

# TAC MEETING MINUTES

## North I-25 PEL

Technical Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, April 4, 2012  
1:30 PM to 3:30 PM

---

**LOCATION:** CDOT R6, North Holly

**PREPARED BY:** Alex Pulley, FHU

**ATTENDEES:** See Attached Sign-in Sheet

### I. Introductions

Andy Stratton, CDOT Project Manager, provided an introduction to the meeting and stated the goal of the meeting was to have a productive dialogue between the project team and the municipalities present.

Andrea Meneghel, CDR Associates, stated that the team wanted to discuss and gain initial concurrence on the purpose and need and existing traffic and environmental corridor condition information. He stated that there would be other opportunities to provide input throughout the project and that the purpose and need will be provided to the public and then presented to the Executive Committee for their input prior to finalization.

### II. TIGER IV Update

Jon Chesser, CDOT Environmental, provided an update on the TIGER IV grant application and said that a decision is expected by the end of May. He expressed appreciation to the municipalities for their local contribution to the project.

### III. Visioning Workshop Summary

Andrea provided a brief summary of the Visioning Workshop and directed the group to review the Issues Graphic developed from input from the Visioning Workshop. No comments on the graphic were provided during the meeting, but asked the group to further review the document and provide any input, as appropriate.

### IV. Purpose and Need

Jon provided a summary of what a Purpose and Need Statement is and how it is utilized in National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation. He then discussed how it is planned to be used in the PEL. He then presented the purpose and need statements for the PEL for discussion and initial concurrence.

Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig (FHU) Transportation Engineer, presented existing traffic information throughout the corridor that supports the corridor need statements (or problems).

#### Congestion Problem

Lyle provided congestion information for the southbound traffic in the AM peak period from Google Maps and CoTrip. A comment was received that if the information was going to be presented to the public that a legend describing the colors would be necessary.

*Recurring Congestion*— Lyle then presented Doppler speed information that is used to identify bottlenecks in the system. The initial graphic showed southbound recurring congestion (i.e., days when no incidents are present) from 5:00 AM to 9:30 AM. At 6:15 AM, congestion occurs at 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue and then a large bottleneck occurs south of Thornton Parkway and lasts longer than 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Speeds then recover by 75<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Lyle stated that the bottleneck is, indeed in the project area and not outside the project area, as was brought up in the Visioning Workshop as a possibility.

# TAC MEETING MINUTES

## North I-25 PEL

Technical Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, April 4, 2012  
1:30 PM to 3:30 PM

---

Gene Putman, Thornton, stated that this conclusion is intuitive and validates what has been stated over time. However, he advised that other days be considered to ensure that the presented day is not an anomaly. Lyle stated that multiple days were considered and the presented day was representative of recurring conditions. Brook Svoboda, Northglenn, stated that when this is communicated to the public, be sure to state that this is a sample of all the data considered and explain why this information is important to analytically demonstrate the intuitive problem. Annette Marquez, Brighton, requested that supporting discussion be provided for the graphical representation of the provided information.

*Non-recurring Congestion*—Lyle presented another Doppler speed graphic of non-recurring congestion (i.e., when an accident occurred at 84<sup>th</sup> avenue at 5:45 AM and then a secondary crash at 88<sup>th</sup> Avenue at 6:10 AM). The queue extends up to 131<sup>st</sup> Avenue, which did not experience decreased speeds during the recurring congestion. It was stated that 81 percent of the time an accident occurs on I-25 mainline in the project area.

Gene suggested that all the same five points in the recurring congestion be presented on this graphic, as well. Brook suggested that the real base case is the one with an accident because it occurs 81 percent of the time and inquired if the project should non recurring congestion as the more typical-day scenario.

Northbound in the afternoon at US 36 has a convergence of many inputs and thus, 75<sup>th</sup> has the longest sustained decreased speeds until 6:30. Further north Thornton Parkway has extremely volatile speeds and this speed differential is a safety concern. Gene thought the differential could be a result of large trucks slowing down because of the increased grade moving towards Thornton Parkway. At 120<sup>th</sup> and further north, free-flow conditions exist.

