



**South Broadway NEPA Process
Consensus Committee Meeting #6
December 15, 2005
Cameron United Methodist Church
1600 S. Pearl St., Denver**

DRAFT Meeting Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NEXT MEETINGS

January 9th, 5:00-7:30pm - Alternatives Packaging Workshop, Webb Building, 201 East Colfax, Room 4.G.2

January 19th, 6:00-9:00 – Consensus Committee Meeting, Cameron United Methodist Church, 1600 S. Pearl. Refreshments at 5:30 pm

AGREEMENT

The CC members accepted the revised Purpose and Need with the words “with increased capacity” removed.

ACTIONS

1. CC Member Homework from this meeting

- Review the list of suggestions, specifically the ones most important to you and make sure they are described (and drawn, as supplied on the CD of suggestions) as you intended
- Review the disposition sheet (suggestions tabled as part of level 1 screening, consolidation and streamlining). Does this list make sense? If not, why not?
- Is there anything that has been screened out or placed on the disposition sheet that you feel should not have been placed there? Please provide your reasoning.

2. The Keystone Center will call CC members to discuss the homework and address questions.

3. Project Team will:

- Revise the needs criteria to change “How well does this suggestion...” To “Does this suggestion...” to facilitate yes/no answers to the measure.
- Provide further information about revisions to the DRCOG transportation model, when information becomes available.

Discussion Highlights:

- Update - Bicycle Pedestrian Workshop, Nov. 29th: Attendees identified current conditions and discussed specific suggestions for improvements.
- Purpose and Need: the CC members accepted the current purpose and need statement with the removal of the words “with increased capacity”.
- Traffic Data and Traffic Modeling: negotiations with DRCOG resulted in adjustments to adjacent transportation analysis zones (TAZ). The project team is working with DRCOG to calibrate the model for 2005 so that any future scenario will be as accurate as possible
- Project Termini: the project team presented a graphic of the termini and clarified that alternatives or potential transportation improvements may extend beyond the project termini, as long as any given alternative is ‘rooted’ within the termini and serves the Purpose and Need of the project.

- Level 1 & 2 Screening & Disposition: The project team presented matrices showing suggestions remaining “in” and those “tabled” (on disposition list) for fatal flaws, considered a duplicate, part of the “No-Action” alternative, replaced by a similar suggestion with greater detail, or did not have independent utility.

MEETING NOTES

UPDATES:

Bicycle Pedestrian Workshop on Nov. 29th: Brendon Harrington, UrbanTrans

There were approximately 25 participants plus the project team in attendance. The workshop:

- Identified pedestrian and bicycle origins-destinations
- Discussed current conditions, including highlights of key opportunities or problem areas
- Discussed specific suggestions for improvements in the South Broadway corridor.
- Discussed opportunities for improved bike and pedestrian access to the I-25/Broadway station.

Purpose and Need

There were small changes to the Purpose statement that were reviewed by the Consensus Committee. A key change that triggered group discussion was the phrase “with increased capacity”. The project team explained this was an effort to emphasize expanding capacity for all modes of travel. Many expressed concern that this narrowed options for Broadway.

AGREEMENT: The CC accepted the revised Purpose and Need with the words “with increased capacity” removed.

Traffic Data and Travel Model

Traffic Data:

In the last CC meeting, initial traffic data and results from the DRCOG transportation model were presented. There appeared to be errors in the model results. Current progress and status in the project team’s efforts to identify and correct the apparent errors:

- Negotiations with DRCOG have resulted in adjustments to adjacent TAZ (transportation analysis zones) to get as close as possible to Lionstone and Cherokee planned developments.
- TAZ 1596 and 1597 include small pieces of Cherokee and Lionstone, but also include a much larger area. This was part of the previous confusion, as it looked like all of the households and jobs in the area were as a result of those two redevelopments and therefore it appeared that these projections were incorrect. Further review and consultation with Cherokee and Lionstone revealed that the initial figures presented at the previous CC meeting were indeed accurate.
- Recently updated job and household estimations from Cherokee may require additional conversations with DRCOG to re-adjust the TAZ numbers.

Model for Baseline Comparison:

The Committee discussed the transportation model including questions about traffic volumes and the coding of roadway (such as the Washington/Emerson pair having two lanes in one direction instead of one lane – this was fixed) and land use. There are still unexpected results on South Broadway that are still being analyzed and discussed with DRCOG. The year 2030 DRCOG

model will be used as input into the more detailed VISSUM and VISSIM models. The VISSUM model will use new, existing traffic counts to calibrate the model to existing conditions. The VISSUM model will be more detailed than the DRCOG model. Then, year 2030 forecasts will be developed using the DRCOG model and changes from the calibrated 2005 model. Finally, more detailed traffic operations analysis will be conducted using the VISSIM model. This will provide more accurate and detailed forecasts than by just using the DRCOG model.

