



## Stakeholder Workshop #2

**Location:** Eagle Pointe Recreation Center

**Date/Time:** March 19, 2024 / 6:00 to 7:30 p.m.

**Meeting Purpose:** Review and evaluate project alternatives developed to date.

### Discussion

---

#### Introductions

Participants introduced themselves. Most of the attendees represented local residents and businesses, and some also represented environmental and transportation interest groups. Others included Adams County, Commerce City, CDOT, South Adams County Fire Department, DRCOG, Colorado Motor Carriers, and project consultant staff. Peak Consulting Group (Mandy Whorton) facilitated the meeting, and CIG (Christian Jimenez) and FHU (Sebastian Montenegro) provided Spanish translation and facilitation. (See list of attendees attached)

Participants provided feedback on their positive experience at the previous workshop and appreciation for these workshops as an opportunity to have their input and experiences heard.

A briefing book was provided to new participants and additional briefing book materials for this workshop provided to all participants. The draft materials were provided for reference and background. The materials will be updated and supplemented as the workshops progress. CDOT intends this to be an ongoing collaboration as the project evolves.

#### Traffic Modeling

Rachel Ackerman (FHU) provided an overview travel demand modeling for the I-270 corridor referencing draft model output map, provided in the briefing book materials, showing trips diverted from I-270 and where they are anticipated to reroute in the 2050 travel demand model if improvements are not made to I-270.

#### Comments and discussion

- Confirmed the model does incorporate I-70 improvements.
- It was brought up that I-270 is the only hazmat route and those vehicles can't reroute.
- Discussed if the model considers mode shift if there are improved connections for other modes. To some degree yes, the model doesn't currently include assumptions around e-bikes though.
- Rachel highlighted how rerouting can lead to more vehicle miles traveled and that emissions are highest when vehicles are traveling in the 0-15 mph range, especially for freight trucks.
- Question was asked about if the model considers that within 2-5 years of expanding the road will be just as congested.
  - Rachel explained that the desire to travel isn't changing just because there is more road, the desire for trips is related to land use, population etc. The model just shows more of that demand being met when there is increased capacity. Noted there is an opportunity cost to unmet demand and people not taking trips they want to or need to take.

#### Alternatives

Ashley Orellana (FHU) summarized all the alternatives currently under consideration.

### Comments and discussion

- Comment regarding toll lanes- if we are paying to build this road why should we have to pay to use it.
- Comment regarding toll lanes - could passes be given to locals to use toll lanes for free similar to I-70.
- Question regarding funding and alternatives - Is there an available pool of funds meaning that a larger I-270 footprint would mean less funding available for other project components.
- David Merenich (CDOT) - highlighted that the alternatives don't currently show well the bicycle and pedestrian enhancements we will be incorporating which will be a lot of what we are hearing from this group.
- Comment - No action option is unacceptable
- South Adams County Fire Department provided insight on some of their experiences with not enough turn arounds and not being able to use turn arounds because of congestion. Mentioned at times this impacts what trauma facility they are able to go to.
  - Explained that from an emergency response perspective adding a lane proves for much better and safer traffic flow during a crash or emergency.
- Comment regarding how this project will impact the community. Mentioned concerns around safety of kids walking in the area, food desert, need for connectivity and bridges and trails.
- There was concern if any of the alternatives would reduce the area of the Sand Creek Greenway. Also mentioned that the Greenway is not intended to be a rapid commuter trail and is intended to have a more wild and natural feel.
  - Project team noted that there is wide ROW along I-270 and none of the alternatives currently under consideration are expected to impact the Greenway in that way.
  - It was also noted that Sand Creek Greenway has counts of trail users in the Commerce City and Denver sections.
- Discussed if connectivity to the Sand Creek Greenway is increased

### **Next Steps and Public Meeting Information**

The original plan for the stakeholder workshop was to hold two workshops to review needs and alternatives. The group expressed interest in continuing through the project development and environmental analysis. The group agreed to hold another workshop after the April Public Meeting.

### Comments and Suggestions

- Comment - we all know that something needs to happen for I-270.
- Suggested topics for future meetings:
  - Air quality and what helps, AQ comparisons
  - Noise
- Participant suggested homework for attendees to come up with pros and cons to the alternatives we reviewed today.
- Handed out flyers for the April public meetings and asked participants to invite 5 to 10 neighbors to the public meetings.