



**South Broadway NEPA Process
Consensus Committee Meeting #8
Cameron United Methodist Church
April 20, 2006**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NEXT MEETINGS

May 18th – date held for possible CC meeting or briefing

June 15th – date held for CC meeting for possible review of results of Level 3 screening and repackaging of alternatives

July 20th – date held for CC meeting for possible review of the identification of a recommended Preferred Alternative for further evaluation in the EA

June (TBD) – possible Public Meeting #3

Discussion Highlights

This meeting focused on:

1. Review of the engineered alternatives packages and discussion of the features of each alternative. The Consensus Committee members asked clarifying questions regarding certain aspects of the alternatives.
2. Review and discussion of the Level 3 screening criteria. The Consensus Committee members were generally comfortable with the criteria, but had questions about the measures to be used, how the criteria would be measured, and how the model data would be used to rank each criterion. Most of the ranking will come from comparisons to the No-Action Alternative and comparisons of the alternatives to each other.

Next Steps

The project team will evaluate the engineered alternatives using the Level 3 screening criteria and repackage the alternatives using the most effective components to create a smaller number of new alternatives. The new alternatives will be presented to the CC for discussion prior to their detailed evaluation.

MEETING NOTES

Meeting Goals

- Review of the engineered alternatives packages for Level 3 screening
- Review of the Level 3 screening criteria

I. ALTERNATIVES FOR LEVEL 3 SCREENING

GRAPHICS AND MATERIALS PRESENTED – COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

The following graphics and related descriptive materials were presented and discussed. The alternatives presented were slightly modified from those previously presented to reflect an analysis of the construction feasibility of component suggestions. Suggestions eliminated due to constructability concerns were placed in the Disposition of Suggestions list. The comments, questions, and suggestions below are from Consensus Committee members; clarifications and answers to questions are from the project team.

- **2030 Conditions**
 - *Clarification:* This does not include Valley Highway EIS improvements because the study is not yet completed. It does include T-Rex improvements.
- **No-Action Alternative**
 - *Clarification:* This alternative will serve as the basis for comparative evaluation of the alternatives.
- **Engineered Alternatives Packages**
 - Alternative #1 – Maximize Transit
 - *Comment:* Transit Note 3 (Option 23A) should be changed to read “Provides right-of-way geometry to not preclude future expansion of light rail.” Delete this comment from transit note 2 in alternative #2.
 - *Q:* Will the ramp be a City or CDOT project?
A: This depends on whether the ramp is considered a “city street or a freeway on-ramp.”
 - Alternative #2 – Multi-Way Boulevard (169-foot ROW)
 - *Comment:* The width of the boulevard tests the limits of what pedestrians are willing to cross.
 - *Comment:* There will be a bottleneck where the road narrows from six lanes to four at Arizona.
 - *Comment:* This alternative is trying to address the back-up northbound Broadway turning left on Mississippi.

- Alternative #3 – No Broadway Widening with Flyover
 - *Comment:* Add suggestion #14 (southbound Broadway to northbound I-25 loop ramp). Delete this suggestion from alternative #5.
 - Alternative #4 – (Not presented – previously eliminated)
 - Alternative #5 – Broadway Widening/Early Left Turns
 - *Comment:* Concern that the Mississippi bridge over I-25 will dead-end traffic into Washington Park.
 - Alternative #6 – Wedge Ramp
 - Alternative #7 – Broadway/Acoma Couplet
 - *Comment:* Concern about southbound Broadway access to Mississippi, retail access, and Lionstone traffic access to southbound Broadway.
 - *Comment:* This does not address the southbound/southbound problem.
 - Alternative #8 – Broadway/Lincoln Couplet
 - *Comment:* One-way streets “challenge” retail operations (reference to alternatives #7 and #8).
- **Descriptions of Alternatives Packages** – This is a list of the suggestions that are included in each of the packaged alternatives presented at the meeting.
 - **Pedestrian/Bike Overlay**
 - *Q:* One aspect that is not clearly addressed is the bicycle and pedestrian connection north and south of I-25 on Broadway. Will the next round of alternatives include these connections?
A: The pedestrian/bike overlay will be modified to reflect this important connection.
 - **Disposition of Suggestions** - This is the list of suggestions that have been screened out in previous screening levels. During the engineering drawing phase, suggestions with construction feasibility concerns were added to this list as “fatal flaw/not constructible”. The suggestions on this list could be brought forward only if they enhance future alternatives.
 - **List of Unused Suggestions** - This list includes suggestions that to date have neither been used nor screened out. These suggestions may be added to enhance an alternative or used as mitigation. All of the suggestions on this list will be evaluated in Level 3 screening. Eventually all of the suggestions will either be included in an alternative(s) or on the Disposition List.

All of these graphics and the related descriptive materials listed above are posted on the project web site: www.denvergov.org/broadwaynepa/

General Questions, Comments, and Suggestions from the Committee

Q: What is the status of the Acoma/Lincoln couplet?

A: This suggestion is on the List of Unused Suggestions and will be evaluated during the Level 3 screening.

Q: Why is northbound Broadway to west bound Mississippi an issue?

A: It is an existing problem and current high demand is expected to increase in the future. At present, turning vehicles back-up northbound Broadway traffic during peak hours.

Q: Is this the best of the best?

A: These alternatives include the best combinations of suggestions as defined during the alternatives workshop, subsequent refinements (including construction feasibility), and discussions with the Consensus Committee. Repackaging of the most effective suggestions will occur after the initial Level 3 screening to produce more effective alternatives.

Q: Will changing the I-25/Broadway intersection from full access to three-quarters access have NEPA process implications?

A: Any modification to the ramps would require some modification could require Federal Highway Administration approval.

