

Jefferson Parkway Advisory Committee (JPAC)
October 23, 2018
Apex Field House (5724 Oak Street)
Meeting Summary – FINAL

ATTENDANCE

Participants: Bini Abbott, Bill Branyan, Vera Ladtkow, Britta Nelson, Ian Owens, Bill Ray, Randy Stafford, Brett Vernon

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Sam Haas

UPDATE ON JEFFERSON PARKWAY PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY (JPPHA) BOARD MEETING

Bill Ray provided an update on the discussion and outcomes of the JPPHA Board meeting.

- On September 7, the JPPHA issued a request for qualifications (RFQ). As part of the RFQ process, the JPPHA Board agreed to host one-on-one sessions with any prospective teams that wanted to ask questions about the RFQ. The JPPHA Board had several of those conversations over a two-day period, and it is encouraging to see a high level of interest in the market. The questions and comments discussed with the teams will be consolidated into an addendum to the RFQ, which will be issued before October 31. Statements of qualification are due to the JPPHA by December 6. There will be a scoring process, and a final recommendation will be made to the JPPHA during the December 20 Board meeting. Up to three teams will be shortlisted and move forward to the request for proposal (RFP) process. The RFP will be issued in January 2019.
- The JPPHA Board met on Thursday, October 18 and discussed the initial budget for 2019. The JPPHA Board will take action on the budget document. The Board authorized the acquisition of a small parcel off of State Highway 72 called the Hotchkins parcel that will be needed for the development of the interchange.
- The next JPPHA Board meeting is on November 15, from 3:00 pm-5:00 pm at Arvada City Hall.

GROUP DISCUSSION OF HOW TO PROCEED

Given that five members of the JPAC were not in attendance, the present members expressed concern about ensuring that the group discussion accurately reflected the perspective of all members. The group discussed several options and agreed to the following next steps.

- The JPAC members in attendance would discuss the revised recommendations and reach agreement on next steps/language for as many recommendations as possible. Peak Facilitation Group will send an online survey with the revised language to JPAC members who were not in attendance to provide them with the opportunity to indicate whether they support the changes made.
- The JPAC will schedule a meeting before November 15 to discuss whichever recommendations they do not have time to discuss at this meeting and to determine a strategy for presenting information to the JPPHA Board.

- Peak Facilitation will expedite the meeting summary and send it to the JPAC members not in attendance with a link to the online survey so they can provide their input.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Participants reviewed the revised list of recommendations, which are now organized by the number of green dots they received during the exercise at the last JPAC meeting (from most to fewest). The recommendations with the most green dots were discussed at the last meeting and had a high degree of support. For each recommendation, JPAC members who do not support it will share their reasoning. The purpose of this discussion is to provide a foundation for the content of the report that will be presented to the JPPHA Board. (A draft of the report will be sent to JPAC members for review before it is sent to the Board).

- The group first discussed how Peak Facilitation would frame the level of support/non-support for each of the recommendations in their report. The report will indicate where the group completely agreed on a recommendation (i.e., all members support the recommendation as written) and will denote recommendations that do not have full support by saying: “Most JPAC members support this recommendation and a few do not because they have X concerns or questions.”
- Unlike in a representative democracy, members of the JPAC do not represent any systematic group of people but rather are individuals who have diverse perspectives and backgrounds. Therefore, it would be inaccurate to assume that if 70% of the JPAC thought X, 70% of the general population would think the same. Also, presenting the binary results (e.g., 70% supported, 30% did not) does not capture the diversity of thought and nuanced opinions on each of the issues.

Recommendation #1 (11 dots) - Adopt the mitigation measures from the 2008 Northwest Corridor Transportation Study Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The JPAC members present had no objections to this recommendation and agreed to support it as written.

Recommendation #2 (11 Green Dots) -JPPHA should require dust control and mitigation during the construction of the Jefferson Parkway to deal with high winds. Additionally, air pollution control measures and strategies are required under Colorado’s State Implementation Plan for the Denver Metro/North Front Range non-attainment area under the Clean Air Act. Dust control measures should be taken along the entire length of the Jefferson Parkway.

- When HDR Consulting presented at a previous JPAC meeting, they indicated that the plan for dust mitigation was to follow Colorado requirements. The dust control measures referred to in this recommendation are not specific. It is important to focus dust mitigation efforts on the risk posed by areas near the Rocky Flats site. There is a difference between dust control and dust monitoring.
- The JPAC members present had no objections to this recommendation and agreed to support it as written.

Recommendation #3 (9 Green Dots) - JPPHA should carefully consider the site and design of the Greenway Trail.

