The inside median concrete barrier color made it difficult to distinguish between vehicles of black, silver, grey, and white color. Location of the dedicated right run deceleration lane made it difficult to see oncoming vehicles in thru lanes when occupied by a right turn vehicle, notably during morning and evening peak times from eastbound right turn vehicle.

Mr. Jagow reported that they conducted a signal warrant analysis to see if a signal is warranted, which is a federal and State code requirement. There are typically nine (9) criteria required, depending upon the intersections. He referred to the report which included information, noting that not all the criteria were applicable, but that the report indicated that the warrants were not met to justify a signal. As noted in the PowerPoint slide, U.S. 50C at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane near the schools that there were 5 or 6 of the warrants that were reviewed based upon the volume data collected, turning movements and the crash history; none of the warrants were met to indicate a signal is needed at the intersection.

Mr. Jagow reported that they did a thorough review of the crash history for both intersections and collected all available accident data from July 1, 2015 to February 28, 2022, which was unfortunately after the fatality of the family members in attendance. The intersection falls under LOSS IV for total and severe crash types; broadside collisions were the most common type. Nine (9) of 11 broadside collisions occurred between the heaviest traffic volumes of morning and evening peak hours. Outside of morning and evening peak hours, the intersection analysis indicated it would operate as expected. The crash history for U.S. 50 at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane during dates as noted for U.S. 50B were that the intersections fell under LOSS IV for total and LOSS III for severe crash types. The most common crashes are with fixed objects. He reviewed highlights of the School Zone study observations conducted April 4 and 5, 2022 at U.S. 50C at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane. He added that after reviewing all the information, the conclusion and recommendations of U.S. 50B at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane and U.S. 50C at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane were based on the analysis of crash history, review of field observation, and analysis of signal warrant criteria. The recommendations for U.S. 50B at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane are:

- Reposition/relocate existing eastbound Roadside Signage to outside of sight triangle looking west view from CO 231.
- Reset/flare existing eastbound right shoulder w-beam guardrail to further off edge of travel way.
- Installation of two (2) raised island (pork chop) with curb and gutter, minor pavement, and grading work, adjust eastbound approach right turn deceleration lane, and moving stop bar closer to U.S.50 mainline.
- Installation of Intersection Conflict System Warning (ICWS) with posted mounted signs (variable messages) and flashers on minor (CO 231) and major (U.S. 50B).

Actions to date for U.S. 50B and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane were reviewed. Region 2 Traffic has initiated a high priority work order that will relocate two signs. The TODS sign has been reset 5 ft. further from the edge of the road and the advance guide sign will be relocated ¼ mile before the intersection.

Mr. Jagow reported conclusions for U.S. 50C (Business) and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane were also based upon the analysis of available crash history, field observation, school zone study and analysis of signal warrant criteria. The recommendations for U.S. 50C (Business) and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane are:

- Installation of four (4) raised island (pork chops) with curb and gutter, minor pavement and grading work and moving stop bar closer to U.S. 50 mainline.
- Lower existing speed limit from 45 to 40 mph within study area between MP 8.86 (just east of 35<sup>th</sup> Lane) to MP 9.9 (just east of 37<sup>th</sup> Lane).
- Change out school pedestrian signs at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane to W11-2 (ped symbol) with rectangular rapid flashing beacons.
- As per C.R.S. 42-4-1103, reroute Pueblo County High School pick-up and drop-off locations to another location off U.S.50C, possibly using Gale Road and changing the on-street parking to a drop-off/pick-up lane.
- Replace existing regulatory and warning signs that are damaged and/or past their life expectancy.

Mr. Jagow stated actions to date for U.S. 50C (Business) at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane were reviewed. Region 2 Traffic has initiated a high priority work order that will replace/update sign changes as per the school zone study final memo 6923 to include changing out speed limit signs from 45 mph to 40 mph, change out Ped Symbol signs at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane and add RRBs, and replace damage/visibility worn signs. They are waiting on material and will notify Pueblo County and PACOG when the work order is complete. They will replace all the signs to bring them up to the current standard as required. He added that he has been working with Mr. Zamora to identify safety funding for both the intersections.

An application was submitted to request the funds to move forward to do the proposed recommendations. They had a kick-off meeting this week so they could get the necessary surveys so they could start the design, depending upon key factors about the design. U.S. 50 and 36<sup>th</sup> Lane has a very tight right-of-way so they may have to acquire right-of-way permits. He is hoping that by the end of next year they will be able to have bids for construction and start building depending on other key factors.

