



## CO 83 ACP Update

### Public Comment Debrief and Adoption Planning Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 22, 2022 2:30 PM

Meeting Location: Virtual Meeting

#### Meeting Attendees:

Ben Pierce (Douglas County), Chris Martin (Douglas County), Alex Mestdagh (Town of Parker), Alisa Babler (Town of Parker), David Dixon (CDOT), Rick Solomon (CDOT), Michelle Hansen (Stolfus)

---

***The following summarizes the meeting discussion (bold items correspond to meeting agenda):***

#### **1. Status Update/Next Steps**

- a. Public engagement process completed with virtual public engagement presentation from Oct 17-Nov 4, 2022.
- b. The purpose of this meeting is to identify any revisions or follow-up required
- c. Each agency will conduct a legal review of IGA language prior to adoption.
- d. Agency staff will lead presentation to elected officials for adoption.

#### **2. IGA/Adoption Planning**

- a. Stolfus presented draft IGA Amendment language to the group
  - i. Stolfus will update the IGA to have a separate signature page for each agency
- b. CDOT will conduct the first review and then send to local agencies for legal review and signature. Electronic signatures will be used. Local agencies should send signatories names and email addresses to CDOT.
- c. Stolfus will provide a draft presentation for Agency staff to present to local elected officials to request adoption and authorization for IGA signature. CDOT staff will be available to attend meetings, as appropriate.

#### **3. Public Comment Debrief**

- a. Response
  - i. 10 comments via email
  - ii. 6 comments via Survey Monkey
  - iii. 40 comments via Interactive Map
  - iv. 5 phone calls/one-on-one meetings
  - v. Spreadsheet with comments was provided.
- b. Specific Access Point Comments –
  - i. Access 27 – requests to close- too close to Lincoln
    1. No changes to ACP. Parker is planning to extend accel lane to Parkglenn. ACP Table notes closure when alternate access is available.
  - ii. Access between 26 and 41 – reduce access points – comment supports ACP as is. No changes to ACP required.
  - iii. Access 66, 73, and 78 – noted as high accident locations. Major signalized intersections typically have more crashes. No changes to ACP required.
  - iv. Access 80/82w – competing comments for ¾ vs signal at Access 80. Multiple commenters want a signal now at 80 to relieve 82w.



1. Access 80 (Scott Ave) meets 1/2 mile spacing. Stolfus recommends keeping full movement signalized intersection for out of direction travel and to make signals on either side work better for side road traffic.
2. Cielo developer required to install traffic signal when warranted. Interlocken extension to N Pinery Parkway planned for additional circulation options in the area. No changes to ACP required.
- v. Access 84 – Stolfus will update ACP table to indicate potential restriction to RIRO. (“May restrict movements with median prior to redevelopment.”) Stolfus will review ACP Table to see if other locations should be clarified.
- vi. Access 88 – NB lefts dangerous (supports ACP as is, but wants RIRO now) – move access off Castle Oaks Dr. Property ownership doesn’t support.
  1. No changes to ACP required. Noted that this access obtains a special use permit for Fall Festival with required traffic control.
- vii. Access 97 – opposed to signal at Lost Lake Drive; Access 101 – left turn blocking through traffic – either add left turn lane or restrict to RIRO; Access 102 – opposed to signal at Rafter Road
  1. CDOT is leading project to add SB left lanes and NB right lanes at Rafter and E Park Dr to improve safety and operations. Meeting signal warrants at Lost Lake and Rafter is unlikely. No changes to ACP required.
- viii. Access 103 – request for an access across from 103 on west side of CO 83
  1. Agencies would only support a RIRO at this location. IGA allows for additional RIRO without the need for a formal amendment. No changes to the ACP will made to provide location flexibility for the property owner. Stolfus will follow-up with property owner to notify of process to request potential RIRO access with redevelopment outside the ACP amendment process.
- ix. Access 104(1) or (2) – multiple (13) requests for FM signal/opposition to combining access points – looking for EB to NB Left
  1. Functional intersection area indicates that  $\frac{3}{4}$  movement could work at this location, but full movement with signal is not recommended.
  2. The agencies decided to leave the ACP as is and include this area in a future study related to the CO 83 and CO 86 intersection as recommended by the CO 83 Safety and Ops Study. Douglas County and CDOT to partner on future study.
- x. Access 104(8) – Access to cemetery not identified on either 83 or 86 ACP
  1. No changes to ACP. This area will be included in future CO 83/CO 86 Study.
- xi. Access 104 (4) – concerned about losing left turn movements and sharing with neighbors. Property is located too close to CO 83 and CO 86 intersection for left turn movements. No changes to ACP. This area will be included in future CO 83/CO 86 Study.
- xii. Access 104 (12) – already put easement in place for property to south and understand this to be long-term access. No changes to ACP required.
- xiii. Access 115 – Franktown Elementary – review access recommendations given access to 121 is unlikely
  1. Arrow Point development eliminated option to connect other properties to Access 121.
  2. Stolfus reviewed the functional intersection area for a four-legged full movement signalized intersection at Access 114 when warranted. There is adequate space to develop required turn lanes and this appears to be the most logical location for a full movement access between CO 83 and Russelville Rd.



