

Jefferson Parkway Advisory Committee (JPAC)
September 20, 2018
Apex Field House
Meeting Summary – FINAL

ATTENDANCE

Participants: Bini Abbott, Rebecca Kallio, Vera Ladtkow, Britta Nelson, Ian Owens, Bill Ray, Brent Smith, Jill-Ellyn Straus, Jerry Taylor, Brett Vernon

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Sam Haas

ACTION ITEMS

Peak Facilitation Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Send the link to the request for qualifications.• Send Judge Brimmer’s decision.• Send a Doodle for the October meeting.
Anyone who wrote a recommendation	Consider whether they want to leave their recommendation as-is, rewrite it, or withdraw it.

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

Bill Ray provided an update on the JPPHA Board meeting.

- The request for proposals (RFQ) to design, build, finance, operate, and maintain the Jefferson Parkway project was released to the public on September 7. That document is available on the website in the “procurement” tab. September 18 was the deadline for the contractors planning to submit a proposal to identify a single point of contact. The JPPHA Board has received a number of submissions.
- If JPPHA received enough qualified respondents to the RFQ, the Board would shortlist no more than three respondents. That selection process will take place between December 6, 2018 (when responses are due) and December 20, 2018. Then a request for proposals (RFP) will be released. Each respondent may spend \$5 million developing their response. It will take approximately eight months for the JPPHA to evaluate those submissions. If there is a clear winner, JPPHA will negotiate a concession agreement that will close approximately a year from today and will reach financial close by the end of 2019.
- Working with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has been challenging, so the JPPHA Board has suggested that a different alternative that serves the purpose should be explored. Bill Ray has approached the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and discussed shifting the north end of the Parkway from where it was going to be (across from Interlocken) half a mile to the west. CDOT has agreed to this realignment. JPPHA will modify their access permits to allow for this change. It would be possible to add lanes onto State Highway 128 to accommodate traffic, and CDOT has agreed with that approach.

Clarifying Questions

Participants asked clarifying questions about the update on the JPPHA Board meeting. Questions are indicated in italics, followed by the response.

Is the current Simms Street going to be closed?

Simms Street will be relocated, and the current location of Simms Street will become a cul-de-sac to serve the airport.

Is Broomfield still going to build an extension through Interlocken to Highway 128?

That is the decision of the Northwest Parkway and the concessionaire. There was a conceptual design for an extension six years ago, and it was going to cost \$150 million to extend the road by two miles.

DOTTING PRIORITIZATION EXERCISE

JPAC members used colored dots to prioritize their recommendations. The dotting exercise is intended to provide data and help the JPAC decide how to proceed with their discussions; the dots do not indicate a decision. JPAC members were provided red, yellow, and green dots and placed one colored dot on each recommendation to indicate their level of support. Green dots signified full support, yellow dots signified questions or concerns, and red dots signified no support. Bill Ray offered to provide recommendation-specific feedback, and the group agreed to listen to Bill's input after they completed the dotting exercise.

Recommendation	Number of Green Dots	Number of Yellow Dots	Number of Red Dots
#1: Adopt the mitigation measures from the 2008 Northwest Corridor Transportation Study Environmental Impact Analysis.	11	0	0
#2: State in the RFP that all NEPA-like standards be followed for the environmental review process.	8	3	
#3: Install air monitoring equipment down-wind of construction to monitor airborne contamination. Accompany this with a public comment period.	7	4	0
#4: Require independent testing for plutonium and other contaminants before surface-disturbing activities on Indiana Corridor and require public posting of results. If contaminant levels exceed CDPHE's standards, pause construction and follow mitigation measures, then resample.	7	2	2
#5: Sponsor independent review of all past studies of soil contamination and public health impacts.	3	2	6
#6: Require dust control and mitigation during construction and follow the Clean Air Act air pollution	11	0	0

control measures required under Colorado's State Implementation Plan.			
#7: JPPHA should seek to open the records of the Special Grand Jury 89-2.	2	0	9
#8: Include bike/walk paths in the design to allow pedestrian use across the Parkway, and eventually like these paths to other trails.	8	3	0
#9: Create multi-modal options along proposed access road by Leyden Rock during phase one of construction that connects to all trailheads.	7	4	0
#10: Offer a subscription for bike access to the new bike route.	1	3	7
#11: Carefully consider the site and design of the Greenway Trail.	9	2	0
#12: Take mitigation measures to insulate Leyden Rock from negative impacts of construction and prevent the highway from dividing the community and keep residents safe.	9	1	0
#13: Do not build sound walls near Leyden Rock.	3	7	0
#14: Build wide, clear pedestrian walkways that connect one end of Leyden Rock to the other.	9	2	0
#15: Integrate forested areas in empty spaces into the design to improve safety, create green space, and increase community connectivity.	7	3	0
#16: Reach out to Leyden Rock Metro District and/or Candelas Metro District to determine if/how they could contribute.	5	5	0
#17: Include an access road onto the Parkway from Highway 72 to facilitate Leyden Rock access and provide additional egress options.	4	6	1
#18: Require incorporation of design features that help achieve objectives from Arvada's community plans.	7	2	1
#19: Carefully consider light/sound mitigation measures, especially close to homes. Sound mitigation options other than walls should be considered to account for views.	9	2	0
#20: Take steps to promote utilization of the Parkway (minimize/eliminate tolls or offer other funding mechanism and solicit state/federal funding.	1	6	3
#21: Utilize Indiana Street as the northbound lanes of the Parkway and construct the new Southbound lanes in the Rocky Flats right-of-way (from west 96 th Ave north to 128).	1	3	6
#22: Change the alignment to go up Highway 93 instead of Indiana Street to avoid concerns about Rocky Flats.	2	0	8