Chairperson Atencio asked if anyone had questions. He asked that anyone wishing to speak would raise their hand to be recognized. A member from the public stated that the number of fatalities reported was incorrect and that a second person died from an accident in the intersection. Mr. Jagow commented that they did not separate the fatalities; they are viewed as a single crash. All accident data is provided by the Department of Revenue from actual police reports. They cycle through CDOT's Safety Office and are added to the database. Ms. Diane Shumar stated that she read the study and that the number of fatalities reported was incorrect. She added that there were three children involved in the accident even though one child was sent to Colorado Springs. She asked for consideration for the lives that can be saved by adding a traffic light at the intersection. Mr. Jagow reiterated that report of fatalities was not set by him; those factors were included in the study. They were reviewed from the safety factor and were considered; they did not ignore the information. Unfortunately, the report did not separate how many people lost their lives.

Mr. Flores asked what process would the Pueblo County have to follow if they wanted to do something at the intersection? Is it possible for the County to get permission to go beyond CDOT's recommendations? Mr. Zamora responded that CDOT must follow a strict code of policies to install an unmarked signal, the reason is that it could cause other issues. They could see other types of accidents because it is in an area where a signal is not expected and is at an intersection with high speeds. He continued that if the County wants to do something at the intersection, CDOT is open to the conversation. Any changes would likely have to follow some evolution of the road; they must follow standards and do not have a lot of flexibility. He stated that they can enter the conversation with the County, if there is a desire to involve a portion of U.S. 50C to install a signal there is potential of that type of an opportunity. Mr. Flores commented that 50% of the problems are at 36<sup>th</sup> Lane, which is really under the control of the County. He stated that it seems to him that if the County wants to intervene to do something to enhance that intersection with a traffic signal or whatever, the County could get permission from CDOT to do that. There have been other such instances dealing with right-of-way issues, and if Pueblo County is willing to pay the cost, the change can be done. He stated that he was speaking as a person with no oversight of the County. He asked County Commissioner Griego if he might want to take the information to the rest of the Commissioners and, if they are amenable to that, that there would be potential of doing at least what is being recommended and maybe more. Mr. Zamora commented that they are working on the design to start construction next year.

Chairperson Atencio stated the question noted in the Zoom chat box; what is the cost difference between installing a traffic light at the intersection and the cost of CDOT's proposal? Mr. Zamora asked to first respond to Mr. Flores comment. The difficulty CDOT has is that even though 36<sup>th</sup> Lane is a County road, the interaction with U.S. 50 is State jurisdiction. CDOT cannot necessarily allow the County to simply put up a signal just because they desire to, the signal needs to meet all the warrant criteria that they are held to from a traffic engineering perspective that is the challenge. Mr. Flores asked Mr. Zamora if CDOT is willing to talk to the County, Mr. Zamora replied, "yes". Mr. Jagow reported that they have a rough cost estimate for the proposed work for both intersections, again, it is not just the pork chop islands, it's the intersection conflicts warning system and some other things that they are looking at that were mentioned before. Currently, they are estimating the cost at about \$1.3 to \$1.4 million. He stated that a typical traffic signal for a single intersection right



now, depending upon if any work to curb ramps or things of that nature, could be on the verge of anywhere from \$600K to \$800K per intersection. For both intersections, the cost would be about \$1.6 million.

