



South Broadway NEPA Process Consensus Committee Meeting #1: June 23, 2005

Final Meeting Summary

In attendance:

CC Members and Alternates:

Baker Historic Neighborhood - Steve Harley,
Tim Lopez

Broadway Area Revitalization District - Joan
Loughridge

Broadway Pedestrian Mall - Tony Gengaro
CDOT - Jim Paulmeno

City of Englewood - Mark Graham

Cherokee Denver, LLC - Rick Well

Cohen Capital/Denver Design District - Joe
Klein

Lionstone/Kaplan, Kirsch and Rockwell - Doug
McKinnon, Steve Kaplan

Overland Park Neigh. Assoc. - Jack Unruh

Platte Park Residents' Coalition - Patti Bennett,
Donna Krentz

Platt Park Peoples Association - Pat Callahan

RTD - Lee Cryer

West University Community Association - Katie
Fisher

West Washington Park Neighborhood Asso. -
Jim Jones, Gloria LeFree

City & County of Denver - Public Works, Jason
Longsdorf,

Observers:

Charlie Busch-West Wash.Park Neigh. Assoc

Janet Burgesser-Denver Environmental Health

Connie Conine-Platt Park Residents' Coalition

Julie Conor-Kathleen MacKenzie's Office

Catherine Cox-Blair-Denver Planning

Charles Howard-W. University Commun Assoc.

Paul Ryan- The Kenney Group

Consultants:

Jody Erikson –RESOLVE

Caelan McGee – RESOVLE

Larry Gibson – Carter & Burgess

Darin Stavish – Carter & Burgess

Brian Welch – Fehr & Peers

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- To review the project description.
- To establish a list and understanding of each entities issues/interests/concerns.
- To learn about measures of effectiveness in preparation for meeting #2.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION/OVERVIEW

Jason Longsdorf, City/County of Denver reviewed the ordering of key elements of the NEPA process and the Consensus Committee (CC) process:

- Study area
- Purpose and Need
- Defining Alternatives – to develop a range of options
- Evaluating Alternatives – to recommend up to three alternatives for further evaluation



The NEPA process will study a range of issues related to the environment, transportation, and social needs and impacts.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is the lead agency and as such has final review and authority for the NEPA documentation. The City/County of Denver is the project sponsor. The City's recommendations will be considered carefully by FHWA. In addition, the city will participate on the CC as a full member, bringing the interests and needs of the City to bear along with other members' on the exploration/evaluation of alternative and the final consensus recommendation.

OPERATING PROTOCOLS

The CC reviewed key elements of the Operating Protocols and discussed other process issues, including:

- **Mission/Purpose:** As stated in protocols, to learn about and discuss possible options and study outcomes and to reach consensus agreement on a recommended preferred alternative that addresses everyone's interests; to inform the decision making process of the City and County of Denver and FHWA.
- **Roles of Members:**
 - Agreement:** the CC agreed it was important to represent future residents through having an empty chair with a name tent. This reminds the group to consider future residents issues and concerns in discussions. The group was open to pursuing one of the other options and to discussing it at a later date (invite a college student for a planning department, invite an 8th grader).
- **Public Input Time at the CC Meetings:**
 - Agreement:** the CC agreed to have 10 minute public comment period just prior to an early break. The timing could be adjusted, by agreement of the CC, if need arises.
- **Email Communications:**
 - o **From RESOLVE:** documents need to be sent in rich text format (rtf); or both rtf and Microsoft Word
 - o **To planning team:** all communication with the project team should be sent to Caelan McGee, RESOLVE (cmcgee@resolv.org – note: no 2nd “e” on the end of RESOLVE)
- **Posting Draft Materials on City's website:**
 - Agreement:** the CC will consider when to publish or distribute each draft document individually and must be clearly marked as “draft”. The draft Operating Protocols will not be posted until adopted as final.
- **Regular Meeting Schedule/Time:**
 - Agreement:** the CC agreed to meet the 3rd Thursday of each month, 6:00-9:00pm (see below for a full schedule, including an additional meeting date in July/August). The meetings times will be no more than three hours, but if agenda permits they will be shorter.



- **Representation at the Table:**

Agreement each entity will have one seat at the table and one alternate to sit behind them. The expectation is that the alternate will be at each meeting or otherwise be up to speed on the substance and interactions of the CC.

