

East Arapahoe Transportation Plan Community Working Group

Meeting #3

August 3, 2016 5:30 – 8:00 pm

Boulder Jewish Community Center, 6007 Oreg Avenue

Meeting Notes

Working Group Members in Attendance: Kai Abelkis, David Baskett, Aaron Cook, Aaron Johnson, Andrew Johnson, Elisabeth Patterson, Brianne Eby, Guy Fromme, Sherry Olson, Aaron Pasterz, Anna Reid, Bill Roettker, Jerry Shapins

City Staff and Consultants in Attendance: Kathleen Bracke, Bill Cowern, Oscar Saucedo-Andrade, Randall Rutsch, Jean Sanson, Cassie Slade (Fox Tuttle Hernandez), Charlie Alexander (Fehr & Peers), Tom Brennan (Nelson/Nygaard), Marc Ambrosi (Boulder County Transportation), Natalie Stiffler.

INTRODUCTION

After a round of introductions by CWG members, Barbara Lewis (meeting facilitator) and Jean Sanson (project manager) presented the purpose of the meeting and the agenda. The project team has completed an initial screen of corridor design and management elements and would like the CWG's input and feedback on preliminary recommendations. The purpose of the initial screen is to remove elements that are infeasible and should not be carried forward for consideration in the corridor. Future CWG meetings will focus on how to package the elements moving forward into discrete alternatives for consideration.

PRESENTATION

Jean Sanson presented the planning schedule and Tom Brennan presented the methodology for the initial screening process.

POLLING EXERCISE

Working group members were asked to draw attention to the design elements that project team recommends for removal based on not aligning with the plan purpose and goals, not feasible based on design or cost limitations, or posing a safety hazard to roadway users. CWG members were asked to confirm the project team's initial screening of corridor elements or identify the need for further discussion or analysis in next stage of evaluation. For each category of elements, the presenters recapped the overall results and conducted a first round of voting on elements recommended for

removal or limited use. The question asked was “Do you agree with the screening results and recommendation?” and responses included “Yes, No, Neutral, Need more information”. Discussions were held after each first round of voting, and a second round of voting followed. The following pages summarize the polling exercise and discussions.

Polling: Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Streetscape Elements

Recommendation to Limit Use - S5: Shared Travel Lanes with Pavement Markings

Preliminary poll

Yes – 75%

No – 17%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 8%

Discussion

- Context dependent
- Perhaps appropriate at right turn pockets/ bus intersection queue
- People can do this today
- Signing not effective
- Appropriate speed of less than 35 mph, comfortable to 25 mph
- Multi-use path is the safest and fewest impacts

Final poll

Yes – 92%

No – 8%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 8%

Recommendation to Limit Use - S6: Bike Lanes (Standard)

Preliminary poll

Yes – 73%

No – 27%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

- Consider frontage roads, for example Pearl Parkway
- Would hugely improve what we have today
- May be better in areas where there exists no bike lane at all
- May not feel safe on roads with 6-lanes or more

- Reduce travel lane widths to accommodate a standard bike at each side, short-term option
- Multi-use path = defacto bus, waiting area
- Need multi-use path on both sides

Final poll

Yes – 83%

No – 8%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 8%

Recommendation to Remove - S9: Shared Bus and Bike Lanes

Preliminary poll

Yes – 92%

No – 8%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Discussion

- Maybe appropriate at que jumps
- How are they different from sharrows?

Final poll

Yes – 83%

No – 17%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

General Discussion Related to Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Streetscape Elements

- Concerned that buffered bike lanes and bollards are not sufficient protection for bikers
- Protected bike lanes impossible to plow in winter (winter maintenance)
- Multi-use path not clear intended for cyclists and more cement – need clear signage and color contrast
- Need multi-use path on both sides

Polling: Corridor Transit and TDM Elements

Recommendation to Remove - T6: Streetcar

Preliminary poll

Yes – 100%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Discussion

- No comment

Final poll

Final poll not needed

Recommendation to Remove - T6: Light Rail Transit

Preliminary poll

Yes – 85%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 15%

Discussion

- Could work as long-term option with potential growth out east
- Would need the right population density and destinations to make it appealing
- Value judgement regarding land use patters, does not meet industry standards
- Right-of-way acquisition for future application of light rail, “rail ready” bus investments
- Elements may force leadership to consider rail options
- Self-driving cars would make Arapahoe operate more efficiently
- Consider new technologies like self-driving busses

Final poll

Yes – 92%

No – 8%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Recommendation to Remove - T12: Reversible Transit Lanes

Preliminary poll

Yes – 92%

No – 8%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Discussion

- What is a safe pedestrian crossing distance?
- Would center-running buses increase pedestrian safety crossing street?

Final poll

Yes – 100%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 8%

Polling: Vehicles and Freight Elements

Recommendation to Remove - V5: Reversible Traffic Lane

Preliminary poll

Yes – 100%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Discussion

- How long does it take people to adjust to infrastructure (managed lanes) changes?

Final poll

Final poll not needed

Recommendation to Remove - V6: Wider General Purpose Travel Lanes

Preliminary poll

Yes – 100%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Discussion

- No comment

Final poll

Final poll not needed

Recommendation to Remove - V8: High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes

Preliminary poll

Yes – 69%

No – 23%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 8%

Discussion

- In a side-running BRT how will cars turn right into businesses?
- Will be hard to enforce HOV lanes in urban areas when turning right into business

Final poll

Yes – 100%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 8%

Recommendation to Remove - V9: Managed Lanes (Express Lanes)

Preliminary poll

Yes – 100%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 8%

Discussion

- Why is Boulder always compared to other bigger cities (Portland, San Francisco)

Final poll

Final poll not needed

Recommendation to Remove - V13: Roundabout

Preliminary poll

Yes – 92%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 8%

Discussion

- May be suitable for select locations, but not advisable for the entire corridor

Final poll

Yes – 0%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Recommendation to Remove - V14: Grade Separated Interchange

Preliminary poll

Yes – 75%

No – 17%

Neutral – 8%

Need more info – 0%

Discussion

- Limited use, use only if last resort

Final poll

Yes – 0%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Recommendation to Remove - V15: Speed Humps

Preliminary poll

Yes – 100%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Discussion

- No comment

Final poll

Final poll not needed

Recommendation to Remove - V16: Tunnel

Preliminary poll

Yes – 100%

No – 0%

Neutral – 0%

Need more info – 0%

Discussion

- No comment

Final poll

Final poll not needed

The project team recommended completing the discussion of vehicle and freight elements at the next CWG meeting.

DEBRIEF

What worked well?

- No changes, Wednesday is good, the clicky answer system was great
- Had good prep for meeting (materials)
- Food is nice! Schedule break would be nice (5min)
- Clickers are good for pace
- Pace was good!
- Constructive dialogue, constructive meeting
- Facilitation was good

What would you change?

- Too much repetition
- Could be more space for dialogue about green elements

- Please poll no later than 5 days after a meeting to set next appointment time and date
- Meeting feel it could be better managed and kept on track
- The polling questions were leading, E.g. “do you agree..”

Questions for future meetings

- Problem is timeframe, a 10-year old interchange study will have no relevance in 20 years from now
- Underpasses?
- The conversation may have been improved/concrete by discussing possible treatments with regard to specific corridor segments

DRAFT