- Bill Ray stated that the JPPHA has no association with the Rocky Mountain Greenway and recommended that the JPAC make actionable recommendations.
- JPAC members asked if the Greenway Trail crossing plan of the Jefferson Parkway has been considered, and Bill responded that he was not sure.
- The JPAC decided to discuss this recommendation in conjunction with recommendations #9 and #12 (See discussion of recommendation #12).

Recommendation #4 (9 Green Dots) - Mitigation measures should be taken to insulate the neighborhood of Leyden Rock from the negative impacts of the Jefferson Parkway during the construction phase and to reduce the impacts of the highway dividing the community, and keep the residents living along the parkway safe when the parkway is operational. Light and sound mitigation measures should be considered carefully, and creative solutions should be explored and implemented since the Leyden Rock residents will only be 65 yards from the edge of the roadway, much closer than any other community along the beltway. An informal poll of nearby residents revealed that almost all are adamantly opposed to traditional sound walls. - One option could be to recess the roadway deeper as it goes through Leyden Rock and build several at-grade, wide pedestrian walkways to partially cover the span and to deflect noise and light pollution. Heavy vegetation could reduce light and sound impacts in the open areas between pedestrian walkways. - Another option could include a sound absorbing tunnel, similar to the one built at the Beijing Zoo. Other creative solutions of this type, beyond traditional sound mitigation measures, should be encouraged. - Traditional sound walls should be avoided, per the wishes of the local residents - **9 Green Dots (for light and sound mitigation measures)** - Light pollution from both highway lighting and car headlights should be avoided as much as possible. Tall light poles should be avoided, and highway lighting should be directed to the roadway and should not be visible to homes lining the Parkway or the surrounding neighborhood. - Signage for the Parkway should be positioned well away from neighborhoods.

- JPAC members asked that some of the recommendations be broadened beyond Leyden Rock, as they may apply to other residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Parkway.
- JPAC members agreed to allow the author to rewrite this recommendation. The revised recommendation is: *Mitigation measures should be taken to insulate the residential neighborhoods from the negative impacts of the Jefferson Parkway during the construction phase and when operational, to reduce the impacts of the highway dividing the community, and to keep the residents living alongside the parkway safe. Mitigation measures should include:*
 - *Regarding sound mitigation, measures should be considered carefully, and creative solutions should be explored and implemented.*
 - *One option could include a sound absorbing tunnel, similar to the one built at the Beijing Zoo. Other creative solutions of this type, beyond traditional sound mitigation measures, should be encouraged.*

- *Another option could be to recess the roadway deeper as it goes through Leyden Rock and build several at-grade wide pedestrian walkways to partially cover the span to deflect noise and light pollution. Heavy vegetation could reduce light and sound impacts in the open areas between pedestrian walkways.*
- *Traditional sound walls should be avoided, per the wishes of the local residents*
- *Regarding light pollution (both highway lighting and headlights from motorists), tall light poles should be avoided, and highway lighting should be directed to the roadway and not visible to homes lining the Parkway or the surrounding neighborhood.*
 - *Signage for the Parkway should be positioned well away from residential neighborhoods.*
- *Regarding safety, guard rails and similar safety measures should be utilized to keep vehicles away from residences in the event of an accident.*

Recommendation #5 (9 Green Dots) - JPPHA should consult with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Wildlife Program about options for wildlife crossings (<https://www.codot.gov/programs/environmental/wildlife>).

- The author of this recommendation asked to withdraw it from consideration because the concept is covered in other recommendations and Colorado Parks and Wildlife are already engaged in an ongoing discussion with JPPHA about wildlife crossings.
- JPAC members agreed to withdraw this recommendation.

Recommendation #6 (9 Green Dots) - The committee should continue meeting during the RFP process and construction of the Jefferson Parkway.

- There would be value in having the JPAC meet with the three final bidders. Because of the confidentiality of the bidding process, the JPAC would not have access to the RFP responses, as the information is proprietary.
- The group discussed whether the JPAC should meet regularly or periodically and agreed that the JPAC should have regularly scheduled meetings during the RFP process that can be canceled as the group sees fit.
- The JPAC agreed to change this recommendation to: *The JPAC should meet regularly (subject to cancellation during the RFP process and construction of the Jefferson Parkway).*

Recommendation #7 (9 Green Dots) - Consider innovative approaches to the design and use of the Jefferson Parkway by offering bonus points to RFP respondents who offer creative ideas in their proposals.

- The JPAC agreed to change this recommendation to: *The JPPHA should state in the RFP that evaluation criteria will include creativity, innovation, and aesthetics.*

Recommendation #8 (8 Green Dots) - The RFP should state that all National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)-like standards be followed for the environmental review process even though no federal funds are used.

