

WestConnect Coalition

Technical Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, August 12, 2015 - 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Jefferson County Administration Building

Meeting Summary

Purpose: Develop recommendations for key aspects of the PEL scope of work including general approach, outcomes and goals and initial tasks and timeline.

Topic
Review of Steering Committee input regarding approach to PEL and implications for the study <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Balancing segment by segment approach with regional mobility• Treatment of Jefferson Parkway segment• Project prioritization process
Discussion: PEL Goals and Objectives Outcome: Recommend PEL goals and objectives to the Steering Committee
Discussion: Preliminary Tasks and Timeline Outcome: Agreement on PEL tasks and timeline
Next Steps and Agenda Topics for Steering Committee

Summary Meeting Notes

The Technical Working Group (TWG) for the WestConnect Coalition met to discuss the goals for the PEL study and the scope of the project. The following are summary meeting notes from this meeting.

TWG Meeting Location and Timing. While the Steering Committee meetings for the WestConnect Coalition will rotate location, the TWG will plan to meet at the Jefferson County Administration Building, roughly 2 weeks prior to the Steering Committee meetings. TWG meetings will be 2-hours in length.

PEL Scope of Work. The question of what information is needed from the Coalition in order to develop the Scope of Work and initiate the Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) study was discussed. From CDOT's perspective, the identification of the PEL goals and objectives and basic parameters of the effort is needed.

PEL General Approach. The TWG discussed the general approach to conducting the PEL. A dual approach will be used, examining regional mobility needs and alternatives as well as an examination of needs and solutions on a segment by segment basis. The segment by segment approach will identify problem areas and appropriate solutions to address issues that impact specific segments. A regional mobility analysis will overlay the segment analysis to ensure that individual segments and projects at a minimum don't preclude regional mobility and ideally enhance it. It was noted that many of the segments have defined and adopted plans and that the PEL will consolidate information, prioritize projects, and examine benefits, connections and implications of such actions. The PEL process will respect and incorporate jurisdictional plans and agreements and focus.

There is a need to define what is needed by the term "regional mobility," and include in the PEL scope of work.

A matrix that examines 1) regional mobility goals and problems 2) segment by segment problems 3) fiscal realities and funding opportunities and 4) risks or potential pitfalls will be developed. Steve Harrelson will develop a draft table for discussion at the next Steering Committee meeting. The matrix will be a tool to document the needs in the segment and in the study area as a whole.

PEL Segments. The segments recommended below are considered to have physical or traffic characteristics that make them applicable to study, to be confirmed with additional analysis in the PEL.

- C-470 – Kipling to Morrison
- C-470 - Morrison to I-70 including the C-470 extension
- 6th Avenue – I-70 to SH 58
- SH-93 – from SH-58 to SH 72 or southern terminus of Jefferson Parkway
- SH-93 – from SH-72 to Marshall Road
- Jefferson Parkway – SH-93 to SH-128
- Interlocken Boulevard – SH-128 to present Northwest Parkway Terminus

Treatment of Jefferson Parkway and Northwest Parkway Segments. The PEL will not analyze or recommend mainline alternatives for the Jefferson Parkway or the connections to Northwest Parkway as these are being defined through separate processes. Rather, they will be considered as future improvements to be implemented by others. The PEL must be informed and aware of these projects and while they are recognized as a segment and will be part of the traffic analysis, they will not be part of the prioritized list of projects. An “if, then when” approach was supported by the TWG, i.e. if it is implemented, what are the implications for other PEL projects and regional mobility?

- It was suggested that the segments be renamed to remove confusion and that the TWG use language that promotes effective conversation, i.e. eliminate use of terms “beltway” and “loop” from PEL discussions. The PEL is not about whether or not to complete the “beltway.”
- It was also discussed that there may be funds for which either of these projects may be uniquely qualified and may be pursued. This can be included in the PEL matrix discussed below.

PEL Alternatives. The TWG agreed that the PEL alternatives analysis will primarily focus on mainline improvements in the study area. Arterial roads will be included in the traffic analysis; however alternatives will not be examined off of the mainline unless traffic studies demonstrate that a “major” improvement could be made to the mainline by addressing it. Multi-modal options will be considered beyond the mainline improvements in the PEL.

As noted above, alternatives for the Jefferson Parkway and Northwest Parkway extension will not be evaluated in the PEL as these are projects that will be “done by others” in the future. However, in order to understand the mobility implications of these potential projects, the PEL will develop scenarios both with implementation and without implementation. The TWG will need to keep up with the status of these two segments to understand what is being done operationally and how it will impact the rest of the study area.

Prioritization Process. The TWG discussed the transportation alternative prioritization process that will be required to narrow alternatives and create an actionable plan that leads toward implementation. The prioritization process will be supported by criteria and data generated during the PEL and will involve deliberations by the TWG and Steering Committee. An outstanding question is whether to prioritize segments and focus the PEL efforts on those priorities, and/or to look at all segments equally and then prioritize projects within each segment.

Temporal Scope. The question of the temporal scope of the PEL was discussed, particularly what are we fixing to? Are we focusing on existing needs in the study area or are we looking at the 2035 or 2040 transportation needs? The TWG discussion led to a general agreement that the initial focus should be on addressing existing problems while overlaying future traffic projections to identify gaps. The project alternatives will not automatically be designed to meet

2035/2040 needs and will look at phasing options. It was assumed that, incremental improvements will not preclude future options and support regional mobility.

Goals and Tasks for the PEL Study. The TWG focused on identifying the goals for the PEL study. The list outlined below is a result of a brainstormed conversation.

Draft PEL Goals include:

- Consolidate and validate jurisdictions plans and priorities
- Identify an agreed upon list of prioritized projects, based on reliable and measurable data, to best address the transportation problems.
 - o The prioritized project list will take into account issues that include environmental, safety, congestion, economic development, mobility, available funding, community plans
- Identify the full range of potential funding options and opportunities
- Engage the public in a meaningful way by educating them on the transportation needs in the study area and by soliciting input on their needs and concerns and the prioritized list of projects
- Identify alternative mobility opportunities in the study area
- Streamline future processes and implementation
- Identify next steps and implementation actions

Tasks for the PEL include:

- Identify existing conditions and target problem areas in the study area
- Consider both incremental improvements /short term solutions and longer term solutions while not letting the “perfect be the enemy of the good”
- Ensure that individual alternatives improve mobility within the study area
 - o Alternatives should support each other; options should be compatible and improve regional mobility

Steering Committee Agenda Topics

1. Summary of TWG conversations including Scope of Work topics
2. Goals for the PEL
3. Next steps and timeline for PEL scope of work

Materials to Distribute to Steering Committee

- PEL draft goals and approaches to scope of work issues
- Updated map with PEL segments – Steve Durian to develop
- Matrix segment concept – Steve Harrelson to develop

Attendees

Alex Ariniello	Anne Beierle	Bill Cown
Bill Ray	Bob Manwaring	Dan Hartman
Dave Baskett	Mike Normandin	Derek Schuler
Steve Harelson	Jana Spiker	George Gerstle
Jordan Rudel	Jon Chesser	Jonathan Bartsch
Kevin Standbridge	Michael Sweeney	Neil Ogden
Steve Durian		