#23: Provide clarity for the public on how the Parkway helps achieve current Front Range transportation objectives and why JPPHA chose Indiana Street alignment.	6	1	4
#24: Consult with Colorado Parks and Wildlife about options for wildlife crossings.	9	2	0
#25: Change the Parkway alignment to “joint use” of current highway 128 from its intersection with Northwest Parkway to where the Parkway turns south at Indiana Street (to mitigate Federal Aviation Administration).	3	5	3
#27: JPAC should continue to meet during the RFP process and the construction of the Parkway.	9	2	0
#28: Consider innovative approaches to pursuing all recommendations.	9	2	0
#29: Send all presentation materials from JPAC’s May meeting to the JPPHA Board to consider and review.	7	1	3

GROUP DISCUSSION

The group focused their discussion on the recommendations that received either all green dots or had only a few yellow dots. Participants who were unsure or had questions about the recommendation shared their thoughts, and Bill Ray provided his input on these recommendations.

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

- Bill stated that this recommendation is a recitation of standard CDOT policies and expressed support for moving forward with the recommendation.

Recommendation #2: The RFP should state that all NEPA-like standards be followed for the environmental review process even though no federal funds are used.

- Group members who used yellow dots shared that their hesitation with this recommendation is associated with the federal NEPA process. They indicated that any specific NEPA-like standards that the group wants to call out could be included in the RFP but embarking on a NEPA-like process without specific goals that differ from other required environmental analyses could create unintended procedural bureaucracy without adding an additional layer of value.
- Bill clarified that the original reason the JPPHA Board decided not to pursue federal funds is that there were no funds to be allocated. The decision was not an attempt to avoid federal standards or regulations.
- Bill stated that there will be no further environmental review processes because they have all been completed. JPPHA is in the construction drawing and building phase. There will be some site-specific reviews for the 404 permit, which is required when crossing a wetland.

Recommendation #3: 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).

- Group members who used yellow dots shared that any air monitoring must be done pre-construction to establish a baseline because there are homes nearby. nearby homes. Some expressed concern that air is difficult to monitor because it is constantly moving. The RFQ also states that permits will be acquired to conduct air monitoring.
- Bill's thoughts on recommendation #3 also related to recommendations #4, #5, and #6. JPPHA will willingly submit to any permitting requirements of any jurisdiction. There are local requirements specific to Broomfield, Arvada, etc., that overlay state requirements. For each of these questions, Bill would like to know the clear purpose of conducting the additional analyses.

Recommendation #5: JPPHA should sponsor an independent review of all the past studies of both soil contamination and public health impact by a qualified national institution that is independent of the Department of Energy (e.g., the National Academy of Sciences). The independent reviewer should assess risks and conclusions surrounding public health impact, and review sampling techniques.

- Bill's question about the purpose of additional review also applied to this recommendation. In response, some participants indicated that the added value was in the independent reviewer.
- Some people who did not indicate support for recommendation #5 shared that recommendation #5 would not be necessary if recommendation #4 were pursued. These participants indicated support for recommendation #4 because the two perspectives on the issue of plutonium are so far apart and an independent review could settle some questions. However, there has historically been some challenges when determining what "objective" or "independent" really means. Also, depending on who hires and pays the independent reviewer, members of the public or the JPPHA Board may view the reviewer's independence as compromised.
- There are also questions about implementation thresholds (e.g., is the reviewer going to study groundwater or surface water; are they going to study to a two-inch or two-foot depth, etc.). People have differing degrees of comfort with risk and differing perceptions of risk.
- The JPAC asked to revisit recommendation #4 and #5 after members review the decision by Judge Brimmer.

Recommendation #8: Bike/walk pathways should be included in the design to allow pedestrian use across the parkway and eventually link up to trails at the north and south ends.

- Some participants were unconvinced that the private partner would agree to implement this recommendation.

- Bill supported advancing this recommendation to the JPPHA Board.

Recommendation #9: There should be multimodal options along the proposed access road by the Leyden Rock community. 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.