- The JPAC agreed to withdraw this recommendation.

Recommendation #9 (8 Green Dots) - Because there are no safe options to transit north and south on non-motorized transportation, bike/walk pathways should be included in the design to allow pedestrian use across and along the parkway. The bike/walk paths should link up to trails at the north and south ends with the objective of extending safe non-motorized routes throughout the northwest metro area.

- The JPAC agreed to discuss this recommendation in conjunction with recommendations #3 and #12 (see discussion of Recommendation #12).

Recommendation #10 (7 Green Dots) - If the current parkway alignment up Indiana Street remains the same, the JPPHA Board should install adequate air monitoring equipment downwind of the construction to monitor for airborne contamination caused by construction activity. Monitoring should be accompanied by a public comment period on the design of the air monitoring equipment and on the consequences of exceedances of specified airborne contamination thresholds (and what those thresholds should be). Monitoring should begin before construction to establish a baseline for air quality. The purpose of the monitoring is to assess whether construction activity is resuspending Rocky Flats contaminants in the air.

- The amendments to this recommendation were driven by the group discussion at the last meeting. The amendment addresses the purpose of the monitoring. The reason for the public comment on the design of the air monitoring equipment is to allow critics such as Gale Biggs to weigh in on how that equipment should be designed.
- The group asked what the action/consequence would be if the monitoring found that construction was resuspending contaminants into the air. It was suggested that there should be public notification if resuspension of contaminants occurs.
- The JPAC discussed the fact that the difficulty of recommending sampling or monitoring on Rocky Flats is that stakeholders have different ideas about what should be tested, to what extent, and to satisfy what concern. There has been an ongoing debate about how much remediation is enough. The best approach is to make sure that all the data is made publicly available.
- The JPAC agreed to allow the author to rewrite this recommendation. The revised recommendation is: *The JPPHA Board should install adequate air monitoring equipment and continuously monitor air quality in the Indiana Street corridor, to assess whether construction activity resuspends Rocky Flats contaminants into the air.*
 - *Before construction, there should be a public process to:*
 - *Design the air monitoring equipment*
 - *Specify thresholds of airborne contamination that should not be exceeded*
 - *Specify consequences of exceedances of those thresholds*
 - *Monitoring should begin before construction to establish an air quality baseline*

Recommendation #11 (7 Green Dots) - The Board should require independent testing for plutonium and other contaminants before allowing any design and construction-related, surface-disturbing activities within the Indiana corridor of the Parkway and should require public posting of the testing results. Results showing elevated levels of contaminants should be reported to Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE) and any other relevant agencies. If contaminant levels exceed CDPHE's standards, construction should pause while mitigation measures are followed, then a resampling should be conducted.

- This recommendation has clearly defined consequences for results that indicate elevated levels of contaminants.
- The group discussed what “independent testing” means. In this context, it is meant to mean “independent of the concessionaire.”
- The JPAC agreed to change this recommendation to: *“The Board should require testing of plutonium and other contaminants independent of the concessionaire before allowing any design and construction-related, surface-disturbing activities within the Indiana corridor of the Parkway and should require public posting of the testing results. Results showing elevated levels of contaminants should be reported to CDPHE and any other relevant agencies. If contaminant levels exceed CDPHE's standards, construction should pause while mitigation measures are followed, then a resampling should be conducted.”*

Recommendation #12 (7 Green Dots) - There should be multimodal options along the proposed access road by Leyden Rock. The pathway should connect to all the trailheads (the Greenway Trail, etc.). - Development of the multimodal options should be included in phase 1 of construction.

- This JPAC decided to discuss recommendations #3, #9, and #12 simultaneously.
- The JPAC agreed to condense the three recommendations into one: *“The JPPHA Board should include bike paths, designed to allow pedestrians to cross or travel along the Parkway. Those paths should link up at the north and south ends as the Greenway Trail. Development of multimodal options should be included in phase 1 of construction.”*

NEXT STEPS

- Peak Facilitation Group will send out a Doodle to find a time for the JPAC to meet before November 15. The group agreed to include daytime and weekend times as options. The group also agreed that, if members are unable to attend in person, there should be a teleconference option available to them. However, meeting face-to-face is preferable.
- Peak Facilitation Group will send out a survey to the JPAC members not in attendance to gather their feedback on the recommendations discussed during this meeting. It will present the language that the group agreed to and ask if they can agree to it as written. If they do not agree, they will indicate their reasoning.
- Peak Facilitation Group will send all JPAC members a separate survey that asks members to indicate their degree of support for the remaining 12 recommendations (#13 - #24).