East Arapahoe Transportation Plan Community Working Group

Meeting #2

June 15, 2016 5:00 – 8:00 pm, Ball Aerospace Conference Center, 1735 Range Street

Meeting Notes

Working Group Members in Attendance: Kai Abelkis, David Cook, Brianne Eby, Guy Fromme, Yvan Lehuerou, Nikki McCord, Sherry Olson, Aaron Pasterz, Anna Reid, Bill Roettker

City Staff and Consultants in Attendance: Kathleen Bracke, Bill Cowern, Ted Harberg, Dave Kemp, Jean Sanson, Bill Fox (Fox Tuttle Hernandez), Charlie Alexander (Fehr & Peers), Tom Brennan (Nelson/Nygaard), Marc Ambrosi (Boulder County Transportation).

INTRODUCTION

The meeting began with a brief discussion of the Meeting #1 Minutes and the two documents sent to working group members since the last meeting, the Draft Existing Conditions Report and the Draft Goals and Objectives. A question was raised about the correct process for submitting comments and edits to any working group documents. Working group members should send comments about any document to Jean Sanson, and these comments will be reviewed and compiled and sent back to the working group with a revised draft of the document.

PRESENTATIONS

Presentations were given next by city staff and consultants addressing the range of elements that could be considered for East Arapahoe. Each presentation was followed by a Q&A session with city staff.

- Transit Signal Priority – has this been implemented anywhere?
  – The county has implemented it in some places, full implementation into Boulder is still being worked on.

- How is north and south traffic addressed?
  – This is important to assess both in terms of impact to Arapahoe, as well as the impact to the entire roadway network as a result of people taking different routes.

- What is the message that is sent by the final design? The current perception is that this is a highway. Others feel that traffic needs to slow down. Is this a city goal?
This is one element of a complete street.

- Is this an important freight corridor?
  - Yes, all state highways are considered important for freight traffic.

- How long is a person willing to walk for a trip?
  - 15 minutes is a standard measurement in transportation planning. This amount may differ for different individuals.
  - The built environment is also important and will affect this number – how comfortable is it to walk in a given area?

- How do “pedestrian scrambles” work and are they appropriate here?
  - These can make sense when there is a high volume of pedestrian traffic, but can also make certain intersections much more congested. It is very situational.

- Is the “interested but concerned” group of potential bike riders the same here as it is in Portland?
  - A specific study of our community has not been done, but it is likely to be at least 50%.
  - Pedestrian first is a matter of city policy as well, and not simply a data point.

- Crossing time is very important. Some people do not feel comfortable, or are not physically able to cross a street like Arapahoe in the time given.

- How do technology changes like ebikes affect the planning process?
  - Data is fairly inconclusive. Some technology changes create much greater societal change than others, and it is hard to ever know how or when this will occur.

BREAKOUT GROUPS

Working group members next rotated between three breakout sessions looking in detail at potential transportation elements sorted by category. Working group members were asked to draw attention to the elements that are of the most interest to them, and generally provide their thoughts on the various elements.

Breakout 1: Transit and TDM

Design Elements:

Real Time, App-Based Information
- Important!

Expanded Ecopass
- Convenient for travel through many cities.
- No excuses for not riding.
Very important, but we need to reduce bus travel times or people won’t stay with transit.

**Bus Rapid Transit (BRT): Side Running in Business Access & Transit Lane**
- No Comments

**Bus Rapid Transit (BRT): Center Running in Dedicated Lanes**
- Mid-highway platform safety becomes extremely important.
- Nice, but is it viable in this corridor?

**Streetcar or Light Rail**
- Overhead transit – “swift tram”

**Side Running Bus in Mixed Traffic**
- This is what we have now. Want to do better, particularly in planning for the future.
- Alternating travel speeds adds danger.

**Enhanced Bus**
- Good incremental improvements to be made.

**Peak Only Exclusive Transit Lanes**
- Seems to make sense if corridor travel patterns are “rush hour” oriented as they seem.

**Better Timed Transfers and Information**
- Important where regional trips have been removed.

**Improved Transit Amenities**
- Context specific
- Excellent inducer to get riders to take the bus during bad weather.

**Park and Rides**
- Important where there is little or no local feeder transit north and south to the corridor.

**Parking Management**
- Important, but how do we get this on private parking lots? Has this been done elsewhere?
- Bike parking too.

**First and Last Mile Connections and Shared Use Mobility**
- Bike shares at stops, particularly at high employment areas.
- The last mile improvements needed in Erie, Lafayette, Louisville, and communities farther east.

**Other Comments**
- Vanpools/Carpools/Shared TNC
- Smart grid planning that doesn’t preclude community –wide broadband technology.
  - Prepaid fare technology.
  - Real-time Transit Information
  - Pay technology – credit card, phone pay.
Breakout 2: Bike, Pedestrian and Streetscape Facilities

*Design Elements:*

**Crossings**
- Automatic signalized pedestrian crossings are important.
- Overhead lights create a much better stop signal. These are rather dangerous.
- Crossings are very important in additions to walkways.
- Flashing lights are not sufficient for pedestrian crossings, needs to be an overhead beacon or signal.

