

**South Broadway NEPA Process
Consensus Committee Meeting
October 20, 2005
Draft Meeting Summary**

INTRODUCTION OF PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS

Brendon Harrington, UrbanTrans – Brendon’s role in the project is alternative mode transportation systems, development of bicycle, pedestrian and other transit alternatives. He will assist in data collection, development and analysis of alternative modes of transportation. Brendon plans to develop a bicycle-pedestrian workshop to capture comments and concerns from cyclists and pedestrians in the study area.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

Discussion focused on concerns that the term “north-south” mobility in the purpose and need statement would inappropriately limit possible mobility solutions. All supported the idea to remove this term and stressed the importance of defining the study area in the development and screening of alternatives. Limited capacity on Broadway near I-25 is believed to be a critical factor for successful transportation solutions in the area.

It was suggested several times that Santa Fe be considered as a part of the project area, and that solutions may lie there. The project team agreed to focus on the definition of the study area and that it is not the intent to shift transportation and mobility issues to other areas.

Action: Jason Longsdorf will talk to city council members and review past deliberations to make sure that the South Broadway NEPA study is in alignment with previous intent of council members.

Consensus Recommendations/Agreement:

- Support of the Statement of Purpose with the removal of the term “north-south”.
- Support for the bulleted statements included in the statement of purpose
- There is support for the Needs statements, “north-south mobility”, stricken from the statement of purpose, will be included in the needs statement.

PROJECT GOALS

Many state the concern that the list of goals statements is not balanced between business and residential interests. There is a request to include a goal for maintaining residential character of adjacent neighborhoods.

Specific comments regarding goals statements follow:

- *GOAL: “Provide safe and attractive bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the corridor.”*
Concern – the goal is beyond “safe and attractive”, the goal is for safe and effective facilities.
- *GOAL: “Enhance the economic viability of the Broadway corridor.”*
Concern – the goal of economic viability needs to include more than just business to include residential economic viability.
- *GOAL: “Optimize redevelopment opportunities in conjunction with transportation improvements.”*

Concern – “optimize” is a subjective term, enhance may be better
Concern – “redevelopment opportunities” this needs to include residential redevelopment

- *GOAL: “Develop a solution that can be implemented, is fiscally feasible, and politically acceptable.”*

“Politically acceptable” is a vague term. This could include support from Denver City Council and could include other considerations. The intent of this goal statement is to avoid selecting a preferred alternative that will not receive the necessary support for implementation.

Action: the project team use the interests matrix to help develop possible criteria for terms such as “politically acceptable”

- *“...recomendations of adopted plans”*

The project team considered including neighborhood plans and found that it may not be equitable among neighborhoods. Different neighborhoods are in different stages of plan adoption, some are: recently adopted, assessments not plans, more than ten years old, nonexistent. Consensus Committee members are bringing their neighborhood’s visions and elements of their plans to bare on the process through the Committee process. The “recommendations” are not just the final Recommendations, but the tenets and visions, and intent of the plans.

Consensus Recommendation/Agreement: add “and all relevant supplements”

Action: the revised purpose and need will be posted on the web site.

DECISION MAKING AND THE CONSENSUS COMMITTEE

The Federal Highway Administration will be the final authority on the validity of the Environmental Document. FHWA will look for recommendations and guidance that comes from the City and County of Denver, the applicant for this study. Both FHWA, Denver are members of the Consensus Committee. In this way, while the Consensus Committee does not have final decision making authority over things such as the Statement of Purpose or the selection of any particular alternative, a consensus recommendation from the committee will carry significant weight with the City and County of Denver in their deliberations.

TRAFFIC NUMBERS AND PROJECT TERMINI

National Environmental Policy Act requires the use of regionally approved regional plans in modeling efforts and travel demand forecasting. The plan for this project is Denver Regional Council of Government’s (DRCOG) 2030 Land Use Plan.

Travel demand forecasting will serve as the basis for determining logical termini (end points of the study area by mode) and evaluating alternatives; determine need and use it to evaluate alternatives capacity. The project team will conduct two types of model runs: 1) no action network model run – traffic conditions with currently committed project (funds committed); and 2) alternative model runs – alternatives that may meet the identified needs.

The project team is in consultation with DRCOG to address discrepancies in the model related to land use, population and demographic distributions in the Lionstone and Cherokee properties. Overall numbers related to jobs and population growth in the model cannot be changed without a plan amendment and approval by the DRCOG member governments, a difficult and time consuming process. Limited movement of jobs and population in adjacent TAZs is possible to more accurately represent existing and planned conditions.

Timeline and next steps for modeling include:

- agreement on strategies to update land use and connectors by the last week of October
- first model run early in the first week of November
- after review and initial corrections/calibrations, the project team will run model again and confer with FHWA, CDOT, DRCOG and Denver about using the model to determine termini
- results of modeling efforts to be discussed at the November 17th CC meeting.

Determining Project Termini

- there will be a different project terminus for each mode of travel: bike, ped, transit, automobile
- termini are determined based on model runs. Where traffic volumes decrease or there is a change in the capacity needs (e.g. at Exposition there may be a change in capacity needs due to the start of three lane/one way) are indications of possible termini.
- Bicycle and pedestrian termini are determined by establishing a radius of accessibility for each of these modes. A bicycle-ped workshop in the study area will help to refine these radii and check with the actual users in the area.
- First look at project termini data will occur at CC mtg #5

PUBLIC COMMENT

Charlie Busch, WUCA – I am concerned that solutions have already been determined. There is a need to clarify decision making – who is deciding what? Charlie disagreed with the screening of one transportation suggestion (#43) and suggested it remain in for further analysis.

