



**South Broadway NEPA Process  
Consensus Committee Briefing #2  
Cameron United Methodist Church  
June 15, 2006**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**NEXT MEETINGS**

**June 27th** – Public Meeting at 1500 S. Grant (Platt Park Senior Center). Level 3B alternatives will be presented to the public, and there will be opportunity for comment and input to the process for development and screening of the alternatives.

**July 20th** – Date held for CC meeting

**August 17th** – Date held for CC meeting

**Discussion Highlights**

1. Presentation of the repackaged Level 3B alternatives. Repackaging addressed findings from the Level 3A analysis.
2. After much discussion, the Consensus Committee gave its approval to perform the Level 3B screening on the alternatives presented.
3. A new idea of a Bypass Couplet with a “Main Street” Broadway was raised that the project team was asked to look at to determine whether it should be considered further.
4. The Level 3B alternatives will be presented at the Public Meeting. Consensus Committee members were encouraged to attend the Public Meeting and to participate in discussions with the public about the alternatives development and screening process to date.
5. Mike Vanderhoof will be representing FHWA on the Consensus Committee. Jean Wallace has relocated out of the Denver area.
6. The Consensus Committee discussed various aspects of each repackaged alternative and reiterated the desire that the solution support a more neighborhood and pedestrian friendly atmosphere. They voiced concerns about the width of all alternatives.

**Next Steps**

Based on the discussion at the briefing, the project team will evaluate the 3B alternatives. The goal of this Level 3B analysis is to identify the best features of the alternatives to be combined into a Preferred Alternative, which will be carried forward for additional evaluation in the EA.



## MEETING NOTES

### **Meeting Goals**

Review and input to the definition of the alternatives to be evaluated in the Level 3B screening. Obtain committee approval to perform the Level 3B screening on the alternatives presented. Preview the Public Meeting and seek the participation of CC members in that meeting.

### **Background**

At the beginning of the Level 3A screening process, seven alternatives plus the No-Action and TSM alternatives were defined. As a result of the Level 3A screening, the seven alternatives were narrowed (repackaged) to three build alternatives that best accommodated the project purpose and need and evaluation criteria. Based on the discussion at this CC briefing, these 3 remaining alternatives (along with the No Action Alternative) will be evaluated in the 3B screening. The 3B alternatives have been refined based on comments from RTD, FHWA, CDOT, City/County of Denver, neighborhood organizations, and findings from the project team analyses.

### **I. ALTERNATIVES FOR LEVEL 3B SCREENING**

Graphics describing the 3B alternatives were distributed and discussed. Because the Wedge Ramp is now included in each of the 3B alternatives it was discussed first. The following comments and questions were addressed on it.

- **General Comments and Questions Related to the Wedge Ramp**
  - *Comment:* Wedge Ramp is located further south than previously shown. This location minimizes potential right-of-way impacts.
  - *Comment:* The westerly SB lane on Broadway, north of the Wedge Ramp, will be a dedicated on-ramp lane. Traffic model results will indicate how long this dedicated lane will need to extend to the north.
  - *Comment:* Forecasted 2030 volumes indicate that during peak hours approximately 1,600 vehicles will utilize this ramp. The grade separated Wedge Ramp will accommodate this demand.
  - *Comment:* Acoma was extended further north to provide better access to Cherokee street. At this time, the cross-section for this improvement has not been defined.
  - *Comment:* Would like to see if the SB Broadway to NB I-25 movement could be moved to the westside of Broadway.
  - *Comment:* Kentucky and SB off-ramp were moved closer together so that they can be controlled by a single traffic signal. This will

eliminate one signal, which should lessen delay and improve traffic operations.

- *Q:* Cherokee is concerned that this relocation of Kentucky would split their development parcel resulting in odd shaped/sized parcels, and asked whether there could be another alignment that would reduce the development impact.

*A:* The project team indicated that it would meet with Cherokee to discuss how to improve the development opportunity.

- *Q:* How does the Wedge Ramp compare with the recommendation in the VHEIS?

*A:* The Wedge Ramp is different from the Preferred Alternative that will be defined in the VHEIS. The VHEIS and the South Broadway projects address different purpose and needs, so differences are expected. The goal of the VHEIS was to improve traffic operations along I-25 and to provide consistency in design. The goal for Broadway is to specifically improve transportation operations along Broadway.