The goal is to develop a year 2030 No-Action alternative model that can be used as a baseline comparison to build alternatives. The existing No-Action model will be calibrated to existing conditions using new traffic count to be conducted in January 2006. It will then be forecast to year 2030 conditions based on land use growth per the 2030 DRCOG model.

ACTION: The project team will report back as they learn more.

PROJECT TERMINI/STUDY AREA:

Larry Gibson, Carter-Burgess, clarified that alternatives or potential transportation improvements may extend beyond the project termini, as long as any given alternative is ‘rooted’ within the termini and serves the Purpose and Need of the project. This point is important given that impacts to adjacent neighborhoods are a part of the Purpose, Need and Goals statements. The project team presented a graphic that showed the termini located at the split on the one-way Broadway/Lincoln couplet (just north of Ohio), and at the Broadway and Mississippi intersection. The east and west termini are located on Mississippi just east/west of Broadway.

GLOSSARY:

A glossary of project terms was disseminated to the Committee. Committee members are asked to submit suggestions for additional definitions throughout the process. Updated versions of the glossary will be posted on the web site.

LEVEL 1 AND 2 SCREENING PROCESS AND PROGRESS:

The Committee reviewed several documents related to the screening process:

- Criteria and measures for the Level 1 and 2 screening
- Disposition of Suggestions table showed the suggestions which are currently screened out because they had a fatal flaw, or were considered a duplicate, or part of the “No-Action” alternative, or did not have independent utility, or were replaced by a more detailed suggestion with the same intent. “Independent Utility” means a suggestion is not dependent on nor creates the need for actions outside the termini. Suggestions on the disposition list may be reconsidered later if they add to the viability of an alternative.

Question: Can improvements extend well beyond the study area – such as making Broadway and Lincoln one-way streets from I-25 north to Speer?

Answer: Yes, but only if they satisfy the purpose and need within the termini and have independent utility, meaning they do not require additional transportation improvements outside the study area. This NEPA study is looking at a specific area along Broadway and near the intersection of I-25. The focus of this project is on improving travel within the study area. Suggestions that lack independent utility; cannot be settled in this process. These types of improvements are addressed through the regional planning process.

Comment: The needs screening criteria are stated as, “How well does this suggestion....” and were answered “yes” or “no”.

ACTION: The project team will restate the criteria as, “Does this suggestion....”

Question: How often does the DRCOG Travel Model get updated?

Answer: DRCOG does a major revision, with a future forecast year about every five years. DRCOG also does an annual update based on input from the member governments.

Question: What does the model show for laneage North of TREX in the Valley EIS?

Answer: All laneage in the existing and year 2030 DRCOG model are being reviewed and inconsistencies will be discussed with DRCOG before moving forward.

CC MEETING PROCESS:

Committee members raised and discussed process issues, including:

- Meetings
 - Start with the most important agenda items first
 - CC members and the facilitator will work to take questions/comments in order, rather than have people interrupt
- Materials
 - Send materials earlier, this will allow adequate time for CC members to “do their homework” and
 - Do not change the materials between the time they are sent to the CC and the time of the meeting

APPENDIX A

Consensus Committee Members and Alternates in Attendance:

Patti Bennett, Platt Park Residents Coalition
Pat Callahan – Platt Park Peoples Association
Warren Cohen, Cohen Capital
Lee Cryer, Regional Transportation District
Katie Fisher, West University Community Association
Tony Gengaro, Broadway Pedestrian Mall
Steve Harley, Baker Historic Neighborhood Association
Jim Jones, West Washington Park Neighborhood Association
Donna Krentz, Platt Park Residents Coalition
Gloria LeFree, West Washington Park Neighborhood Association
Jim Lindbergh, Platt Park People’s Association.
Jason Longsdorf, Denver Public Works
Joan Loughridge, Broadway Area Revitalization District
Doug McKinnon, Lionstone Group
Jim Paulmeno, Colorado Department of Transportation
Rick Pilgrim, URS
Mike Vanderhoof, Federal Highway Administration
Beth Wampler, Broadway Area Revitalization District
Jean Wallace, Federal Highway Administration
Rick Wells, Cherokee Redevelopment

In Attendance:

Genevieve Hutchison, Regional Transportation District
Steve Kaplan, Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell
Paul Ryan, The Kenney Group
Kirk Webb, Colorado Department of Transportation

Project Team:

Larry Gibson, Carter and Burgess
Craig Gaskill, Carter and Burgess
Brendon Harrington, UrbanTrans
Marvinetta Hartwig, Hartwig and Associates
Mike Hughes, The Keystone Center
Darin Stavish, Carter and Burgess
Brian Welch, Fehr and Peers

Facilitation:

Caelan McGee, The Keystone Center
Jody Erikson, The Keystone Center