Chairperson Atencio asked for one more speaker. Mr. Brad Lisac introduced himself as a resident of 38<sup>th</sup> Lane about a mile east of the intersection C (U.S. 50C). He mentioned that he knows the Frasiers very well. He stated that immediately after the tragic accident he met with the County Commissioners and that is a big reason why they are all here today. He stated that he thought the study is flawed due to the review conducted in March when the farms are not quite going. There is a lot more pedestrian traffic on 36<sup>th</sup> Lane now than there is in March. He thought the pork chop idea is decent, but it will cause problems in the rural farming community. Tractors around the raised pork chops, especially a tractor with a big disc, are going around them or cruise by and will do damage. The tractors will not be able to get through or cause more of a problem. He stated that he thought the 36<sup>th</sup> Lane and U.S. 96 intersection is the worst problem that they have. He stated that a stoplight is a cure all; pork chops, turning lanes, being able to see would all help; but a flashing light that lets people know that someone is coming down the road during peak hours would help but will not be a cure all. A stoplight is a cure all and the lights would be flashing constantly. He also stated that he thought that U.S. 50C by the Loaf 'n Jug is a moot point. He stated that he doesn't know why that intersection was part of the study. The bigger problem intersection is two miles to the west on U.S. 50 and Baxter Road. There are wrecks there where cars turn over a least once a month. He gets calls every other week about an accident on Baxter Road. The intersection on 36<sup>th</sup> Lane is not as bad. He hates to see a lot of time, money, and effort put into that intersection, but put time, effort and money into the intersections that need it most and understanding that a study in March is a lot different than most every other time of the year. He added that we should be putting time and effort positively instead of jumping around. A question was asked from the audience to clarify the cost of the proposed recommendations. Mr. Jagow responded that U.S. 50C did not meet the State and federal warrant regulations for a signal and CDOT is not eligible to fund a signal light at that intersection. An unidentified gentleman asked, if there was a cost difference of \$200K to put in the signal lights. Mr. Jagow explained that U.S. 50C warrants were not met for a signal light. The gentleman asked that in the long-term planning for the expansion in the County, isn't it a waste of money to put \$1.4 million into improvements that are going to basically time themselves out; but if the money is invested correctly the first time, there will be no waste of money the second time? Mr. Jagow responded that the intersection conflict warning system is easier to adjust than a traffic signal. It will be even more expensive if they put in a signal and the intersection were to be rebuilt, they would have to redo the signal light again. Whereas, with the intersection conflict system, it would just be resetting the system and would be a lot cheaper than doing a whole new signal if the intersection were to be changed. He reiterated that based on comparative information from the other intersection with the same accident history and data, particularly U.S. 50B (the northern intersection), the intersection conflict warning system typically has a long life from servicing and improving, it will last typically 20 years and is serviced for additional traffic. The typical life cycle of a signal light is also 20 years. If they put in a signal, it would have to be replaced in about 20 years. The cost would be way different to replace. He asked to respond to the gentleman who spoke earlier from the standpoint of the study. It is true that the study came out after the unfortunate fatality. He stated that CDOT is trying to move forward with improvements by conducting the intersection safety study. They also looked at typical volumes in their available data comparison and the data collected when they did the single warrant analysis; they always use the highest volume collected. The study included data over three days which is typical standards for a signal warrant analysis. They do have data from other months to compare to March; that is information that they took into consideration when doing the signal warrant analysis.

Chairperson Atencio asked if there was any further discussion. Ms. Jennifer Holderman commented that her statements are not personal toward Mr. Jagow; she knows that he does not make the decision. She asked, "how can you guys look at the pictures of Trenton and McKenzie who didn't even get 20 years. McKenzie just turned 6 years old in November; Trenton was going to be 14 years old in March. If it's a matter of money, are you kidding me. She's had to watch her best friend lose both of her children. Her friend goes home to their empty bedrooms. If this is about money, fix it, cut costs somewhere, cut salaries." She continued, "the proposed pork chops aren't going to save anybody's lives. These were children, babies, why can't something be done? Like Joe just said, let's put the answer to this on record, would a signal light make the intersection safer, if so, why are we putting money in front of children's and people's lives?" Mr. Jagow requested to respond to Ms. Holderman. He stated that to this point, in this type of rural area, a signal light will not necessarily make the intersection safer. A signal in this type of rural situation will increase other types of accidents, rear-end accidents, they will typically see an increase of red light running due to the standpoint of the volume, especially when they are trying to service that intersection; there would be other larger accidents. He added that a signal is not automatically safer, that is why, based on the study and thorough comparative analysis, they looked at all the types of things that can be done to resolve what was an unfortunate situation that caused this fatality along with others. The issues were sight distance for people being able to see oncoming vehicles. That is what CDOT is trying to address with the intersection conflicts system. He explained that CDOT has plans to work on how they will angle the detection system which should work. It is a very similar situation with the same volume. The system will probably help drivers on the side street to enter the intersection safely. This is a proven safety measure for these types of accident patterns here and across the country. Mr. Zamora added that CDOT recognizes the pain of this accident. They are part of this community as well. It is not about money. They are looking at things from a true engineering perspective to improve safety at the intersection. He stated, as Mr. Jagow said, a signal that is not well warranted can have consequences, people get a false sense of security, and people can potentially run the light, and accidents can continue to happen. He added that from CDOT's engineering perspective, the proposed changes are a really good solution, and they will continue to evaluate and analyze as Pueblo County develops and grows. He stated that they are looking at holding another community forum. They do not have it organized yet. It will hopefully be scheduled in the next few months in the community. Mr. Chris Roberts commented that McKenzie was his daughter. He asked, "does the request for a signal have to go before the Legislature to get some of this changed and to meet your criteria, does it have to go to the Legislature, is that we have to do to save kids' lives?" Mr. Jagow responded that installing a signal is based upon regulation requirements set by the federal government; the regulations are not set by CDOT. Mr. Roberts asked again, "does this have to go before the federal government? There were two fatalities out there, one was his daughter and Trenton's grandma on February 15<sup>th</sup>. The Colorado Highway Patrol were at both accidents in that short period." He added that it does not make sense to spend the \$1.4 million when two things will solve this issue, a stoplight and slowing down the speed in that area. The speed on U.S. 50 needs to be lowered, put warning signs up telling people that there is a stoplight coming up, and put patrol out there. He asked that CDOT invest the time and the resources to slow the speeds down and people running the stoplight since it has been said that the stoplight will cause more accidents because they will run the stoplight. There is a way to solve that problem--enforce the law. Mr. Zamora responded that he is not sure where the error comes from in terms of the accident, but they can check into to it. He stated that he was not trying to be argumentative with Mr. Roberts but there are things that CDOT needs to do. "Unfortunately, the State Patrol is stretched very thin right now from an enforcement perspective, they are hiring patrol officers." He added, "similarly they have people driving 100 mph on I-25. They cannot dedicate enough enforcement to patrol everything that is happening throughout the entire State and frankly the entire country." He felt for the family and does not want to argue, but CDOT cannot simply put up a signal; there are very strict criteria when a signal is warranted because it creates other issues. He added that he was sorry. Mr. Jagow

