

# COLFAX CORRIDOR CONNECTIONS

## ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

**DRAFT**

JUNE 2015





**Table of Contents**

Executive Summary ..... ES-1

1 Introduction ..... 1

    Purpose of this Document ..... 1

    Previous Plans and Projects ..... 1

2 Purpose and Need..... 5

    Proposed Project Location ..... 5

    Purpose of This Proposed Project..... 5

    Need for This Proposed Project ..... 5

3 Corridor Characteristics ..... 7

    Introduction ..... 7

    Population, Employment, and Land Use..... 7

        Population..... 7

        Employment..... 8

        Zoning..... 10

        Parks and Open Space..... 10

        Community Centers ..... 11

        Commercial Property ..... 11

        Why is This Important? ..... 12

    Transportation Conditions ..... 13

        Person Trips ..... 13

        Existing and Future Transit in the Study Area..... 15

        Traffic Operations ..... 17

        Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities and Connectivity ..... 21

        Why is This Important? ..... 23

4 Evaluation Process and Initial Alternatives Considered..... 25

    Introduction ..... 25

    Overview of Evaluation Process..... 25

        Screen 1 Criteria..... 26

        Screen 1 Process for Mode/Vehicle Technology Options..... 27



Mode/Vehicle Technology Options Evaluated.....	27
Traditional Urban Roadway Corridor Mode/Vehicle Technology Options.....	28
Non-Traditional Urban Roadway Corridor Mode/Vehicle Technology Options.....	32
Mode/Vehicle Technology Screen 1 Results.....	38
Route/Alignment Screen 1 Results .....	54
Packaging of Options .....	57
Public Review and Input into the Screen 1 Process.....	58
5 Screen 2 Definition and Evaluation.....	59
Introduction .....	59
Conceptual Vehicle/Technology Options Definition.....	59
Enhanced Bus.....	60
Bus Rapid Transit.....	61
Modern Streetcar.....	63
Light Rail.....	66
Screen 2 Evaluation.....	68
Screen 2 Process Summary .....	68
Screen 2A Evaluation and Results.....	68
Screen 2B Evaluation and Results.....	81
Public Review and Input into the Screen 2 Process.....	94
Summary of Screen 1 and 2 Results to Date.....	95
6 Screen 3 Analysis and Results .....	97
Introduction.....	97
Screen 3 Evaluation Process, Categories, and Criteria .....	97
Alternatives Description .....	98
Major Physical Characteristics of Each Alternative.....	99
Screen 3 Results .....	102
Mobility Measures .....	102
Environmental Measures.....	112
Fiscal Measures.....	117
Urban Character Measures.....	123
Deliverability Measures .....	125



Overall Screen 3 Summary and Preliminary Locally Preferred Alternative Recommendation ..... 126

How Well Does the Preliminary LPA Meet the Proposed Project’s Purpose and Need Statement? ... 127

    Public Review and Input into the Screen 3 Process ..... 129

7 Next Steps ..... 131

Appendix: Summary of Public Involvement Activities ..... 133

DRAFT



## Acknowledgements

The following individuals and their respective organizations contributed to this study and report:

### Project Management Team

*City and County of Denver:*

Tykus Holloway, Project Manager  
Ryan Billings  
Crissy Fanganello  
David Gaspers  
Emily Silverman

*RTD:*

Genevieve Hutchison  
Lee Cryer  
Jeff Dunning

*City of Aurora:*

Huiliang Liu  
Mac Callison  
Anna Bunce  
Danny Montoya

### Consultant Team:

*Steer Davies Gleave (prime consultant):*

Tim Baldwin, Project Manager  
Chris Proud  
Jean Sanson  
Shari Frank  
Jonny Rotheram

*Apex Design:*

Melissa Rosas  
Bart Przybyl  
Malinda Reese

*CH2M HILL:*

Michelle Pinkerton  
Carlos Sala  
Doug Stewart

*Entelechy Design:*

Deana Swetlik

*GBSM:*

Andy Mountain  
Miles Graham  
Michele Ames

*Goodbee and Associates:*

Elissa Roselyn

*Heinrich/Hispanidad:*

Laura Sonderup

*HMMH:*

Dave Towers

*Leland Consulting:*

Chris Zahas  
Ted Kamp

*OV Consulting:*

Chris Vogelsang

*Pinyon Environmental:*

Scott Epstein  
Amanda Cushing  
Amy Kennedy

*PUMA:*

Brad Segal  
Anna Jones  
Erica Heller

*RockSol:*

Saeid Saeb  
Don Hunt

*Two Hundred:*

Marjorie Alexander

