



Meeting Notes
South Broadway NEPA Process
Consensus Committee Meeting #2
July 21, 2005, 6:00 pm
Cameron Community Church

Consensus Committee members in attendance:

Jim Paulmeno- CDOT	Warren Cohen – Bdwy Mktplace
Carol Gosselin - MDLDC	Karen Cuthbertson – Athmar Park NA
Doug McKinnon – Lionstone	Ferd Belz – Cherokee Redevelopment
Katie Fisher- WUCA	Mark Graham – City of Englewood
Jim Jones - WWPNA	Steve Harley – Baker Historic NA
Patti Bennett - PPRC	Jason Longsdorf – City of Denver
Joan Loughridge - BARD	Jack Unruh – Overland NA
Lee Cryer - RTD	

In audience:

Jeremy Klop – Fehr & Peers	Zafar Alikhan- Carter Burgess
Craig Carter – Carter Burgess	Robert Rynerson – RTD
Diana Bell – Carter Burgess	Kathleen MacKenzie –Council District 7
Jim Carlson - WUCA	Chris Arend – Rep. D. Degette office
Rick Wells – Cherokee Redevelopment	Gloria LeFree- WWPNA
Charlie Busch - WWPNA	Dan Ridgeway – College View NA
Marvinetta Hartwig – Hartwig & Assoc.	Donna Krentz – PPRC
Steve Kaplan – Kaplan, Kirsch & Rockwell	Max Cohen – Cohen Capital
Garret Krietier	Gertie Grant- WWPNA

Facilitation:

Caelan McGee - RESOLVE

Introduction of Project Team Members:

Marvinetta Hartwig

- 19 years transportation planning experience
- Has experience on EIS/EAs from design to construction
- For this project: leading design efforts which includes alignments, widths and footprints

Craig Carter: Carter and Burgess

- Background: Geologist BS, MS:
- For this project: in charge of phase 1 environmental site assessment

Presentation: Key phases and elements of a NEPA Process: Diana Bell

There are multiple levels of analysis in a NEPA process. Some analysis involves developing criteria for screening and narrowing alternatives. Other phases involve the development of details and the fine tuning of alternatives. Different interests can and will be included in different phases of analysis.

There are two phases of this NEPA process:

- Phase 1 will last approximately until January 2006 and will involve the development, primary analysis, and narrowing of options. This will include:
 - o Definition of Purpose and Need for the project
 - o Identification of Screening Criteria
 - o Development of a Universe of Alternatives
 - o Initial Screening. This can be thought of as a “fatal flaw” screening. Those alternatives which do not meet the purpose and need or which are technically or logistically unfeasible are eliminated
 - o Comparative Screening: This level of screening will use transportation, environmental and social criteria to compare, distinguish and further narrow among alternatives. Consistency with local plans and analysis of impacts to historic properties are examples of likely criteria for this screening.
 - o Phase 2 will take place in 2006, and involves the detailed analysis and design of a small number of remaining alternatives resulting in the identification of a
 - o With appropriate justification, it is possible to bring back all or portions of a previously screened alternative at any phase in the NEPA process
 - o Alternatives may include ‘packaged’ improvements
- A No-Action Alternative is required to be considered and compared to other alternatives throughout the he NEPA process

Overview of Purpose and Need Statement: Diana Bell

- Purpose and Need is a particular section of the NEPA document and is a succinct statement of the transportation need
- Included in the Purpose and Need are secondary goals and critical factors for decision making when considering and comparing transportation alternatives
- The Purpose and Need demonstrates that a need exists for improvements and will provide the basis for the definition and evaluation of alternatives, including the No-Action Alternative

Group Discussion: Purpose and Need:

- Is there a threshold value for minimum automobile traffic capacity that will serve as a constraint on the development or screening of alternatives and if so, when might we know this?
 - o By the next meeting, there will be more ballpark information on expected auto traffic volumes. However, if the Purpose and Need is well written, this will be one of many transportation criteria considered. I don’t think this addresses the question asked
- Is there a budgetary constraint on the development and screening of alternatives?
 - o There are two budgetary considerations: cost and financing
 - ■ Cost: Generally, alternatives are not to be screened based on estimated cost of construction. However, alternatives considered may not be “feasible” due to exorbitant costs. Cost/benefit analysis of alternatives can be a useful evaluation criteria.
 - ■ Financing: The decision to conduct a NEPA process is largely based on a desire to seek federal funding. A Record of Decision (ROD), which is

necessary before a Proposed Action can be approved for construction, requires identification of a realistic funding strategy within a reasonable time frame of the completion of the environmental process. Investigation of financing alternatives comes late in the NEPA process. In addition, the phasing of the Proposed Action may be a key consideration in implementation over time.