**Intersection Comfort and Safety**
- Consider curb ramps, including within bus stops themselves.
- The plan needs to be safety-focused; the corridor is not safe for bicyclists.
- Intersection safety and comfort is a high priority.
- Cross-parcel access and access from properties to the sidewalks is important.

**Multi-Use Path**
- Consider color-coded sidewalks for visual acuity.
- Consider more bike paths on East Arapahoe; this would at least be an improvement over the existing condition.

**Separated Multi-Use Path**
- This is the primo treatment – but is there the demand in this corridor? Would it draw added usage? Maybe if it is longer and well connected.
- East Arapahoe is not an ideal bicycling route. Are alternative routes available?

**Amenity Zone Features**
- This is all important.
- Yes – it makes it feel like all modes are valued.
- Any amenities should be considered that buffer adjacent travel lanes from sidewalks.
- Support all amenities, especially to slow cars down.
- All pedestrian-realm amenities should be considered.

**Landscaping**
- In some cases, landscaping can block important views, such as to transit.
- Landscaping needs to be drought-tolerant.

**Public Art**
- This area needs neighborhood naming/branding/identity.

**Gateway Features**
- Not so important

**Bike Lanes**
- Some bicyclists prefer on-street to multi-use paths because of driveways and curb cuts (already likely on East Arapahoe).
- What is the efficiency of green bike lanes?
- Multiple lane changes by drivers cause a lot of chaos on the road.

**Buffered Bike Lanes**
- These, or conventional bike lanes are okay.

**Protected Bike Lanes**
- Best of the bicycle options.
- Need to consider protected bike lanes on the corridor.
- A bike lane along might not be beneficial.
- Prefer a buffered or protected bike lane.
- Prefer curb/landscaped protected bike lane instead of bollards; bollards aren’t sufficient.
- Maintenance concerns regarding snow in protected bike lanes.

**Shared Bicycle-Transit Lanes**
- Too much speed differential between these two modes.
- How would this lane work exactly? This is unclear.

**Other Comments**
- The corridor needs to be looked at with a pedestrian focus.
- Need to improve Complete Streets but also not impact traffic too much.
- Recommend a roundabout to break speed as a gateway treatment.
- Access Management will be very important to any of these options.

**Breakout 3: Vehicular**

**Design Elements:**

**Adding General Purpose Lanes (East End of the Corridor)**
- This is very important to do.
- It is very important that this is not done.

**Reversible General Purpose Lanes**
- Depending on dedication to BRT (or not). If no BRT, then this would be secondary.
- Seems to match the corridor travel pattern. How about a reversible express lane that retains 45 MPG while local traffic slows?
- These are not good.
Wider General Purpose Lanes
- No Comments

Narrower General Purpose Lanes*
- What is the experience with this on Broadway?

High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes
- There should be some BRT element, exclusive or managed lane.
- Electric Cars.

Managed Lanes/Express Lanes
- Not sure that tolling makes sense on Arapahoe.
- These are not good.

Three Travel Lanes per Direction*
- This is very important to do.
- It is very important that this is not done.

Repurpose Travel Lanes – Two General Purpose Lanes Per Direction*
- Favored
- Please don’t create too much congestion.
- Please do this.
- Please don’t do this.

Maintain Three Travel Lanes – Add Space for Transit and/or Bikes
- See above – related discussion.

Better Signal Timing*
- Hard to do with 2way traffic.
- Look at doing this at Conestoga St.

Reduced Speed Limit
- No Comments

Emergency Vehicle Access
- Emergency response and access to the hospital is important*
- 48th Street connection to the north.

Access Management
- Requires much better travel conditions between properties.
- In sync with land use plans to facilitate accesses or access management to parcels and properties anticipated to density – don’t preclude your options.
• Interested in this option.

**Roundabouts**

• Don’t preclude future possibility of implementation where it could make sense to remove a signaled intersection and add a roundabout.
• Entry Feature.

**Safety Improvements/Reduce conflicts**

• Pedestrian Experience.*

**Vehicle Overpass (at Foothills)**

• Perfect opportunity to implement an overpass at 55th too.
• Interested in this option.

**New Ideas**

• Express Lane Tunnel
• Speed Humps

* Topic or comment was brought up by multiple people

**NEXT STEPS AND SCHEDULE**

The meeting concluded with a discussion of next steps, including an introduction into the screening process that may be used to assess the various elements and begin to package them into distinct alternatives. The week of August 1st has been selected for the working group’s meeting #3, and members were asked to let staff know their preferred date which will be selected and communicated to the working group in the near future.