Similarly, common transit and pedestrian/bicycle issues were also initially addressed.

- **General Comments and Questions Related to Transit Improvements**

- *Comment:* Bus only lane has been included from Exposition Ave. to the station platform area.

- *Q:* What impact to parking, specifically at the park-n-ride lot, is there with the Wedge Ramp and other alternative improvements?

*A:* The impact to parking will be quantified during the 3B screening process with the intent to make RTD “whole” with its existing number of parking spaces.

- **General Comments and Questions Related to Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements**

- *Comment:* Right-of-way (ROW) cross-sections were presented to illustrate the differences in ROW width between each of the alternatives, the length of the typical pedestrian crossing, and the related time for pedestrian crossing. Committee members sought to identify similar width corridors for comparison in the Metro area - including Colorado Blvd.

- *Comments:* The West Washington Park Neighborhood Association reiterated its objection to the pedestrian/bicycle bridge across I-25 at Mississippi. They do not see the benefit of such access. There was disagreement among other committee members as to whether this access might be beneficial to other neighborhoods west if the

highway wishing to access the park and other destinations to the east.

- *Q:* How does the improved Wedge Ramp impact the pedestrian and bicycle access to the station?  
*A:* Improved pedestrian and bicycle access to the station will be provided with an exclusive pedestrian/bike access across Ohio and under I-25 to the station platform area. Details of this access, including how it will cross through the parking area under I-25 will be addressed in the design stage.
- *Q:* Freeway underpasses have a reputation for being unsafe. How will this be addressed?  
*A:* Pedestrian and bicycle safety issues will be addressed during the design stage utilizing items such as lighting, wide sidewalks, public art, clear visibility, and other urban design elements.
- *Q:* With the intersection of Kentucky/Broadway moving north as part of a single intersection, including the SB I-25 off-ramp to Broadway, will this larger intersection negatively impact pedestrians and bicyclists seeking to cross Broadway to access the station?  
*A:* Again, this will be addressed during the design stage to facilitate and make safe ped/bike movements across Broadway to the station.
- *Q:* What improvements are planned at the Ohio/Lincoln/Off-ramp intersection?  
*A:* The project team is aware of the concerns of the neighborhood about the speed of traffic in the intersection and turning into the neighborhood. We will address improvements to this intersection to improve ped/bike safety, including looking at the recommendation in the VHEIS, as part of the process for identifying the Preferred Alternative.

- **Comments and Questions Related to the Broadway Widening Alternative**

- *Q:* Why is the parking garage west of the CML only on the widening alternative?  
*A:* The traffic model will indicate the benefit of this improvement. If it is determined to be beneficial, then it will be included in the all of the alternatives.
- *Q:* The number of lanes on Mississippi is the same as existing in this alternative, yet there is indication of improvements (black lines). What is changing?

A: The black lines indicate that the travel lanes will be widened to bring them up to design standards. No additional lanes have been proposed at this location.

- *Q:* At one time, improvements were shown on Mississippi between Broadway and Santa Fe. The current alternatives show only improvements between the CML and Logan. Are there no improvements recommended between the CML and Santa Fe?

A: There are no improvements recommended between the CML and Santa Fe because they are outside of the project study area.

- *Q:* Why is the pedestrian bridge at the Mississippi/Broadway intersection shown as a diagonal crossing?

A: The reason for the diagonal crossing is to create enough of a time savings for pedestrians to select the elevated crossing rather crossing two “legs” of the intersection at grade.

#### • **Comments and Questions Related to the Multi-Way Boulevard Alternative**

- *Comment:* The challenge with this alternative would be to educate drivers on how to navigate through the corridor. Accessing the adjacent parcels would need to occur from the access lanes paralleling the through lanes.
- *Comment:* There is a jog in the alignment with this alternative to try and take equal portions of right-of-way from the Cherokee and Lionstone developments. Right-of-way can not impact the historic Ford Building.
- *Q:* Various Consensus Committee members raised the concern that this alternative and the widening alternative showed significant increase in roadway width. Is it possible to have an alternative that does not require extensive widening?