3. Rick Solomon is concerned about providing a full movement access on the west side of CO 83 that doesn't provide public benefit. The group discussed potential language in the ACP Table to require the west access to provide connectivity to the public road system.
4. Stolfus will provide CDOT and Douglas County with a summary of potential options for the area between CO 86 and Russellville Rd and will follow-up to confirm final configuration for ACP.
- xiv. Stolfus will add a footnote to identify roundabouts and other traffic control for FM intersections as possibilities in the ACP Table.

**c. Improvement Request Comments**

- i. Stolfus provided the following list of signal timing comments received:
  1. 82e – signal improvements (flashing yellow for SB lefts)
  2. 82w – signal timing (turning east onto S Pinery waiting for S Pinery light with no traffic)
  3. 83 – signal improvements (flashing yellow for SB lefts during off peak)
  4. 89 – signal favors Castle Oaks Dr – should favor CO 83
  5. No action for ACP required.
- ii. Stolfus provided the following potential low-hanging fruit improvement requests for future consideration:
  1. 55, 59, 67e – weaving from access points to left turn lane signals at these intersections. Recommends signage for no left at next light.
  2. 82w – drive through in SB right turn only lane
  3. 104(1)-104(2) - Eliminate parking on shoulder/add lighting/add do-not block striping (check 83 study)
- iii. Stolfus provided the following improvement requests for information:
  1. 26 - Accel lane at Lincoln (26) not long enough (assuming EB to SB)
  2. 41 - Add SB to WB right turn lane at Plaza
  3. 78e – add NB Accel lane at N Pinery Pkwy
  4. 80/78w - Connect Scott Ave to N Pinery Pkwy
  5. 82(w) - Double lefts on Old Schoolhouse Rd (EB to NB)
  6. 83 – School crossing improvements at Bayou Gulch Rd
  7. 83 – bottleneck at lane drop
- iv. Other general comments included the following:
  1. Resurfacing on CO 83
  2. Alternate E-W routes between CO 83 and I-25
  3. Alternate N-W routes besides CO 83 through Parker
  4. Request for more Law enforcement/speed control
  5. Widen 2-lane section south of Bayou Gulch
  6. Improvements to address median crashes in snowy conditions

**d. Public Follow-up Needed**

- i. The group decided no formal follow-up was needed for the Next Door comments re action local/state government has taken since 2007-2008 plan. The plan has guided access as development has occurred.
- ii. Stolfus will follow-up with the property owner requesting access across from Access 103.
- iii. Stolfus will follow-up with Franktown Elementary when final configuration is confirmed.
- iv. The local elected officials meetings will be used to provide a public update on the final plan and responses to high interest areas like Access 80 and 104(1).



*The following summarizes the action items:*

<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
Update the IGA amendment to have a separate signature page for each agency	Stolfus
Conduct first review of IGA amendment and send to local agencies for legal review and signature.	CDOT
Provide list of signatory names and email addresses to CDOT for IGA	Local Agencies
Provide a draft presentation for Agency staff to present to local elected officials to request adoption and authorization for IGA signature.	Stolfus
Update ACP table for Access 84 and review ACP Table to see if other similar locations should be clarified.	Stolfus
Follow-up with the property owner requesting access across from Access 103.	Stolfus
Provide CDOT and Douglas County with a summary of potential options for the area between CO 86 and Russellville Rd and follow-up to confirm final configuration for ACP.	Stolfus
Add a footnote to identify roundabouts and other traffic control for FM intersections as possibilities in the ACP Table.	Stolfus
Follow-up with Franktown Elementary once final configuration is confirmed.	Stolfus

*The above summary represents the understanding of Stolfus & Associates, Inc. as to items discussed, agreements reached and actions to be taken. Please call Michelle Hansen at (303) 221-2330 with comments or additions.*