INTERESTS AND ISSUES OF CONCERN

To arrive at a solution the group will work toward consensus through a process of interest-based negotiation. Interest-based negotiation is based on discussing interests (the needs that must be satisfied by a solution) and not positions (what the solution ought to be). The interests can be translated into a list of criteria by which any potential solution will be measured. For the process to be successful, participants need to passionately represent their own interests and passionately search for the option that satisfies all interests.

Individuals spoke of their interests, concerns and needs that must be satisfied in the group's consensus agreement. The discussion created a list of interests to be used to develop draft criteria for the CC's evaluation of alternatives:

- Pedestrian and bicycle friendly
 - o Safe for pedestrians and bicycles – movement and crossings
 - o Aesthetically pleasing and enjoyable for pedestrians and bicyclists – not just sidewalks, need to get away from traffic
 - o Access to Platte path, to increase use
 - o Good flow through the area (from Washington Park to the Platte path)
 - o Transit access by pedestrians and bicyclists
- Traffic flow
 - o Accommodate anticipated traffic needs/flows
 - o Provide a functioning transportation network that works for regional and local streets and traffic
 - o Crossing major arterials – east/west and left turns
 - o Connections with surrounding major roads/corridors (I-25, Santa Fe, Logan, etc.); integration of surrounding corridors
 - o Circulation between major one ways (Broadway/Lincoln) and other side streets
 - o East/West access
 - o Cut through traffic
 - o Speed
 - o Noise
 - o Displaced traffic – ripple effect
- Neighborhood/Residential Character
 - o Maintain/preserve residential character and quality of life
 - o Maintain residential streets
 - o Integrate the transportation solution into existing neighborhood character



- Preserve parking – residents
- Reduce cut through traffic
- Reduce overload on local roads
- Consider the impact of roads as barriers between neighborhoods – need community building
- Businesses
 - Preserve viability of local businesses
 - Provide Parking – need for, do not decrease
 - Provide access to existing and new businesses – by car, bike or feet; safety and aesthetics; especially at peak hours
 - Preserve the new life, new investments coming into the area
 - Maintain the street grid alignments in the Broadway Marketplace (Kmart, Sam's, Albertson's, etc.)
 - Encourage local businesses
 - Maintain and enhance cross roadway pedestrian traffic/shopping
- Commuters
 - Encourage transit
 - Maintain commitments to transit riders
 - Pleasing
 - Accessible for commuters (walking, driving, or biking)– easy, safe, enjoyable
 - Accessible for buses
 - Flow at peak times
- Condemnation Process
 - Provide as much notice as possible
- Blend north and south Broadway areas (businesses and neighborhoods)
- Balance between traffic needs and protecting neighborhood feel
- Facilitate development of underutilized, contaminated sites
- Integration with surrounding projects – local development and public works projects and Statewide projects
- Environmental impacts
- Consider adjacent adopted local plans (example BARD plan)

Other input:

Suggestions for alternatives/options to study

- tunnel for South bound Broadway to I-25 South traffic
- move traffic to Santa Fe

Specific traffic challenges mentioned:

- Two-way stop on Grant at the McKinley/Thatcher elementary school
- Crossings for pedestrians too spread out on Broadway (near Ohio)
- South to North (Broadway to Lincoln) at Ohio – not a lot of room and light signals are not synchronized
- Commuters leaving the Virginia parking lot at peak hours
- Distribute bike/ped crossing north of Ohio



- Tradeoffs between traffic (auto) volume and pedestrian friendliness
- Traffic during construction

NEXT MEETING: MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Brian Welch briefly introduced Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs). For every issue/interest there needs to be a way to measure its effectiveness in achieving stated goals for the project. Being able to measure the issues is important for discussion and evaluation of alternatives via the interests articulated. Some examples of MOEs are:

- Pedestrian connectivity
- Safety
- Flow (traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles)

The next CC meeting will examine how to convert interests into Measures of Effectiveness, or criteria to evaluate and compare alternatives. This development of Measures of Effectiveness will in part shape the nature of the study area for the project. It may be that the project area is defined by a number of overlapping polygons that represent the important geography for key issues of concern.

SCHEDULE

CC Meetings; 3rd Thursdays of each month (exceptions indicated by **)

- Meeting #2 July 21st, 6:00pm-9:00pm, Lincoln Elementary
- Meeting #3 August 4th**
- Meeting #4: August 18th
- Meeting #5: September 15th
- Meeting #6: October 20th
- Meeting #7: November 17th
- Meeting #8: December 15th

Anticipated Phase I meetings– further meetings may be requested on the same schedule, and if so they would be on the third Thursday.