Stakeholder Working Group
Tuesday, May 10, 2016
5:30 to 7:30 PM
Temple Emanuel
51 Grape Street, Denver, CO 80220

Meeting Goals

- Overview of the Go Speer Leetsdale Study
- Understanding of roles/expectations for Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)
- Begin development of a corridor vision

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Introductions
3. Project Overview
   a. Schedule
   b. Scope of Work
   c. Role of SWG/Charter
4. Existing Conditions Summary
5. Mobility Issues Exercise
6. Vision Exercise
7. Next Steps

Open House #1
May 24, 2016
5:30 – 7:30 PM
Temple Emanuel
51 Grape Street
Denver, CO 80220

SWG #2
Late July
Date, time and location TBD

Website: www.denvergov.org/gospeerleetsdale
Email: info@gospeerleetsdale.org
Scope of Services Summary

The Speer Leetsdale corridor is a prominent travel route for local Denver residents, commuters and visitors. The Speer Leetsdale Mobility Study (Go Speer Leetsdale) will evaluate how to improve the way this corridor moves people between Broadway and Mississippi Avenue through a variety of different transportation modes, including walking, biking, public transit and driving. The study will also consider transportation facilities approximately one half mile to the north and the south of the main corridor to acknowledge the broader roadway network that influences Speer Leetsdale. It is important to note that the study area is just one element of a larger travel movement connecting people to I-25 to the west and to I-225 to the southeast.

The City and County of Denver (CCD) Public Works will actively seek input from corridor stakeholders and the general public throughout the study through advisory groups, public meetings and other outreach efforts. Members of the advisory groups are community and jurisdiction representatives, technical experts, and representatives from Denver registered neighborhood organizations (RNOs).

Denver Public Works has retained the Felsburg Holt & Ullevig (FHU) team, which includes Rocky Mountain West Transit and Urban Planning, GBSM, Toole Design Group, Apex Design, Leese & Associates, Arland, and Two Hundred to help conduct the study.

Identify a Corridor Vision
Denver Public Work’s 2008 Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) envisions a future where roadways offer increased person trip carrying capacity and improve efficiency and reliability for enhanced transit operations and non-motorized travel modes. Go Speer Leetsdale will work to define the overall vision for the corridor by articulating a clear purpose and need for the study effort. This visioning process will help guide how the team identifies specific recommendations for multimodal transportation improvements along the corridor.

Identify Issues
The project team will analyze current and future (2040) demographic, land use and transportation data to explore existing mobility concerns and identify anticipated transportation issues in the future.

With help from stakeholders, the project team will identify and map current conditions and needs for cyclists, transit users, pedestrians, and drivers along the Speer Leetsdale corridor by examining the corridor’s operational and physical characteristics as well as the surrounding land use patterns. In addition, sensitive environmental resources will be identified and evaluated, such properties with or eligible for historic status, noise and air quality conditions.

Learn from the Public and Stakeholders
Input from the public and stakeholders will be key building blocks for developing a recommended approach for improved mobility along the corridor. The team will solicit input on the issues, needs and ideas along the corridor throughout the study. This will include the following forums:

- **Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)** - A geographically targeted task force formed to include representation from registered neighborhood organizations, educational groups, formal business/maintenance groups, and/or transportation management associations located on or within the study area.
• **Technical Working Group (TWG)** - Includes CCD personnel and technical partners from external agencies including RTD, CDOT, the City of Glendale, DRCOG, City of Aurora, Arapahoe County, and others as identified during the study.

• **Public Meetings** – formal public meetings and other engagement opportunities will be held throughout the study area duration. Please continue to check the study webpage at [www.denvergov.org/gospeerleetsdale](http://www.denvergov.org/gospeerleetsdale) for the latest information on how to get involved.

**Develop Possible Solutions**
After developing a clear understanding of corridor needs, a broad and comprehensive set of potential improvements will be identified and evaluated that can then be combined or packaged into a “preferred approach” for the corridor. Potential improvements include those that could be implemented along the entire length of the corridor as well as location-specific projects to address particular issues or constraints.