LEVEL ONE SCREENING/FATAL FLAW ANALYSIS

Overview of Process

Each element generated by the Consensus Committee and the project team (total of 94 elements) was assessed or screen conservatively by the level one screening criteria. The goal of screening is to narrow the list of transportation suggestions/elements to be reviewed in the detailed NEPA analysis. The first level screening will be completed following the public meeting on November 2nd. Purpose and Need were the primary considerations in Level One Screening, and some of the concerns in the Interest Matrix are included in the Fatal Flaw screening.

Screening Matrix

The Committee reviewed a matrix which catalogued screening considerations to date. This included information on whether a suggestion was screened, if so on what basis. This also included cataloguing some of the suggestions as a part of the No Action alternative. The project team was conservative in first level screening. If a suggestion had the potential of meeting any element of the purpose and need, and was with the study area, and was deemed technologically feasible, it was not screened and was carried forward. It is possible that suggestions that are screened out may re-enter the process or be packaged with other elements.

Discussion centered on definitions and transportation suggestions that were “screened out.”

Definitions:

- “Practicability” – technologically and legally feasible
- “Feasibility” – broadly defined as can it be built
- “No Action” in the screening matrix – suggestions that are apart of an existing planning process or adopted decision

- “No Action” Alternative – this alternative will assume only changes are those included in other committed projects in the area. This will also include any necessary improvements that may be complete soon

DISCUSSION OF SUGGESTIONS SCREENED IN LEVEL ONE

Consensus Recommendation/Agreement – any suggestions screened out base on the study area or project and need move forward into level two screening (#s: 11, 43, 44, 45, 50, 51)

Consensus Recommendation/Agreement – leave out those suggestions that were screened out because they were duplicates (#s: 16-combination of 4&17, 43-duplicate of 1)

- #1: Needs greater clarity, how does it affect Cherokee and Acoma
- #36: Agreement to remain screened out
- #37: Agreement to remain screened out
- #49: Agreement to remain screened out
Explanation - the “Cherokee extension” means extending Cherokee street into/becomes Acoma
- #53: Agreement to move this forward into level two screening – it could technologically be achieved by where the tunnel daylights, pumping or moving the outfall.
Explanation - the Mississippi outfall is a drain that collects storm water run off from I-25 (Lake Logan Drainer)
- #61: Agreement to move this forward into level two screening (strike TBD)
- #63: Agreement to move this forward into level two screening – it may be technologically feasible
- #74: Agreement to remain screened out
Explanation - eliminate all at grade intersections. There would be no way to get on/off of Broadway. It does not meet purpose and need are revised tonight.
- #81: Agreement to remain screened out

LEVEL 2 SCREENING

The next step is to develop level two screening criteria. The project team will develop the list of criteria for Consensus Committee review on November 17th.

PUBLIC MEETING NOVEMBER 2ND

The public meeting on November 2nd, at Lincoln Elementary, 4:30-7:30, will focus on the transportation suggestions, gather further suggestions, and review the level one screening.

Consensus Committee members were concerned about the maps giving the impression that they were the alternatives. It is important to have visualization and important to give the right impression. The project team will work to provide another method to display transportation suggestions such that it is clear that there are have been no packaged alternatives developed yet in the process.

BROADWAY AREA REVITALIZATION DISTRICT

Joan Loughridge passed out the BARD plan for the South Broadway area. It includes pedestrian friendly elements, such as trees, cut-ins for parking, bulb-outs for pedestrian crossings and pedestrian safe havens in middle.

NEXT Consensus Committee Meeting November 17th -

Actions:

- Post maps on the web in jpg of smaller PDFs so that it is easier to open
- Date documents with recurring revisions/iterations

Attendance List:

Consensus Committee Members in Attendance:

Donna Krentz, Platt Park Residents Coalition
Patti Bennett, Platt Park Residents Coalition
Pat Callahan, Platt park Peoples' Association
Catherine Cox-Blair, City of Denver
Jim Carlson, West University Community Association
Lee Cryer, Regional Transportation District
Karen Cuthbertson, Athmar Park Neighborhood Association and Interneighborhood Corporation
Katie Fisher, W. University Community Assoc
Mark Graham, Englewood Community Development Dept.
Steve Harley, Baker Historic Neigh. Assoc

Jim Jones, W. Wash Park Neigh. Assoc.
Ray Keinar, Godsman RNO
Gloria LeFree, W. Wash Park Neigh. Assoc.
Jim Lindhbergh, Platt Park People's Assoc.
Jason Longsdorf, Denver Public Works
Tim Lopez, Baker Historic Neighborhood
Joan Loughridge, Broadway Area Revitalization D.
Doug McKinnon, Lionstone Group
Jim Paulmeno, Colorado Department of Transportation
Mike Vanderhoof, Federal Highway Administration
Beth Wampler, Broadway Area Revitalization District
Rick Wells, Cherokee Redevelopment

In Attendance:

Jo Krieger, Godsman RNO
Art & Nancy Scheidegger, Godsman RNO
Paul Ryan, The Kenney Group
Rick Pilgrim – URS Corp.

Charlie Busch, W. Wash Park Neigh. Assoc.
Genevieve Hutchison, Regional Transportation District

Project Team:

Larry Gibson, Carter and Burgess
Craig Gaskill, Carter and Burgess
Brendon Harrington, UrbanTrans

Gail Keeley, Hermsen Consultants
Darin Stavish, Carter and Burgess
Jeremy Klop, Fehr and Peers

Facilitation:

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