The following comments were received on the presentation and interpretation of the traffic information:

- Instead of “Recurring” and “Non-recurring” Congestion, it should be called “Incident” and “Incident-Free”
- Add a percentage to show days with and days without incidents
- The corridor seems to differ from convention in that slower speeds should reduce incidents, but the data doesn’t seem to reflect this
- The incidents could be affected by driver expectations

### Safety

Generally the corridor is operating in the expected range of safety for the volumes. Only two areas experience at or less than expected safety numbers. It was suggested that all areas be shown, even if they are in the expected range to show completeness. Brook conveyed that the Northglenn Police Department suggests stepping down speeds in the north to lessen the drastic slowing from congestions, potentially using variable speed limit signs.

### Multi-modal Facilities

The information presented was based on information from the Visioning Workshop. An aerial photo of the Wagon Road park-n-Ride shows that the facility is at capacity. Kevin Standbridge suggested that RTD 5, 10, and 15 year park-n-Ride projections are used to show future problems. Gene stated that the commercial area near the park-n-Ride has put up special signage discouraging RTD patrons from parking there, which indicates additional parking demand. Brook suggested putting in parking limitations in nearby residential areas.

# TAC MEETING MINUTES

## North I-25 PEL

Technical Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, April 4, 2012  
1:30 PM to 3:30 PM

---

### Purpose and Need Statement Initial Concurrence

After the presentation of the data, the purpose and need was revisited. The following comments were received:

- Make the ending of the purpose statement more positive. For example, use the word “enhance” instead of “not preclude.”
- Any projects identified need to be defined enough to identify them and fold into the DRCOG 2040 fiscally constrained plan.
- Identify that the need statements are based on data available at the time of the study.
- Consider adding clarifications like “interim improvement” and “that progress toward long term options.”
- Add 2035 condition information, such as that SH 7 is projected to have similar volumes in 2035 as 84<sup>th</sup> Avenue has today.

The following clarifications were provided by the project team:

- The long-term options will be identified using the 202 foot width of the recently constructed interchange/bridge structures. It will identify what could be possibly be constructed and won't state specifically what the vision is, but provide options.
- The near-term projects will be compared to this in an effort not to preclude these options.

Based on the discussion, the purpose will be updated with a more positive spin and the language in the mobility need will be modified to eliminate the recurring and non recurring congestion terminology. With these revisions, the TAC indicated initial concurrence with this purpose and need statement as a basis to move forward with public involvement and identification of alternatives. The purpose and need statement may be further refined as the study progresses, if appropriate, based on addition information that comes to light.

### **V. Goals**

The following suggestions were made on the goal statements:

- It was suggested that the second goal (Expand/enhance transportation options) be listed first.
- Have the third goal read: “Complement and utilizes services *and goals* of the newly formed TMO.”
- Change the fourth goal to read: “Avoid and minimize impacts to environmental *and cultural* resources.”
- Change the fifth goal to read: “Identify and prioritize improvements that can proceed independently.”
- Add a new goal that states: “*Minimize throwaway projects.*”

The project team committed to look at the goals and make sure that it is clear that the goals are in addition to the purpose and need statement and that they are intended to help direct alternative development and screening.

### **VI. Additional Data Collection**

Keith Borsheim with Jacobs Engineering presented additional information on parallel arterials trips and it was decided that the title of the slide was a bit confusing because the distribution of trips changes north of 104<sup>th</sup>. Keith presented modeled traffic data showing that the I-25 corridor carries more commuter traffic than the region.

A single origin and destination graphic for the 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue interchange was presented and showed that many of the trips end within the project area (specifically along I-25) and downtown. It was asked if the Tech Center was included in the analysis, which it was, but not displayed. It was suggested that data for the other interchanges also be presented. The project team has this information developed and it is included in the Corridor Conditions Report. It was also suggested that the figure should be footnoted that the information is from the DRCOG model.

# TAC MEETING MINUTES

## North I-25 PEL

Technical Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, April 4, 2012  
1:30 PM to 3:30 PM

---

Keith presented a volume composition graphic showing the volumes coming from each interchange. The highest single interchange adding volume is at 84<sup>th</sup> southbound. The majority of travelers in the project area exit I-25 at US 36/I-270.

