



## **CORRIDOR STAKEHOLDER GROUP #3 MEETING MINUTES**

**Highlands Ranch Metro District  
January 19, 2016**

---

### 1. Introductions

- Project Team Presenters: Roman Jauregui, Allan Brown, Jason Longsdorf, Lee Kellar, Kurt Kolleth
- CSG Members and Guests: See attached sign-in sheet

### 2. Updated PI approach and webpage

- Jason reported that several additional methods to broaden the public outreach were being implemented by the project team.
- Jason also asked the CSG for additional thoughts about days or times that might be better at attracting additional CSG members. No CSG attendees had other advice.

### 3. Recap of Bike/Ped Task Force Meeting

- The design team recapped the discussion with the task force including:
  - i. An agreement that it was unlikely the new US 85 facility would need a separate bike-only facility.
  - ii. Acknowledgement that more advanced riders who prefer higher speed riding with fewer pedestrian conflicts would likely prefer to use the shoulders along US 85 so those should be designed to accommodate those cyclists wherever possible.
- a. For the HRP to C-470 Project
  - i. Discussed path width and based on guidance and anticipated volumes Understand that 12' is CDOT's maximum for high volumes and that a 10' wide multi-use path is appropriate for the east side of US 85 from Highlands Ranch Parkway (HRP) to C-470. The grade separated crossing of the High Line Canal is being designed to be 12' wide and 12' high but may be modified based on coordination with Denver Water. In this case the dimensions are dictated more by the need for maintenance vehicle use and for a bike or pedestrian to be able navigate around a vehicle. Key connections for this new trail will be at the Centennial Trail (east west trail just south of C-470) and East-West Regional Trail (connecting at Highlands Ranch Pkwy.)
- b. PEL (Sedalia to County Line Road)
  - ii. The EIS assumed the path would be on the east side of the road which allows it to avoid the larger intersections, which are on the west, and eliminates concerns related to proximity to the railroad. However we may consider a west side alignment south of HRP since that allows use of the

area between the road and the RR that is otherwise “unused”, and it may provide better access to the larger populations on the west side.

- iii. The group also discussed the areas to consider grade separated bike/ped crossings including: HRP (N-S), Town Center Drive (TCD) (N-S), US 85 just south of 470 (E to W) and C-470 just east of US 85 (N-S)
- iv. The group agreed there was no need to consider separate, parallel bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

#### 4. HRP to C-470 Project

- The group discussed the merits of modifying the EIS alternative to include Continuous Flow Intersection (CFI) operations for the SB to EB left turns at HRP and TCD.
- The group discussed a chart compared the different improvement options to the expected traffic growth over time.
- The group also watched videos and animations of CFI operations via youtube.
  - a. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DsfCIPHrjT4>
  - b. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7mjOPvsJyCs>
  - c. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iN9SzhWZvc>
- CSG members appreciated that the project team had coordinated with two fire fighting units to solicit input and suggested that the design had been supported the idea of additional outreach to police and ambulance services for input.

#### 5. PEL (Sedalia to County Line Road)

- Level 1 Screening Update
  - a. Transit - the project team clarified that Bus Rapid Transit would be retained as an option in any alternative that included a managed lane, but not as a stand alone in situations where the BRT was the primary reason for an additional managed lane
  - b. Bike/Pedestrian - as mentioned, the CSG agreed that the cycle tracks (bike-only facilities) should be eliminated.
- Level 2 Screening
  - a. Jason provided a brief review of the Level 2 alternatives
  - b. Lee presented the draft screening recommendations
    - i. In Segment A, it is recommended the following three alternatives be advanced to Level 3.
      1. A2 – Expressway with Access Options North of TCD
      2. A3 – Split Pair
      3. A4 – Bypass
    - ii. These alternatives are capable of meeting the project’s Purpose and Need and all provide vastly different approaches that will highlight the advantages and disadvantages of each in Level 3.
      1. Dave Evans pointed out that the environmental and sustainability criteria returned relatively poor results for all alternatives and the team agreed to look into clarification to

# CORRIDOR STAKEHOLDER GROUP #3 MEETING MINUTES

Highlands Ranch Metro District  
January 19, 2016

possibly identify more differentiation or understanding of impacts.

- iii. Alternative A1 (Expressway) was eliminated because the interchanges are too closely spaced, which would cause operational/safety issues and require the closure of several access points.
- iv. In Segment B, Alternative B2 (Improved US 85 with Right in/Right out) is recommended because it is expected to improve safety and can be phased over time with Alternative B1.
- v. Several different interchange improvements will be considered at Titan Road to accommodate the high directional traffic movements.
- vi. In Segment C, the focus will be on the development and analysis of access options at Airport Road, Delva Way, and SH 67.

- Level 3 Draft Screening Criteria was reviewed and the CSG was provided the following table summary.

Number	Criteria	Measure of Effectiveness
1	Provides Long-Term Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mainline LOS</li> <li>- Peak hour cross-street LOS and Delay</li> <li>- Volume to capacity ratio</li> </ul>
2	Results in Improved Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Estimated number of crashes</li> </ul>
3	Provides Reasonable Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Travel time for out of direction travel</li> </ul>
4	Expands Multi-modal Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of traffic stress</li> <li>- Bicycle LOS</li> <li>- Potential transit ridership</li> </ul>
5	Consistent with Land Use Goals and Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phasing opportunities</li> <li>- Compatibility with Existing Land Use</li> <li>- Compatibility with Planned Land Use</li> </ul>
6	Enhances Life/Safety for the Chatfield Basin Residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Peak Hour Travel Time</li> </ul>
7	Supports the Preservation of the Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 4(f) property used (acres)</li> <li>- Wetlands impacted (acres)</li> <li>- Riparian vegetation impacted (acres)</li> <li>- Waters of the US impacted (acres)</li> <li>- Air quality (based on intersection LOS)</li> <li>- PMJM habitat impacted (acres)</li> <li>- Prairie dog town impacts (acres)</li> </ul>
8	Creates a Sustainable Solution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets new water quality requirements</li> <li>- Accommodates wildlife crossing needs</li> <li>- Supports emerging technologies</li> <li>- Accommodates future transit facilities</li> <li>- Annual maintenance costs</li> </ul>
9	Ensures Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Construction costs</li> <li>- Ability to phase over time</li> <li>- Maintenance of traffic</li> <li>- ROW: Number of partial and full acquisitions</li> <li>- Railroad and other institutional impacts</li> </ul>

# CORRIDOR STAKEHOLDER GROUP #3 MEETING MINUTES

Highlands Ranch Metro District  
January 19, 2016

Number	Criteria	Measure of Effectiveness
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Optimized investment (best use of limited funds over time)</li><li>- (Re)use of existing facilities</li></ul>

## 6. Next steps

- Jason announced that the next Public Open House was scheduled for February 18<sup>th</sup> 5:30-7:30 Valley View Church.
- ***Post Meeting Clarification: IT WAS DECIDED THAT THIS FEBRUARY 18<sup>TH</sup> MEETING WILL BE POSTPONED AND NOTIFICATIONS WILL BE SENT DIRECTLY TO THE CSG MEMBERS IN EARLY FEBRUARY.***
- CSG members also requested that public meeting materials be posted online at least a couple days prior to the in person meeting.
- CSG Meeting #4 is expected to be held in March
  - i. Level 3 Alternatives and Draft Screening Recommendations