**Pick the Best Approach**
Potential packages of improvements will be evaluated based on how well they address identified issues along the corridor and how well they support the overall corridor vision and purpose and need developed at the outset of the study. The evaluation will provide qualitative and quantitative assessment of each package. Evaluation criteria will be developed with the public and stakeholders. Examples of the evaluation criteria include the:

a. Ability to improve person trip carrying capacity along the corridor  
b. Ability to improve pedestrian and bicycle connections, network, and experience  
c. Ability to improve transit operations  
d. Impact on future travel times for all modes  
e. Anticipated impact on safety  
f. Ability to improve livability or urban design qualities  
g. Ability to catalyze/support economic development or redevelopment  
h. Impacts to existing right of way and need for expanded right of way  
i. Potential environmental impacts and ability to mitigate impacts  
j. Cost (including capital, ongoing operations and maintenance, and opportunity costs)  
k. Other

Increasingly detailed levels of screening will be applied to narrow the list of potential improvement packages and to ultimately identify the preferred approach for implementation.

**Phasing and Implementation**
After identifying the overall set of improvement packages (“the preferred approach”) that best addresses the mobility needs of the Speer Leetsdale corridor, the team will evaluate potential phasing opportunities considering the most acute needs, order of magnitude costs, and constructability. A recommended phasing plan will help the City identify funding opportunities to implement each project.

**Deliverables and Documentation**
Each phase of the study effort will be documented in a final *Go Speer Leetsdale* report, which will include both narrative and technical information on the process and projects identified. The *Go Speer Leetsdale* final report will be available on the project website once complete (anticipated in spring 2017).
## Project Schedule

**Go Speer Leetsdale**

**Leetsdale Speer Mobility Study 12-430 05/05/2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 1: Project Management</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Kick-off</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Work Plan</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Team Meetings</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Apr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Jul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 2: Define Purpose &amp; Need</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Vision Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 3: Document Review, Data Collection &amp; Analysis of Existing Conditions</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Review &amp; Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Conditions Technical Memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 4: Needs Assessment &amp; Corridor Vision</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment Technical Memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria Process Technical Memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 6: Development of Corridor Alternatives/Stage 1</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Development &amp; Stage 1 Technical Memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 7: Comparative Analysis of Corridor/Stage 2</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 Technical Memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 8: Identification of Preferred Alternative/Stage 3</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 Technical Memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 9: Recommended Alt. Concept Development, Prelim Cost Estimation &amp; Packaging/ Phasing</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Alternative Technical Memorandum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 10: Project Report</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 11: Public Involvement Process</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Working Group Meetings (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Working Group Meetings (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Go Speer Leetsdale Stakeholder Working Group
PARTICIPANT ROLES AND TEAM CHARTER

The Go Speer Leetsdale Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) is comprised of representatives from neighborhood organizations, businesses and civic interests in the Speer/Leetsdale corridor (roughly bounded by Broadway to the west, Mississippi Avenue to the east and approximately a half mile in either direction of Speer/Leetsdale to the north and south).

The SWG will meet up to three times throughout the study to provide input on the study’s findings and serve as a critical conduit between the project team and the public.

Each Go Speer Leetsdale Stakeholder Working Group member is expected to:

Act as a representative of their community.
Although everyone has diverse personal opinions on transit and mobility within the Speer/Leetsdale corridor, SWG members will put aside personal interests and participate in a manner that represents their organization’s interests while also being conducive to the best interest of the community as a whole.

Bring ideas and collaborate.
Meetings will be productive forums for sharing ideas, issues, solutions and feedback. Prior to meetings, SWG members will solicit input and feedback from their constituents.

Respect the ideas of others.
Even though members may disagree with some of the ideas that are brought to the table, it is important to listen to everyone’s input with respect and consideration. At times, members will agree to disagree.

Focus on the task at hand.
Go Speer Leetsdale will develop a corridor vision, produce corridor alternatives, compare those alternatives, and recommend a preferred alternative. The SWG will be given specific tasks and areas for input tailored to each project phase. Members agree to focus on the task at hand (e.g. identifying issues rather than jumping into solutions) in order to best facilitate positive plan outcomes.

