

DRAFT TAC MEETING MINUTES

North I-25 PEL

Technical Advisory Committee
Thursday, June 28, 2012
10:00 AM to Noon

LOCATION: Adams County Economic Development

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. He also thanked the group for their participation in the recent success of the TIGER grant.

II. TIGER IV Update

Gene Putman provided the group with a handout on the TIGER award. He was very happy with the outcome. However, he expressed concern with the *Denver Post* poll on tolling because it was misleading by implying that all lanes would be tolled.

Jeanne Shreve suggested that we make an extra effort to describe how the managed lane TIGER project and our PEL work together. This is important from a messaging standpoint. In addition, we should provide a link between the two web sites.

Steve Cook stated that the DRCOG Plan Amendment for the managed lanes is in place but a TIP amendment will still need to be completed.

III. Public Meeting and Executive Meeting

Chris Primus provided an overview of the May 9th public meeting, identifying the number of attendees and a summary of the corridor issues raised by the public at the meeting. The public questioned what managed lanes are and how they are used. A couple of key issues/comments included: concern about noise, support for improvements that increase capacity, support for transit, and concern about RTD's Fastracks schedule. The public did not identify any issues with the purpose and need statement as presented.

Holly Buck provided a summary of the May 31st Executive Committee meeting. Concurrence was received on the Purpose and Need, and there was some clarification on a few items. The EC is not expected to meet again until after the summer. Holly asked TAC members to be sure to coordinate with their EC representatives during this time to keep them up to speed on the project. If TAC members are going to give council or board presentations please contact the team and we will provide you the latest information available for you use.

Gene Putman requested all the materials handed out today in digital format because they have gone paperless. He suggested that all materials should also be posted to the website.

Gene Putman stated that at the latest NATA meeting, elected officials voiced strong dissatisfaction of RTD transit improvements in the northern metro area to Phil Washington, RTD General Manager. Brook Svoboda expressed that there is an undercurrent of skepticism about this PEL because the RTD relationship has degraded.

DRAFT TAC MEETING MINUTES

North I-25 PEL

Technical Advisory Committee
Thursday, June 28, 2012
10:00 AM to Noon

IV. Corridor Assessment Report

Holly Buck asked how the website worked for retrieving the Corridor Assessment Report and there was a positive response. Holly provided an overview of what the Corridor Assessment and why it was completed. This report documents where problems existing and tries to understand why they exist. The information is then used to develop a purpose and need statement and ultimately develop alternatives to address the problems.

The 2025 DynusT model is not yet operational and therefore the Corridor Assessment section on the 2025 conditions is not yet included. Comments on the document will not be requested until the missing sections are provided.

Gene Putman reminded the group that this project should be identifying projects that need to be incorporated into the 2040 DRCOG Plan. Steve Cook stated that large operational capacity projects with widening for more than one mile must be identified in the 2040 plan, through a competitive process but operational improvements less than a mile on an existing facility are eligible for the TIP but don't have to be in the Plan.

V. Near-term Components

Holly provided an overview of the two-level screening/evaluation process. Level 1 will be a qualitative assessment of the components. Level 2 will be a quantitative and qualitative screening resulting in a comparison between components. After Level 2 the team will package components to create alternatives then prioritize the components within the package. Holly then reviewed the more detailed Level 2 screening criteria.

Jon stated that Level 1 has been set up to mirror the NEPA process so can take credit later. He also confirmed Level 1 criteria with the group.

Highway Infrastructure Components

Lyle DeVries oriented the group to the near-term components and walked the group through these components. He provided clarification between the CD option and the pre-main line merge option.

Gene wants to request that the parclo at SH 7 also be shown as DDI.

Component S-14 has a lot of impacts, along with its positive components; it would also benefit the reversible lane movements.

Jeanne stated that in regard to S-14 we do not want to lose the local access at Broadway.

Brook reminded the group to look at how these improvements fit into the other planned/existing improvements.

Lyle stated that I.8 should be deleted because it is the same as I.1.

Questions were raised as to the number of vehicles that enter southbound I-25 at 84th Avenue that seek to enter the I-270 flyover ramp.

Brook suggested perhaps providing a barrier separation to limit existing NB reversible to past 84th to not add additional or perpetuate weaving movements.

DRAFT TAC MEETING MINUTES

North I-25 PEL

Technical Advisory Committee
Thursday, June 28, 2012
10:00 AM to Noon

Larry Squires suggested seeing how these planned components fit because they could have an effect on privatization and packaging.

Transit Components

Chris and Lyle began the discussion on transit components.

Larry suggested that the group look at new PNRs and service changes. He also suggested that the group be sure to look at and complete an EJ analysis. Roaring Fork uses bus on shoulder as their BRT to Aspen full time.

Karen asked for clarification on median stations and if a median station would require bus to cross over to opposite direction. The details have not been identified but this component would likely require a large amount of right of way, cross over travel or left side bus doors.

US 36 will use managed lane on inside shoulder and bus running on outside shoulder.

ITS Components

Larry suggested looking at transit priority for STS, bus route information, and TTI.

Karen noted that Region 4 has an ITS plan and asked if Region 6 has one that can be consulted. Lizzie confirmed that one is available for our considerations. The team will review these plans to determine if anything should be added to the ITS component discussion.

Brook asked if anything, such as ramp metering, can be done at Thornton Parkway.

TDM/TSM Components

Karen – Telework and guaranteed ride home should list the NFRMPO programs as they are very active in the Denver metro area.

Bike/Pedestrian Components

Lyle told the group that we are looking for direction from them on how to handle bike and pedestrian improvements. Steve Cook suggested looking at bike/pedestrian connections to PNRs. The group was asked how bike/pedestrian fits into project in regard to Purpose and Need. The team should provide guidance to incorporate into design. Mostly will be at small scale. Add statement/philosophy/commitment that sets forth bike/pedestrian connectivity. This language will also benefit grant applications.

Parallel Arterials

Lizzie brought up corridors of significance. FHWA needs to identify TTI for interstates and other important corridors, which may have to be consulted and may include arterials. The team will check into this further.

The group also felt that during incidents a more active traffic management role should be taken. This would be part of the Incident Management Plan component.

VI. Next Steps and Next Meeting

The team will develop a preliminary level 1 screening for review with the TAC by the next meeting. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 16th.