

Washington Street Study – CWG #3

Community Working Group Meeting Notes

August 3, 2017

5:30-7 p.m., Project Angel Heart

Community Working Group Members

Name	Affiliation	In Attendance
Kristin Cardenas	Garden Place Elementary PTO	
Fred Schultz	ASARCO/Trammell Crow	X
Dennis Maddox	DenCol	
Elizabeth Bugay	Project Angel Heart	X
AE	Globeville K.A.R.E.S	X
Vernon Hill	Globeville Civic Partners	X
Marina Chotzinoff	Where Wood Meets Steel	
Jill Locantore	Walk Denver	
John Zapien	Community representative	X
Dave Oletski	Community representative	X
Maria Campos	Community representative	
Cliff Lind Teresa Immel (Cliff sub)	GES Business Association	
Kaitlyn Randol	Superior Farms	X
Rob Ollett	Bike Denver	X
Mickey Zeppelin	Zeppelin Development	X

Study & Design Team Members

Name	Representing	In Attendance
Elise Brenninkmeyer	Matrix Design Group	X
Matt Buster	Matrix Design Group	X
Karen Good	City and County of Denver	X
Andrew Irvine	RNL Design	X
Heather Noyes	Studio CPG	X
Chris Pacheco	City and County of Denver	
Chris Proud	City and County of Denver	
Jason Rutt	Matrix Design Group	X
Andrea Santoro	Matrix Design Group	
Michael Sapp	City and County of Denver	X
Rosa Snyder	Zoeller Consulting	
Christopher Valencia	Matrix Design Group	
Beth Vogelsang	OV Consulting	X
Lisa Zoeller	Zoeller Consulting	X

Guests: Nancy Gradys-Jones, Ray Ruppert



Washington Street Study – CWG #3

Introduction:

Jason stated that the main agenda item for the evening will be to have the CWG members go through the exercises that are planned for the public meeting and to provide feedback on their value and whether they should be adjusted in preparation for the general public on August 15. Jason then went through a short presentation about ongoing study results and an explanation of the exercises for the public meeting.

CWG and guest Comments:

Prior to starting the exercises the following comments were made:

Vern: The community wants to know short-term and long-term solutions, he is concerned that the open-house format might not be able to address this, particularly in regards to addressing truck traffic and truck needs.

AE asked that we have larger images of the study site that include the surrounding neighborhood; with regards to truck traffic, the current needs of truck traffic should not be the focus and burden to resolve with this Washington Street Study; bike lanes on Washington will displace parking and we need to be sensitive to this balance, as this has been an issue along Lincoln Street as well.

There was also some interactive discussion about the need for bike lanes on Washington and whether the lack of cyclists on the road now is due to a lack of facilities or lack of need. Is this a matter of, “If we build it, will they come?” **Karen Good** added that we are looking at a full range of options, but one option that is not on the table is the option to have a non-protected bike facility. If we have a bike facility, it needs to be protected from vehicular and truck traffic.

Exercise Process:

CWG members and guests then went through a process to design their ideal cross-section of the road, to see the resulting road width needed, and then to project what this width would mean in terms of existing right of way. The group then reconvened to discuss whether this process was effective and how it might be modified for the August 15 public meeting.

Comments & Questions by CWG members and guests:

Elizabeth B likes the preferences board and felt that it was helped her better understand the options in choosing cross-section elements.

AE asked that we have cross sections for people to write on directly as a way to provide another method for collecting input and to indicate that the input is being acknowledged.

John Z. feels that we need a “time to vent” prior to doing these exercises so that we can get community issues on the table and then move forward on the exercise.

Dave O. acknowledged that he found the group process difficult to jump into and that at the public meeting we should have input methods for people that do not want to participate in the group aspects of the exercise

A general comment was that we might need more structure at the tables and have a smaller ratio of staff to community member.

Fred S. liked the hands on exercise. He suggested that we provide a bit more detail on the clear strips used to represent the road width—perhaps add in drive lanes, etc. He also felt that we need to explain parking during this process and that parking for the entire length of the road might not be necessary or good.



Washington Street Study – CWG #3

Ray R. stated that he does not want to have any property taken in this process and therefore an 80-foot road width should be sufficient. Note: Washington St has a variety of current rights of way widths within the study area, ranging from 60' to over 150' near the interchange with I-70.

John Z. believes the exercises will motivate people to share their thoughts. He asked that we have more data available at the meeting such as traffic volumes, previous studies done to date, and accident data regarding number of accidents, locations and type of accident. He would like to know how this compares to other city streets. He added his opinion that it's important to represent the residents' point of view and that truck traffic is important to local businesses but we need to accommodate business while prioritizing residents.

Dave O. suggested an exercise that offers alternative bike routes to consider.

Teresa I. (Cliff Lind sub) said the exercise was good and helped illustrate the impact of each choice in terms of road components. Personally mentioned the need for cohesive flow of truck traffic and to consider alternative routes.

Vern agreed with Fred that more detail on the clear road-width strips would be helpful. Also asked for more traffic data and comparisons.

Mickey Z. Felt that the exercises and presentation need to provide clear understanding of the costs associated with the decisions made about Washington Street. Washington Street is not a panacea; it is a discussion as much about what we are willing to give up as it is about what we want. It's a values discussion. We need to convey the concept that the wider the street, the greater the cost, and the longer it will take to achieve.

Rob O. said the exercise was good, thought that we should perhaps consider breaking the road into sections and having people what their thoughts are for each section.

Kaitlyn R. commented good exercise. Agreed that we need to make sure we are clear about how decisions impact costs which impact timing for completion.

Elizabeth B stated that the exercise was good, but be sure to explain why we might not get exactly what we ask for in this exercise—what are those factors?

The meeting was adjourned with a reminder of the August 15 public meeting and passing out flyers for CWG members to share with their networks to encourage turnout.