reported that prior to the study there were also State statutes about speed limits that they had to review. Unfortunately, the statutes are old regarding how fast someone is driving; that is why a speed study was not part of the study. They knew that it is likely that the speeds will go up. They are legally obligated to increase them; however, by recent changes within CDOT, this played into the U.S. 50C location. He commented that CDOT can go back and discuss this if the County is willing to. He can do a speed management study to see if the findings would warrant reduced speeds. A formal request from Pueblo County to CDOT for the U.S. 50B location will be required based upon State statutes. County Commissioner Griego said that he will take the comments back to the other Commissioners. Mr. Jagow offered to provide information to County Commissioner Griego for the formal request. Chairperson Atencio commented that a speed study would be good. At the time when the speeds were set there wasn't a Loaf 'n Jug and other businesses. Mr. Jagow clarified that they are planning to lower the speed at U.S. 50B. Chairman Atencio replied that he felt that the intersection where the Loaf 'n Jug is a bigger issue. He understands the improvements that CDOT will make to the intersection. Mr. Jagow commented that, unfortunately, sight issues were, noting they were trying to address the U.S. 50B intersection outside of those A.M. and P.M. peak periods. The study of the intersection showed that it operates normal at this standpoint; there are sight line issues the study would have likely communicated that no safety improvements would be made, but given what was found there, that is why they are moving forward with their recommendations to improve sight distance with the intersection conflict system. Chairperson Atencio asked if CDOT has funding for the Loaf 'n Jug intersection. Mr. Jagow stated that they do have funding for both intersections. The funding is \$1.4 million total, which includes both intersections. County Commissioner Griego commented that Baxter Road is bad. He has experienced how bad it is when he takes his grandson to school at County High. He added that it's hard to get into the intersection and to turn, while traveling east. The morning sunshine makes it very hard to see. Mr. Jagow commented that Mr. Zamora and he will speak to the County Commissioners regarding the issues at Baxter Road. Chairperson Atencio stated to the family that he knows that the recommendations do not satisfy them. He stated, "let's pray that the improvements at that intersection will make a difference in the future after all the improvements are done. They will have to see if there is really an improvement. You are being heard." Mr. Zamora was asked when a community meeting could be scheduled. He stated he will work with Ms. Michelle Peulen, CDOT's Public Relations person, to set the date. Currently, they are not prepared to set a date. Ms. Holderman asked for clarification of a start date for the intersection improvements. Mr. Zamora responded that they are currently collecting survey information to start the design work with the desire to start construction next year. Ms. Holderman commented that is a year after the accident. Mr. Zamora replied, "understandably, it does feel like it takes a long time, but there is a lot of work required." He added that the school zone study was conducted by someone other than CDOT. They are trying to get all the information collected to have the ability to review and make recommendations. That is the timeline they are on right now.

E) MPO Manager Update

Ms. Cosyleon had no additional informational to report.

F) Other Transportation Matters

Ms. Cosyleon had no transportation matters to report.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

### FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

There were no future agenda items.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further regular business before PACOG, Chairman Atencio adjourned the meeting at 1:45 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled on Thursday, October 27, 2022, at 12:15 p.m. (Note: The meeting will be held at the Pueblo County Emergency Operations Center, 101 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, 1st Floor Conference Room. The meeting will also be held virtually on Zoom.)

Respectfully submitted,



---

Louella R. Salazar  
PACOG Recording Secretary

### JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' MEETING

Following the regular PACOG meeting, there was a joint meeting held between the Pueblo City Council and Board of County Commissioners to make one appointment to the Community Services Advisory Commission (CSAC) and one appointment to the Pueblo Regional Building Department's Building Board of Appeals (General Contractor).

The following persons were selected:

- Community Services Advisory Commission - Clara Trautman (complete a four-year term expiring April 30, 2024).
- Regional Building Department's Building Board of Appeals - Brian Gray, Incumbent (General Contractor) with a term expiring July 1, 2024.

These individuals will need to be ratified by the respective entities at each entities' future meetings.