- Bill's questions about this recommendation were about timing; it may not be able to be implemented during phase 1 of construction. Bill has discussed closely-related concepts with the landscape designer for Arvada.

Recommendation #11: JPPHA should carefully consider the site and design of the Greenway Trail.

- The Jefferson Parkway has nothing to do with the Greenway Trail. The Greenway will propose their design, and the JPPHA Board will review it.
- A federal grant is being used to pay for the Greenway Trail.

Recommendation #12: Mitigation measures should be taken to insulate the neighborhood of Leyden Rock from the negative impacts of the Jefferson Parkway construction, prevent the highway from dividing the community, and keep the residents safe.

- Bill's question about the purpose of the mitigation measures also applied to this recommendation. Many people would likely have differing opinions about how much mitigation would be enough. It will be important to come to a common understanding with Leyden Rock residents about expectations for the mitigation measures.
- The RFP could potentially provide bonus points to bidders who show the most creative, innovative ideas for mitigating the impact to Leyden Rock.

Recommendation #13: There should not be any sound walls to mitigate noise near Leyden Rock.

- Participants who used yellow dots expressed hesitation about the speed with which trees and other vegetation grows, and therefore its effectiveness as a barrier.
- Those who were uncertain were also uncomfortable with the uncompromising nature of the statement "no sound walls," as there could be some cases where a sound wall is desirable.

Recommendation #14: There should be wide, clear pedestrian walkways that connect one end of the Leyden Rock community to the other.

- The pedestrian walkway would go across the Parkway connecting the two sides of the Leyden Rock community.
- This recommendation relates to recommendation #15 and #16 in terms of the potential partnerships.
- CDOT conducted a study about the impact of construction on the floodplain, and this should be considered when building the pathways.

Recommendation #16: Reach out to Leyden Rock Metro District and/or Candelas Metro District to determine if and how they could contribute.

- The purpose of this recommendation would be to expand options and provide an opportunity for the communities to be part of the solution.

Recommendation #17: The design should include an access road onto the highway from Highway 72 to the Jefferson Parkway to facilitate Leyden Rock access to the Parkway and provide additional egress options.

- The suggestion is for there to be a slathed road that would allow community members to access one of the roads onto the Parkway. This would pull traffic off Indiana Street.
- Bill responded that this would be a multi-million-dollar change in design.

Recommendation #18: JPPHA should require the incorporation of design features into the Jefferson Parkway that help to achieve objectives from Arvada’s community plans, including the Arvada Arts and Culture Master Plan, the Arvada’s Bicycle Master Plan, and the Parks Plan. These objectives include expanding the arts and culture throughout Arvada and improving bicycle and pedestrian access (i.e., reducing barriers to access).

- Some participants had questions about how much the community plans influence specific actions. Bill shared that master plans translate to strategic results. If a community plan says there should be “safer spaces,” practical actions emerge from that direction.
- Participants were also interested in including the community plans from the other involved jurisdictions (not just Arvada). They recommended changing the recommendation to “all applicable master plans.”

Recommendation #23: JPPHA should provide clarity for the public on how the Jefferson Parkway helps achieve current Front Range transportation objectives and why the JPPHA chose the Indiana Street alignment over other alternative alignments (e.g., Highway 93).

- A one-page description of how JPPHA came to the alignment decision would be helpful for many community members. Bill agreed that this was a great idea.

Recommendation #26: The public (residents, city, county, etc.) should not be financially responsible for the Jefferson Parkway. The RFP should require the private investment firm to cover the shortfall if the revenue does not cover operations costs.

- There were questions about who would be financially responsible if the concessionaire goes “belly-up.” Bill clarified that the debt would be resold to a different company.
- The JPPHA Board is hoping to receive a proposal that does not seek a subsidy for the initial year of operations.

Recommendation #27: The JPAC should continue meeting during the RFP process and construction of the Jefferson Parkway.

- Some people had questions about the purpose of continuing to meet. Others emphasized that there will be ongoing changes and that it will be important for the

community to have an opportunity to interface with the Board. The group should be able to consult on the RFP responses and design proposals.

Recommendation #29: JPAC should send the following material from the May JPAC meeting to the JPPHA Board to consider and should specify what they would like the JPPHA Board to do with this information:

- Randy Stafford's position paper
- Jon Lipsky's presentation (PowerPoint and the meeting summary)
- The videotape recording and transcript of Kristen Iversen's talk; the presentation material from Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
- Some participants did not think this recommendation was necessary because the meeting summary (which included the presentations and transcript)

NEXT STEPS

- Anyone who wrote a recommendation should consider whether they want to leave their recommendation as-is, rewrite it, or withdraw it.
- At the next meeting, there will be a shorter list of recommendations, and the group will go through each one. Those in support of the recommendation will share their reasoning, and those in opposition to the recommendation will share their reasoning. The report will list these reasons for support or opposition.