



DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INC.

MEETING NOTES

PROJECT:	Arapahoe Road Corridor Study, I-25 to Parker Road
PURPOSE:	Community Resource Panel - Metro District/Business/Chamber Focus Group Meeting
DATE HELD:	08/15/06
LOCATION:	Arapahoe County Public Works
ATTENDING:	See attached sign-in sheet
COPIES:	Attendees, EC, TAC, Project Team

Summary of Discussion:

1. Following self introductions, a PowerPoint presentation was used to provide an overview of the land use, market study, travel forecasts and improvement options.
2. Initial Screening of Improvement Options:
 - Options that were eliminated during the Level 1 screening were reviewed.
 - All options currently considered as viable are being put through Level 2 screening, and interactions between the options are being considered.
 - The major criteria being used to evaluate the improvement options are ROW impacts, number of businesses directly impacted, environmental concerns, opportunity to include an alternate mode within the option, ability to package a variety of improvements, feasibility, and cost.
3. \$40 M has been identified in the DRCOG fiscally constrained plan for the Arapahoe Road project corridor. There is a lot of competition for regionally funded projects in the metro area, so consensus on improvements is necessary.
4. Arapahoe Road Improvement Options:
 - Arapahoe Road improvement options would be combined with intersection improvements along the corridor as needed.
 - Existing ROW along most of Arapahoe Road is 130 - 140 feet, and only slightly more ROW is needed for most of the roadway improvement options. Adding sidewalks to the improvements could require additional ROW - may need to consider easements.
 - Concern expressed about impact to adjacent businesses if ROW for 8 lanes is needed.
 - The value of the Boulevard improvement option was questioned since it is intermittent and has a high cost and substantial ROW requirement. This option may be screened out in the second level analysis due to driver expectancy issues associated with it, inconsistency with adjacent land use and limited benefit unless implemented along the entire corridor.

5. Parallel/Intersecting Road Improvement Options:

- Spot improvements to Peoria and Broncos Parkway, including intersection safety improvements (signal and alignment adjustments), will occur if the project is approved for funding.
- Broncos Parkway, Jordan to Parker Road – timing of 6 lanes was questioned as it will require widening the new bridge (which was designed to accommodate the widening). Jordan to Potomac is already 6 lanes.
- Parallel road connections are important and are being used by area travelers more frequently.

6. Intersection Improvement Options:

- The intersections that may warrant grade separated intersection improvements are those with the highest existing turning movements (e.g. Havana, Lima, Jordan and Peoria), and those with high forecasted traffic volumes. The potential for redevelopment and future land use will be considered when evaluating intersection improvements.
- Not all intersection improvements would be grade separated. Many at-grade improvements are being considered as well.

7. Interchange Improvement Options:

Arapahoe/Parker Interchange:

- All environmental clearances have been completed for the Arapahoe/Parker interchange and the final design is now underway. Due to budget constraints, the construction is being phased over time.
- The first phase included the turn lanes that have been newly constructed (will become part of the interchange off-ramp). The next phase will include constructing the ring road to intersect opposite Lewiston and environmental impact mitigation measures such as noise walls. The final phase will be constructing the grade separation to take Parker Road over Arapahoe Road.
- \$21 M will be available for the first and second phases of the project over the next 3 years. The remaining \$20 – \$25 M needed to construct the grade separation has not yet been obtained, and is being pursued through earmarks.

I-25/Arapahoe Interchange:

- \$26 M has been identified for the I-25 interchange in the DRCOG 2030 plan. A \$1 M environmental study to provide clearance for the preferred interchange improvement option has been funded. After the preferred option is identified, a proposal will be given to DRCOG to fully fund the entire interchange improvement.
- TREX contingency funds may soon become available, which could be used for short-term operational improvements at the I-25 interchange. The Southeast Corridor Urban Transportation Committee of the SEBP is taking the lead for consensus building for use of TREX contingency funds. (All local jurisdictions are represented on this committee by elected officials. Bryan supports the technical committee.)
- The I-25 interchange is being considered as an interchange complex, including the intersections to the east and west of I-25, because those intersections affect traffic volumes and operations through the interchange.

- A comment was made that the westbound to northbound I-25 ramp from Arapahoe Road needs improvements. Problems are created by both south and northbound on-ramp traffic using the westbound lanes on the north side of Arapahoe Road. Non-frequent drivers expect the southbound ramp to I-25 to be accessed via the left lane. Need to implement signage to warn drivers that both entrance ramps are on the right side. Need signal timing changes and better signage.
- All of the I-25 improvement options include shifting Arapahoe Road to the south to accommodate the LRT bridge piers (Arapahoe Road would come back on alignment at either side of I-25).
- A comment was made that the three level diamond would have some visual and other impacts related to the sheer size of the infrastructure. This concept would limit access and development, especially if it was extended to the east and west.
- Major congestion points are currently at the two ends of the project corridor (I-25 and Parker Road), but with planned redevelopment, the congestion may be in the middle of the corridor.
 - Prioritization of improvements was questioned. Both ends of the corridor are a high priority for major improvements, but smaller, short term improvements could also be a high priority. (Surrounding agencies have already identified both ends as high priority in the Four Corners Agreement.)

8. Transit/Alternative Mode/Other Improvement Options:

- The frequent fixed route shuttle would serve many employees in the project corridor.
- The effectiveness of the Frequent Fixed Route Shuttle could possibly be improved by looping the route, instead of having the shuttle drive both directions on the same road. Need a parking lot at the east end of the shuttle route.
- Most of the ITS, TDM and transit options would probably not stand alone to benefit the traffic on the corridor, but would assist operations in combination with other corridor, interchange, parallel route and intersection improvements.
- HOV lanes not a good option for this congested corridor. The short segment of HOV lanes would not link with any other HOV lanes and unlikely result in creation of new car/van pools.
- East/west RTD ridership potential is great and the call-n-Ride won't likely be sufficient to serve the demand for transit service to access the SE Corridor LRT.
- Removing the tolls from E-470 is an option being explored.
 - Initial look is that this option is not a great benefit to removing traffic from Arapahoe Road.
 - A meeting has been scheduled with the project team and the E-470 Authority next week.

9. The next meeting of the CRP is tentatively planned in January, between public meetings 3 and 4.