



Meeting Summary

Purpose: Alternatives Packaging Workshop

Date: January 9, 2006

Location: Wellington E. Webb Municipal Building

I. Introduction

- Purpose of the workshop: to develop “skeleton” alternatives that include at least one element from each of the “Needs” categories.
- Expected outcome: to define at least six alternatives (two per group from the breakout session, as defined below) to be utilized by the project team in the definition of reasonable alternatives to be assessed in the Level 3 screening process.
- Ground rules: focus on alternatives that best meet the Purpose and Need and have the highest likelihood of receiving the concurrence of the broadest range of stakeholders. No process discussions. Do not attempt to define the details of each alternative – that will be done later by the project team.

II. Breakout Session (development and packaging of alternatives)

- The participants were divided into three groups of approximately ten persons each that included a facilitator, technical leader, recorder, City & County of Denver representative, RTD representative, Consensus Committee members, and project team members.

III. Presentation of Alternatives Packages and Discussion

- Group 1 developed two alternatives, Group 2 developed three, and Group 3 developed three and included the suggestions listed in the table below.

Packaged Alternatives by Group				
	Suggestions Utilized			
	Need 1	Need 2	Need 3	Need 4
Alternatives Developed				
Group 1: Alternative A	96	88	73	21
	20			
Group 1: Alternative B	15	119	28	95
			94	

	Suggestions Utilized			
	Need 1	Need 2	Need 3	Need 4
Alternatives Developed				
Group 2: Alternative A	15	(None indicated)	19	102
	20 ¹			110
	91 ¹			111
	92 ¹			
	90			
	79 ²			
	80 ²			
Group 2: Alternative B	14 ³	40	19	34
	96 ³			95
	27 ⁴			
	60 ⁴			
Group 2: Alternative C	10	39	84	46 ⁵
		120		110
Group 3: Alternative 1	23	40	47	42
	48			102
	92			110
	96			21/22
				89
				97
				99
				105
				107
				108
Group 3: Alternative 2	20 ⁶	40	26	102
	23 ⁶	88		107
	85			110
				111
Group 3: Alternative 3	23 ⁷	(None indicated)	84	(None indicated)
	60			

¹ #20, #91, and 92 to work in tandem.

² "Fallback" options if other Need suggestions do not work.

³ #14 and 96 to work in tandem.

⁴ #27 and 60 to work in tandem.

⁵ Provided capacity were increased on Mississippi by widening it.

⁶ #20 and 23 to work in tandem.

⁷ Operating underground from CBD to I-25/Broadway station.

Group discussion about the packages developed

- Suggestion #80: converting a parking lane to a travel lane during peak hours would create increasing demand for parking in adjacent neighborhoods.
- RTD expects either Broadway LRT (#85) or streetcar (#84) would provide adequate additional transit service into/from downtown. Providing both would be redundant service.
- If separate diamond lanes for buses only on Broadway (#27) would include taking of parking or general-purpose laneage, it would not be consistent with capacity improvements. Could only work if Broadway were widened, although it's not yet clear how far north or south. RTD says existing frequency of bus service in the corridor is sufficient to meet demand without restricting bus lane usage beyond a.m. and p.m. peak periods.
- If Broadway were widened south of Arizona (#10, #60), condemnation or taking of properties would be necessary, which doesn't fit with the goal of preserving local businesses.
- Northbound Broadway to northbound I-25 needs a new solution to remove that travel demand from the study area.

Suggestions needing additional refinement and definition

- #95 (Bicycle/Pedestrian access along Mississippi and parallel to I-25 and to I-25/Broadway station via Tennessee).
- #96 wedge ramp (SB Broadway to SB I-25 on-ramp between Broadway bridge and SB I-25 off-ramp) needs to be studied further to determine if it's feasible.
- #110 (Create bicycle improvements throughout the entire study area...) needs to include bicycle connections throughout the study area, but the toughest connections to make are on the north end.
- #111 (Improve access to Broadway/I-25 park-and-Ride from Broadway for pedestrians) – access to station or park-and-Ride facility?
- The “Boulevard” concept (#60) needs greater definition and detail describing all of its possibilities; look carefully at parking implications. If it would only go south to Mississippi, would that be long enough? Need visuals.
- New #122 (Median-controlled right-turn only onto Mississippi from southbound Broadway).

Observations about the range of alternatives developed

- There are some alternatives that rely mostly on transit improvements, and some alternatives that rely mostly on roadway improvements.
- Needs 2 and 4 in the alternatives developed tonight need greater definition. Each of the suggestions included in a package needs refinement. Also, the inclusion of additional suggestions within different packages may increase the range of alternatives to study.

- Noticeably missing from the alternatives developed this evening is an alternative that extends or includes a Broadway couplet. Studying a couplet may or may not be useful in increasing the range of alternatives to study.
- Acoma/Lincoln couplet (#76) may create more problems than it solves by interfering with Lionstone redevelopment goals of improved pedestrian accessibility. Moves problem rather than solving it.
- Southbound Broadway to southbound I-25 access is identified in all alternatives as a key element to relieve congestion or improve travel.
- Start with major elements and add to those.
- If either southbound Broadway to southbound I-25 suggestion (#15 or #96) accommodates traffic coming from downtown as well, it should be considered a viable solution.
- Need an updated trip origin/destination analysis to be conducted in the corridor. (Note: Traffic counts are being taken this month and the DRCOG travel model revision task has been authorized by the project team.)

IV. What's Next?

- All packaged alternatives created tonight will be “cleaned-up” and documented by the project team for presentation at the next Consensus Committee meeting on January 19th. Additional details for each alternative will be added, as appropriate.
- For the NEPA Process requiring a range of reasonable alternative, the project team may also develop some additional alternatives, not identified tonight.
- After the Consensus Committee meeting, the project team will prepare detailed drawings of the alternatives to be utilized in the Level 3 screening.

Attendees:

City & County of Denver

Jason Longsdorf
 Janet Burgesser
 Steve Gordon
 Amy Wiedeman
 Julie Connor
 Shelly Watters
 Jess Ortiz
 Bob Kochevar

Carter & Burgess

Larry Gibson
 Darin Stavish
 Derek Crider
 Craig Gaskill

Transportation Agencies

Kirk Webb (CDOT)
 Lee Cryer (RTD)
 Genevieve Hutchison (RTD)
 Robert Rynerson (RTD)

Subconsultants

Brian Welch (Fehr & Peers)
 Marvinita Hartwig (Hartwig & Associates)
 Brendon Harrington (UrbanTrans)
 Caelan McGee (The Keystone Center)
 Jody Erikson (The Keystone Center)
 Mike Hughes (The Keystone Center)

Neighborhood and Local Business Representatives

Jim Lindberg (Platt Park People's Association)

Pat Callahan (Platt Park People's Association)

Doug Farquhar (Platt Park People's Association)

Donna Krentz (Platt Park Residents' Coalition)

Katie Fisher (West University Community Association)

Steve Harley (Baker Historic Neighborhood Association)

Joan Loughridge (Broadway Area Revitalization District)

Ferd Belz (Cherokee)

Rick Wells (Cherokee)

Steve Kaplan (Lionstone)