A: The widening shown anticipates the future 2030 peak hour traffic demand in the corridor. The additional lanes will enable traffic through the area to travel at present speeds during peak travel periods. However, even with the widening alternatives as drawn, the goal is to accommodate 80% of the 2030 forecasted demand.

#### • **Comments and Questions Related to the Broadway/Acoma Couplet Alternative**

- *Comments:* This alternative provides enough traffic and pedestrian benefit that it cannot be discarded. The Broadway width could actually narrow (36-foot pavement width) with this alternative and traffic could move through the area more efficiently due the incorporation of one-way signal phasing.

- *Comments:* Cherokee was concerned about the right-of-way impacts that this alternative would have on their property. The couplet would create several small parcels that are hard to develop. If this alternative was selected, review of the Acoma right-of-way would need to be evaluated. Also, there was concern about the speed of vehicles traveling through the area on the couplet.
- *Comments:* Developers do not care for the proposed pedestrian bridges. They would like a corridor that encourages pedestrians to make those movements at grade. Bridges convey the notion that auto traffic has preference.
- *Comments:* Developers would prefer Broadway to remain a two-way street (south of I-25).
- *Q:* How would RTD buses be accommodated with this alternative?  
*A:* Routing for the buses would be more difficult with this alternative. If this were selected, specific transit accommodations would need to be considered.

## **II. APPROVAL TO USE THE ALTERNATIVES IN THE 3B SCREENING**

The Consensus Committee had a few changes/suggestions on the three repackaged alternatives (see below). They also asked the project team to look at a new idea of using the Couplet alignment as either a two-way by-pass or using Acoma as a contra-flow for one-way traffic (direction depending on the time of day).

Moving forward with the repackaged alternatives the CC would like:

- i. To see the SB Broadway to NB I-25 movement moved to the westside of Broadway
- ii. The corridor designed to encourage pedestrians circulation at the ground level.
- iii. Broadway to remain a two-way street.

After much Discussion, the Consensus Committee gave its approval to perform the Level 3B Screening on the alternatives as presented, with the considerations listed ‘above’.

## **III. NEXT STEPS**

- Conduct Level 3B screening incorporating the traffic simulation model results
- Conduct Public Meeting #3 (June 27<sup>th</sup>) to provide opportunity for public comment on the 3B alternatives and the alternatives development and screening process to date

- Identification of the Preferred Alternative. The Consensus Committee will provide input to the identification of this alternative.
- Conduct the EA evaluation and prepare EA documentation

*Schedule:*

- **June 27<sup>th</sup>** – Public Meeting to be held from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 and the Platt Park Senior Center
- **July 20<sup>th</sup>** – Date held for possible CC activity
- **August 17<sup>th</sup>** – Date held for possible CC activity

## **APPENDIX**

### **Consensus Committee Members and Alternates in Attendance:**

Karen Cuthbertson, Athmar Park Neighborhood Association and INC  
Steve Harley, Baker Historic Neighborhood Association  
Tim Lopez, Baker Historic Neighborhood Association  
Joan Loughridge, Broadway Area Revitalization District  
Tony Gengaro, Broadway Partnership  
Rick Wells, Cherokee  
Jason Longsdorf, City and County of Denver  
Kirk Webb, CDOT  
Doug McKinnon, Lionstone  
Jack Unruh, Overland Neighborhood Association  
Jim Lindbergh, Platt Park Peoples' Association  
Donna Krentz, Platt Park Residents' Coalition  
Patti Bennett, Platt Park Residents' Coalition  
Robert Rynerson, RTD  
Katie Fisher, West University Community Association  
Jim Carlson, West University Community Association  
Jim Jones, West Washington Park Neighborhood Association  
Gloria LeFree, West Washington Park Neighborhood Association

### **In Attendance:**

Shelly Watters, City and County of Denver Council At-Large representative  
Steve Kaplan, Kaplan Kirsch & Rockwell - Lionstone  
Paul Ryan, The Kenney Group – Lionstone  
Patricia Leslie, DU Student  
Jeff Kaye, RTD

### **Project Team:**

Larry Gibson, Carter & Burgess  
Mike Gill, Carter & Burgess  
Scott Jones, Carter & Burgess  
Brian Welsh, Fehr and Peers  
David Dyer, Hartwig and Associates  
Julie Connor, City Council District #7 representative

### **Facilitation:**

Jody Erikson, The Keystone Center