- Is there a tension or competition between this, a transportation project, and the planning goals of the city laid out in Blueprint Denver and other city plans?
 - o The goal for this project is to define a transportation system or network in the area that allows for and encourages the integrated transportation land use goals contained within Blueprint Denver and the zoning for the major properties.
- Should not prioritize moving traffic fast, just moving it through. What is this? Needs to be more clearly stated.
- The problem is worst at the peak hours, not all day.

Suggestions for the Development of the Purpose and Need Statement:

- As per Denver Blueprint, a purpose of this project should be to encourage Transit Oriented Development, multiple modes of travel, and to decrease dependence on cars
- This project and resultant alternatives should help “make a place” along S. Broadway that balances and marries the interests of those passing through with those that are “there”. This includes making Broadway safe to cross
- The primary focus should be on moving people through the corridor and NOT just on moving automobile traffic
- The “volume throughput” goal is to move people
- Large intersections tend to bottleneck traffic so a goal should be to allow a road network that better spreads the volumes
- The connectivity between Broadway and I-25 in both (N-S) directions should be a primary focus of the Purpose and Need
- Provide a solution that minimizes cut through traffic
- Need to reinforce all the good things TOD can provide, not just the downsides of density.
- Understand the regional travel needs in and through the area
- Don’t allow the destruction of the block between Broadway and Lincoln
- Address the realistic possibilities of light rail and other transit modes

Introduction to Interests Matrix

- The Consensus Committee reviewed a matrix which lists the range of interests and concerns heard from members of the public, resource agencies and the Consensus Committee
- This matrix is to be used as a tool to plan and track the use of different interests at different points in the NEPA process. For example, vehicles miles traveled and number of transit alightings may be used as criteria for early screening, where pedestrian-friendly streets may be considered during the design phase of the study.
- Some of the interests/criteria/concerns are believed to be duplicates or considered under others.
- The Consensus Committee members are to review this matrix, especially to identify those interests that are most important to them to review for:

- Accuracy in the statement of the interest
- Accuracy if described as a “duplicate”
- To see if the measures of effectiveness, criteria, and place in process make sense
- To provide suggestions for ways to measure this interest where possible
- The deadline for the review of these matrices is Friday August 12th. Electronic copies will be circulated. Comments should be made in any color but black and returned to Caelan
 - There is a suggestion to change the “Role in Process” column to a series of columns that reflect the different stages and levels of analysis. This has been done and will allow for “check boxes” that can be more easily read and sorted
- It is important to recognize that not all interests may be able to be measured. This may be so because:
 - The interest is best reflected in a goals statement or a design guideline
 - The metric is too difficult or costly to develop
- While the project team may not be able to measure every interest, the team pledges to engage in open discussions with the Consensus Committee about how different interests are considered, and if they cannot be measured, why

Announcement by Councilwoman MacKenzie:

“I am pleased the City is engaging in this collaborative process. My office will be hosting a meeting on July 27 at 7pm at the Platt Park Senior Center about TCE and remediation efforts at the former Gates property”.

Public Comment:

- A suggestion for the “Future Resident” representative. The group should consider recruiting a Teacher, Police Officer, Minister...someone who gives important service to the community but who may require affordable housing to live in the area which the new developments will provide.
- There is a desire to know what expected and desired automobile traffic capacity will be in the S. Broadway area. Many counts and projections have been done already and have projected a demand as large as 90,000 cars/day. Currently the largest capacity intersection in Denver is Colorado and I-25 with 66,000 cars/day.
- The Project Team should consider building into the Purpose and Need statement the goal of less capacity for automobiles. It appears that the total demand cannot be met anyway, and it is possible that this demand projection is inaccurate given rising fuel costs and other factors. Even if demand does not decrease, it may be valuable to have as a primary goal reducing automobile capacity on South Broadway and encouraging other modes.
- At the construction phase of this project, please consider apprenticeship of local students and workers and support the local economy. I suggest this be included in the Purpose and Need
- It is important to bring accurate, current traffic counts and projections to bear on the analysis of this project especially given that on/off ramps to I-25 will be coming online with the completion of TREX at Downing, Washington and Emerson