

# DRAFT TAC MEETING MINUTES

## North I-25 PEL

Technical Advisory Committee  
Thursday, August 16, 2012  
9:30 AM to 11:30

---

**LOCATION:** Thornton Police Department Training Center

**PREPARED BY:** Alex Pulley, FHU

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

### I. Welcome and Introductions

Andy Stratton, CDOT Project Manager, welcomed the group and asked the group to conduct self introductions.

### II. Follow up from Previous Meeting

Andy asked for any additional improvement ideas other than those presented at the last TAC Meeting. No additional alternatives were noted. The project team therefore, considered the current list comprehensive for evaluation in the PEL.

### III. Screening Process

Holly Buck provided an overview of the three screening levels and generally what will be evaluated at each screening level. The remainder of the meeting would focus on Level 1 Screening that focuses on the initial screening of components that do or do not meet the Purpose and Need statement.

Holly Buck provided the following list of questions that were asked during Level 1 Screening:

- Purpose—Component could be accommodated within recently constructed structures?
- Purpose—Potential to be implemented in the near-term?
- Need—Potential to address identified near-term congestion issues?
- Need—Potential to address identified near-term safety issues?
- Need—Potential to address identified near-term multimodal capacity issues?

The results of Level 1 were categorized into the following four groupings:

- Category 1—Retained for Analysis in Level 2 Screening
- Category 2—Retained for Packaging in Level 3 Screening
- Category 3—Eliminated for Near-term Consideration, but may be considered for long-term
- Category 4—Eliminated from Further Evaluation

#### Category 1—Retained for Analysis in Level 2 Screening

Lyle DeVries walked through the components that have been retained (see Handout) and asked for any questions. Lee Kemp stated that the 120 and 120x bus routes are already using all articulated buses and that component should be removed from the retained category.

Brook Svoboda asked if extending the toll egress/ingress to 84<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be barrier separated to eliminate the I-270/US 36 access to the toll before 84<sup>th</sup>. This was confirmed as correct.

Larry Squires suggest that the project team could better explain what is meant by saying the alternatives ‘fully’ meet the purpose and need. He suggested that screening matrix would be beneficial in showing how ‘fully’ each alternative meeting the purpose and need, which would add clarity and justification for selected and non-selected project activities. Holly stated that the retained components do meet one of the three needs and the purposes. The degree to which these components meet purpose and need will be further evaluated in subsequent screening levels.

# DRAFT TAC MEETING MINUTES

## North I-25 PEL

Technical Advisory Committee  
Thursday, August 16, 2012  
9:30 AM to 11:30

---

The group questioned whether the restriction of southbound 84<sup>th</sup> travel to the I-270 fly over is even feasible to the public. Lyle DeVries stated that additional modeling numbers were needed to see how many people are actually performing that movement. Andy Stratton suggested that an alternative route could be to use US 36. This is an example of the type of consideration and information needed for subsequent screening steps.

### Category 2—Retained for Packaging in Level 3 Screening

Lyle briefly discussed the components in this category (see handout). There were no comments from the TAC regarding this grouping.

### Category 3—Eliminated for Near-term Consideration, but may be considered for long-term

Lyle briefly discussed the components in this category (see handout).

Jeanne Shreve requested that additional and specific rationale why components/alternatives were eliminated in the near-term be provided to the TAC. This is needed so the TAC members can sufficiently answer questions by their elected officials regarding this category.

The project team will send out the detailed matrix for clarification and add additional documentation and justification for removal of components/alternatives.

The TAC members asked for two weeks for review and conversation with their Executive Committee members from the time of receiving the additional information to provide comments.

The TAC members also asked to receive meeting materials via email prior to the actual TAC meetings so they would have an opportunity to review the materials prior to the meeting and come to the meeting with comments ready.

Brook Svoboda suggested that circle matrix (circles empty/half/quarter/full filled) be used to make the matrix easily understood. This would work well in the 'graphical' handout provided.

Jon Chesser and Jay Hendrickson both stated that this process is complicated and they appreciate the conversation and it really helps the project team with the project.

### Category 4—Eliminated from Further Evaluation

Lyle briefly discussed the components in this category (see handout).

Jeanne Shreve asked that adding a structure to 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue bus tunnel to facilitate bus access to the manage lanes (to and from the north) be deferred for long-term consideration (Category 3) rather than fully eliminated.

The TAC requested that a map showing the locations of the components would be helpful to understand the location and interaction of the components.

Holly asked the group if they felt comfortable with moving forward with the components on the green page (retained for additional analysis in Level 2) with the understanding that there is potential for more discussion on a couple of the long-term options once additional information is provided. The group confirmed that they feel

# **DRAFT TAC MEETING MINUTES**

## **North I-25 PEL**

**Technical Advisory Committee**  
**Thursday, August 16, 2012**  
**9:30 AM to 11:30**

---

comfortable with developing additional analysis on these components. No further clarification or concerns regarding Level 1 Screening were voiced by the TAC.

#### **IV. Dynus-T Model Update**

Lyle DeVries provided an update on the Dynus-T model and the timing for obtaining the model information and evaluation for the project would take additional time to complete.

The TAC asked if the Dynus-T model fully captured the arterials and Lyle confirmed that it does.

A question was asked about the southern terminus for project improvement influences in the model. The southernmost influence area is downtown, but no improvements are expected in this area, it is simply the influence area.

The Project Team intensively worked with FHWA on the modeling extents and initially looked at Huron and Washington and one interchange north and south of the project area, but the area covered is now much larger.

Some information from Dynus-T will be used in Level 2 Screening, but Dynus-T is critical to Level 3 Screening.

A question was asked if the model can differentiate between single occupancy and high occupancy vehicle traffic. DRCOG assigns a 15% HOV assumption to the traffic. The Project Team will be using a static number to assign for modeling. The Project Team will identify a percentage of HOV for this corridor.

#### **V. Next Steps and Next Meeting**

The Project Team will provide additional information for removal of components for the TAC and provide a deadline to get comments back from the TAC. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for September.