Public Meeting #2 Summary

The second public meeting for the Northeast Area Transportation Study (NEATS) Refresh was held on June 21, 2018 at the E-470 Public Highway Authority administration building. This meeting was held from 4:30 – 6:30 PM in an open house format, with no formal presentation. Attendees were invited to review the travel demand forecasting results and discuss recommendations for the 2040 roadway network, planned trails and bikeways, and potential transit corridors and mobility hubs with project team members. More than 40 members of the public attended the meeting.

To advertise the meeting, two email blasts were sent to the project's electronic mailing list, a news release was sent to local media outlets, a story ran on Aurora TV the week preceding the meeting, and the City posted the notice on the City's web page and distributed through their communication forums. The I-70 Scout advertised the meeting in their newspaper.

Following is a summary of comments submitted by public meeting attendees on comment sheets, recorded by open house staff during one-on-one conversations with attendees, and submitted via email surrounding the meeting. This summary includes comments received through June 25, 2018.

Comments

Do you agree with the proposed 2040 roadway network, or suggest any revisions to it? What roadway and intersection/interchange improvements do you see as the greatest future need in this area?

❑ Certain considerations taken into account: how oil and gas is going to work in harmony with residential, commercial, retail development. There is going to be numerous oil and gas wells by Conoco and Extraction. In light of The Aurora Highlands wanting to move parts of Harvest Road to the east, it would be appropriate for City to demand, in exchange for these modifications, that specific dedicated oil and gas easements to be make available to the two oil companies. This will help solve numerous environmental and traffic concerns. When all oil and gas can be delivered by pipelines, there will be a decrease in truck traffic and other traffic generated by oil and gas. The Comprehensive Plan should not overlook the need for oil and gas transportation needs. The Aurora Highlands and City are in a perfect position at this point in their planning processes to provide for oil and gas easement to meet the aforementioned goals. This type of planning and cooperative effort can be used as a model for other cities to use when oil and gas development is also imminent.

❑ Consider transportation network ability to accommodate oil and gas access within the development areas – and pipeline needs related to road right of way (need collaborative planning).

❑ I am submitting the following comments regarding the Northeast Area Transportation Study - Refresh (NEATS) meeting held yesterday and sponsored by the City. The below referenced comments are in addition to those comments I submitted in writing yesterday regarding the need for the City to assure that a dedicated oil and gas right of away or easement be secured through the entire area for oil and gas companies to use to expeditiously and efficiently move oil and gas to distant processing centers. This is necessary for several reasons. First, a dedicated oil and gas easement will significantly reduce truck traffic in the area eliminating wear and tear on the roadways. Reduction in truck traffic results in safer and less congested roads and streets. Secondly, securing a dedicated easement is also environmentally and visually sound. Thirdly, future residences and businesses in the area will enjoy a much more pristine way of life. I believe transportation planning cannot be done in isolation from the imminent needs of the oil and gas industry. Coordination is of paramount importance. Hopefully, and in this case, I hope that specific and detailed outreach will be made to ConocoPhillips and Extraction Oil and Gas Companies to coordinate short and long term transportation needs of the industry. If the City, oil and gas businesses and residential and commercial developers all work together using the highest quality standards all stakeholders, including taxpayers, will benefit. It has been my experience in working with both ConocoPhillips and Extraction Oil and Gas Companies, that they have, and continue to go out of their way to be good and ethical neighbors. They are taking into account the needs of the city, future residents, businesses, mineral, and property owners.

During the meeting at the E-470 Office, many of those in attendance, including myself, have concerns about the realignment of certain sections of Harvest Road to the east (the area south of 48th Avenue). I think there are many concerns. First of all, I think the City would be hard pressed to find curved thoroughfares anywhere with two unusual configurations that flow as well as a straight thoroughfare. These curves and loops will most likely result in more accidents, slower traffic flow, and more congestion over time. This needs careful study and reconsideration. If one of the goals is to move people as expeditiously and safely as possible from I-70 to the airport, then a straight thoroughfare using the current Harvest Road would be a better choice. It is also a shorter distance resulting in gas savings, reductions in air pollution and other emissions.