Alex Pulley from Felsburg Holt & Ullevig briefly presented information on the existing environmental resources in the project area, focusing on noise walls, floodplains, and parks/open space/trails. He asked the communities for input on the trails and parks to ensure that the latest planning information has been included. A discussion regarding the noise walls along the corridor ensued that focused on what was going to be included with the TIGER IV application. It was clarified that the existing timber noise walls will be rehabilitated and any new noise walls identified in Phase 1 ROD for the North I-25 EIS would be evaluated and constructed.

### **VII. Next Steps**

The next steps in the process will be to complete the Corridor Conditions Report and draft the Purpose and Need statement. The team will be preparing for the upcoming open house and subsequently will initiate the alternatives development and screening process.

### **VIII. Public Meeting**

The public meeting date is to be conducted May 9<sup>th</sup> at the Northglenn Recreational Center between 5 and 7 PM. TAC members were reminded to send available contact lists to the project team. They were also asked to disseminate information on the open house to their citizens and stakeholders.

### **IX. Next TAC Meeting**

The group tentatively discussed conducting the next TAC meeting toward the end of May. This date may be moved out in order to not conflict with the next Executive meeting.



# TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Community/Agency	Representative	Signature
Brighton	Joe Smith	<i>Annette Marquez</i>
Broomfield	<del>Debra Baskett</del> Kevin Standbridge	<i>Kevin Standbridge</i>
Commerce City	Daren Sterling	
Dacono	A.J. Euckert	
Erie	<del>Gary Betten</del> Russell Pennington	<i>Russell Pennington</i>
Firestone	Dave Lindsay	
Frederick	Richard Leffler	
Longmont	Phil Greenwald	
Northglenn	Brook Svoboda	<i>Brook Svoboda</i>
Thornton	Gene Putman	<i>Gene Putman</i>
Westminster	Dave Downing	<i>Dave Downing</i>
Adams County	Jeanne Shreve	<i>Jeanne Shreve</i>
Federal Transit Administration	Larry Squires	
CDOT Region 6	Andy Stratton	<i>Andy Stratton</i>
CDOT Region 6	Jon Chesser	<i>Jon Chesser</i>



Community/Agency	Representative	Signature
CDOT Region 6	Lizzie Kemp	
CDOT Region 6	Jay Hendrickson	
CDOT Region 6	Steve Hersey	
CDOT Region 6	Leela Rajasekar	
CDOT Region 4	Carol Parr	<i>Chapman</i>
CDOT Region 4	Karen Schneiders	
CDOT Region 4	Long Nguyen	
FHWA	Monica Pavlik	
RTD	Lee Cryer	
DRCOG	Fred Sandal	<i>John Sandal</i>
City and County of Denver	Emily Silverman	
Metro North Chamber	Interim Rep: Deb Obermeyer	
Broomfield EDC	Interim Rep: Stephanie Salazar	
Broomfield Chamber	Interim Rep: Jennifer Kerr	



OTHER ATTENDEES

Name	Organization	Signature	Phone	Email
Doug Monroe	RTD		303 299 2213	douglas.monroe@rtt-denver.com
Nate Diaz	RTD		303 299 2135	Nathan.Diaz@rtt-denver.com
Holly Buck	FHU		303 721 1440	Holly.Buck@fhwy.com
Andrea Menezes	CDOT		7.4074721	no change
Leela Rajasekar	CDOT		303 757-9862	
Russell Pennington	Town of Erie		303 926-2700	rpennington@erieco.gov
Chris Pimus	Jacobs		3 820 4875	chris.pimus@jacobs.com
Carol Parr	CDOT		970 350 2170	carol.parr@dot.state.co.us
Jennifer Gorek	CDOT		970 350 2264	jennifer.gorek@dot.state.co.us
Ther Gjelsteen	FHU		3/721-1440	ther.gjelsteen@fhwy.com
Kent Borstein	JACOBS		7/359-3033	Kent.Borstein@Jacobs.com
Alex Polley	FHU		303-721-1440	alex.polley@fhwy.com
Lyle Montes	FHU		3-721-1440	lyle.montes@fhwy.com
Lizry Squires	FRA		720-963-7305	Lizry.Squires@dot.gov