Share information.
Each member will share information about Go Speer Leetsdale with others in their respective organization and community. Members will encourage others to get involved with the project by participating in public meetings, signing up for email updates and sharing project information.
Existing Conditions Summary

- **13** Bus lines serve/cross the corridor (83L/83D)

- **12-30 min** to travel by bus in the AM

- **13-40 min** to travel by bus in the PM

- **69,800** Live outside the corridor/work in the corridor

- **5,600** Live and work in the corridor

- **35,800** Live in the corridor/work outside the corridor

- **21% Growth**

- **3% Growth**

- **1185** Vehicle Crashes (2012-2014)

- **3** intersections with moderate or high potential for crash reduction

- **25** Crashes involving bicycles (2012-2014)

- **22** Accidents involving pedestrians

- **14** WB Speer Blvd & Lincoln St

- **7** Parker Rd. & Mississippi Ave

- **10** Intersections operating at/over capacity
A. Identify Mobility Issues

1. Identify your top mobility issues and concerns on the roll plots.

   Mobility Issues and Concerns:
   
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

2. In small groups of 2 or 3, discuss your mobility issues and write a newspaper headline about the corridor as it exists today.

   Newspaper Headline:
   
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

3. Share your small group’s top three issues and headline with the larger group.
B. Define a Vision

A Vision is a clear, succinct and inspirational description of what the corridor will look like and how it will operate after successful implementation of recommended strategies. It is an expression by the people about what they want the corridor to be – a preferred future, a word or picture of the corridor.

- A vision should include desired outcomes and benefits
- A vision should grow out of past decisions and actions as much as possible
- A vision should be inspirational
- A vision should be widely disseminated and used to help guide organizational decisions and actions

4. Identify your top three aspirations for the corridor; consider the following:

- Who uses the corridor? Who will use the corridor 20 years from now?
- What land uses exist along the corridor? What land uses would you like to see 20 years from now?
- What will make this corridor exceptional or more desirable than other corridors?
- How will emerging technologies (i.e. intelligent transportation systems, alternative fuel vehicles, etc.) integrate with the corridor?

Aspirations:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. In your small groups, discuss your answers and identify 2-3 common themes.

Common themes:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

6. In your small group, create a newspaper headline about the corridor as you would envision it 20 years in the future and share with the larger group.

Newspaper Headline:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Analysis - East Corridor
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AM Bus Average Travel Speeds - 83D/83L - West Corridor
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Source: RTD Route 83 TriMet data, August-December 2015
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PM Bus Average Travel Speeds - 83D/83L - East Corridor

Legend
AM Bus Travel Speed
0-10mph
11-15mph
16-20mph
21-25mph
26-30mph
Bus Stop
Traffic Signal

SOURCE: RTD Route 83 TriPac data, August-December 2015
Number of Daily Bus Trips and Route Boardings - West Corridor
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XX: Number of Daily Bus Trips per Roadway Segment

XXXX: Estimated Number of Daily Route Boardings

Bus Routes

- 1: 46
- 3: 65
- 3L: 73
- 11: 83D
- 12: 83L
- 24: 0/OL
- 40: X

Route No.

- 3700: Cherry Creek Shopping Center
- 236: 236
- 175: 175
- 80: 80
- 600: 600
- 32: 32
- 1600: 1600
- 4500: 4500

SOURCE: DUS Cherry Creek Glendale Corridor Feasibility Study, 2014

SOURCE: RTD Service Performance, 2014
Number of Daily Bus Trips and Route Boardings - East Corridor
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Source: DUS-Cherry Creek-Glendale Corridor Feasibility Study, 2014
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Existing Average Daily Traffic Volumes - West Corridor
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SOURCES: Denver Regional Council of Governments Regional Data Catalog, Cherry Creek Area Parking and Traffic Conditions Inventory, 2013
Existing Average Daily Traffic Volumes - East Corridor
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SOURCES: Denver Regional Council of Governments Regional Data Catalog, Cherry Creek Area Parking and Traffic Conditions Inventory, 2013
Posted Speeds - West Corridor
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posted Speed Limits</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 mph</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 mph</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Number of Crashes (2012 - 2014) - West Corridor
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Households with People Older than 65 by Census Block Group - West Corridor
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SOURCE: American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates, 2010-2014
Households with People Older than 65 by Census Block Group - East Corridor
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SOURCE: American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates, 2010-2014
Jobs per Acre by Census Block - East Corridor
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Source: 2010 Tiger Data by Census Block & DRCOG
Percent of Low Income Households per Census Block Group - West Corridor
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SOURCE: American Community Survey 5 Year Estimates, 2010-2014
Percent of Low Income Households per Census Block Group - East Corridor
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