I believe that at least one or two prior transportation studies conducted by the City that resulted in the current transportation plan concur. So to abruptly modify the results of those studies and resulting plan is problematic. For example, oil and gas companies have relied on the transportation plans currently in place to develop their businesses I am told. To suddenly change road configurations is not very business friendly. Nor does it put much faith in the "promises" of the City. Just like when we annexed and zoned our property, we relied on certain facts when making decisions about the future of our land. To change the reality upon which businesses made or will make high stakes decisions seem unfair. New developers in the area bought land knowing what the City had planned. They also knew what the plans were

when the decisions were made to purchase property for development in the area. It seems fair that the now existing transportation plans be honored. Surface development can be built and planned around the current road configuration plans found in the current city transportation plan for the area in question.

- ❑ Interchanges needed at Watkins and Bennett. What is the timeframe for the interchange shown at I-70 and Quail Run?

- ❑ I would like to get information on I-70 Picadilly interchange.

- ❑ It makes more sense to me to move the I-70 and Harvest interchange to Powhaton.

- ❑ The new Harvest/Powhaton alignment is a better alternative.

- ❑ Consider grade separation options for Harvest/Powhaton interchanges beyond 2040.

- ❑ It's amazing that 26th doesn't have an interchange.

- ❑ Diagonal through Sun Empire property being pushed by The Aurora Highlands – threat to pull Regional Transportation Authority funds for 48th Avenue.

- ❑ Yes. Concerned that development in Prosper (since not within Aurora) may be large enough that its impact is not fully accounted for or part of funding.

- ❑ No.

- ❑ So far I'm only in the study area. At least this project is thought out.

Please provide your thoughts regarding the planned trails and bikeways, and the potential transit corridors and mobility hubs proposed for the NEATS area.

- ❑ Looks OK for now.

- ❑ Trail along E-470 – timeline and details associated with it.

- ❑ Trails and bike/ped paths appear well thought out and conducive to citizen use. Like the trails proposed along stream beds. As development comes and run-off allows more vegetation, these trails could offer a nice experience.

- ❑ I hate to see a trail along Box Elder Creek. We've got wild turkeys along the creek and a few deer, squirrels, etc. Box Elder Creek Trail I'm against. We have cover for wildlife and a trail will ruin the area. We have turkeys, deer, antelope, squirrels, fox, coyotes, raccoons, porcupines, owls, etc. Don't mess it up with a trail.

- ❑ Glad to see the drainage. Super impressed on the transit/development maps. Plan for scoping the braided drainage open and wide. Plan for the wildlife corridors. There are also residential recreational areas, necessary as populations become increasingly dense. I like the availability

of car sharing and believe it will endure long after segways, scooters, even bicycles and electric bicycles have passed their peak usage.

❑ I like these plans.

❑ Support for the mobility hub concept.

❑ Mobility hubs seem too easy. When you have kids, it's hard to do things without a car.

❑ Could call mobility hubs smart hubs.

❑ Transit would be really expensive out east, especially if not that many people ride this service and they want to go all the way downtown.

❑ Seems very unlikely that transit will actually happen out east because there won't be much development out here.

Please provide general suggestions and comments regarding this study.

❑ Just like to be kept in the loop.

❑ Why does existing land use map(s) show "Murphy Creek North" where Traditions is located (6th Avenue and Harvest Road) between Cross Creek and Adonea?

❑ I am generally concerned that some of the traffic volumes look low compared to previous projections (i.e., Alameda given continuity, Watkins, etc.). Also Alameda as a collector – what improvements/treatments are proposed to make roadway function as such?

❑ Need to explain trips being much lower than traffic impact analysis and former model.

❑ Transport land use looks low.

❑ How are you going to address the water line that goes along Powhaton? (It will be important to keep this in mind if elevated interchange is considered.) Not going to have an elevated interchange and instead it will be at grade (at 48th Avenue and Powhaton).

❑ A utility corridor is planned along the former Harvest alignment south of 48th Avenue.

❑ Need Aurora to notify Arapahoe County Public Involvement of the public meeting as much of the project is in Arapahoe County.

❑ Any plans for a race track?