Suggestion: Because the wedge ramp doesn't allow northbound Broadway to southbound I-25, suggest widening Mississippi west of Broadway, make Broadway a boulevard with 4 lanes of through traffic and 1.5 lanes locally (space to move around parking cars) and use the early left turns suggestion to access southbound Broadway to southbound I-25.

Comment: The wedge ramp (and the flyover) alternatives do not allow for northbound Broadway to southbound I-25 movement, but the bigger problem of southbound Broadway to southbound I-25 is solved.

Comment: One-way streets challenge retail operations (reference to alternatives #7 and #8).

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Charlie Busch – *Q:* Are noise impacts of the flyover being considered? *A:* Noise has been added to the Level 3 screening criteria.

III. REVIEW OF LEVEL 3 SCREENING CRITERIA

The intent of the Level 3 screening is to identify the most effective alternatives and the most effective component suggestions of those alternatives. The criteria will provide for a comparative evaluation of the alternatives and their component suggestions. The Interest Matrix will be updated to indicate the use of specific interest statements in the definition of the Level 3 screening criteria. The updated Interest Matrix will be posted on the project web site.

After the initial Level 3 screening, the team will repackage the suggestions and develop a new set of alternatives. There will be fewer alternatives at the end of this screening. Repackaging may include elements from the Unused List of Suggestions and/or the Disposition List if any of the suggestions might improve an alternative.

Questions, Comments, and Suggestions from the Committee

The CC members did not offer additional changes to the Level 3 screening criteria.

Q: How does the team translate the analytical results in Level 3 screening to the rating system?

A: For many of the screening criteria, there are no objective standards that allow the team to immediately translate the results of a model run into a rating. The ratings come from comparison to the No-Action Alternative and to the other alternatives. These are subjective conclusions that the team will ask the CC to assist in making.

IV. NEXT STEPS

Actions: The project team will:

- Conduct Level 3 screening
- Present the results of the Level 3 screening to the Consensus Committee
- Repackage the most effective alternatives and suggestions to develop new alternatives that better satisfy the Level 3 criteria. The number of repackaged alternatives that are developed will depend on how many alternatives and suggestions successfully address the purpose and need and project goals as derived from the Interest Matrix.
- The repackaged alternatives will be reviewed by the Consensus Committee prior to their screening
- During this time, Public Meeting #3 will be held to provide opportunity for the general public to comment on the alternatives definition and screening process
- After the screening of the repackaged alternatives, recommended Preferred Alternative will be identified for further evaluation in the EA (along with the No-Action Alternative). The Consensus Committee will provide input to the definition of the recommended Preferred Alternative.
- Prepare the EA evaluation and documentation

Schedule:

- **May 18th** – date held for possible CC meeting or briefing
- **June 15th** – date held for CC meeting for possible review of results of Level 3 screening and repackaging of alternatives
- **July 20th** – date held for CC meeting for possible review of the identification of recommended Preferred Alternative for further evaluation in the EA
- **June (TBD)** – possible Public Meeting #3

APPENDIX A: Questions asked during, yet answered after the meeting

The following questions were asked during the meeting. The answers were provided after the meeting.

Q: Alts. #1 and #6 - Does the Broadway street lane to the wedge ramp utilize the existing westerly lane or require a new lane?

A: This alternative is drawn with a new lane. The traffic analysis may indicate that we can eliminate one of the existing lanes instead of adding a lane. At the time this alternative was prepared, that information was not available.

Q: Alts. #2 and #8 - Is Mississippi east of Broadway widened?

A: The width of Mississippi is wider than existing. However, the number of lanes have not increased. The reason why this section is wider is because the existing lanes are less than a standard lane width and we also showed wider sidewalk widths in this area.

Q: Alt. #2 - Can the Broadway ROW "split" be equally shared south of Mississippi?

A: This alternative could be moved to the west – However this shift would also have to occur north of Mississippi.

Q: Alt. #2 - Check Mississippi cross-section (both sides of Broadway)?.

A: The Mississippi section shows the same number of lanes, including a median/turn lane as existing. The biggest difference is the existing lanes are narrow than the accepted standards. In addition, we are showing wider sidewalks than what the existing has.

APPENDIX B

Consensus Committee Members and Alternates in Attendance:

Lee Cryer, Regional Transportation District
Karen Cuthbertson, Athmar Park Neighborhood Association
Katie Fisher, West University Community Association
Jim Carlson, West University Community Association
Tony Gengaro, Broadway Partnership
Steve Harley, Baker Historic Neighborhood Association
Jim Jones, West Washington Park Neighborhood Association
Gloria LeFree, West Washington Park Neighborhood Association
Donna Krentz, Platt Park Residents Coalition
Patti Bennett, Platte Park Residence Coalition
Jim Lindbergh, Platt Park People's Association.
Jason Longsdorf, Denver Public Works
Joan Loughridge, Broadway Area Revitalization District
Doug McKinnon, Lionstone
Mike Vanderhoof, Federal Highway Administration
Jean Wallace, Federal Highway Administration
Rick Wells, Cherokee

In Attendance:

Genevieve Hutchison, Regional Transportation District
Steve Kaplan, Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell - Lionstone
Shelly Watters, Councilwoman Boigon's office
Charlie Busch, West Washington Park Park Neighborhood Association
Matt Wittern, Kiewit Building Group
Kim Kucera, Citizen
Paul Ryan, The Kenney Group – Lionstone

Project Team:

Larry Gibson, Carter & Burgess
Mike Gill, Carter & Burgess
Erik Guderian, Fehr and Peers
Caryn Wenzara, Denver Community Development & Planning
Amy Wiedeman, Denver Public Works
Julie Connor, Council District #7

Facilitation:

Jody Erikson, The Keystone Center
Mike Hughes, The Keystone Center