



January 4, 2022

Meeting Summary

29 Road Interchange at I-70, NEPA/1601 Project FHU Reference No. 121072-01

Travel Demand Modeling Meeting
Via MS Teams

Meeting Date: December 02, 2021

Invitees:

Invitee	Organization	Attended?	Invitee	Organization	Attended?
Kevin King	Mesa County	X	Melanie Bishop	FHU	X
Dana Brosig	Mesa County		Alex Pulley	FHU	X
Dean Bressler	Grand Valley MPO (GVMPO)	X	Amanda Cushing	FHU	X
Andrew (Andy) Gingerich	GVMPO	X	Paul Brown	FHU	X

Note: Text that is in blue are responses/discussion points. Action Items are highlighted and called out as such.

Introductions

- Dean (GV MPO) -- Grand Valley MPO is housed within Mesa County but is its own separate MPO. Dean will be retiring next month and his job is posted.
- Andy (GV MPO) -- Title is Transit Coordinator but does transportation planning & modeling as well. Andy spent several years with the Mid Region Council of Government in Albuquerque

Project Background

- Alex provided a brief project background; most attendees are familiar with the project based on the 29 Road Interchange PEL (completed in 2020)

Travel Demand Modeling

- Dean -- The model was most recently updated to reflect 2045 (from 2040). Andy developed and updated the current land use assumptions, which the GV MPO holds static within each forecast year.
- How does the Mesa County Regional Travel Model (MCRTM) relate to the CDOT Statewide Model?
 - The basic network is identical.

- There are some differences between the models.
 - Statewide is activity based
 - MCRTM is a Four Step Model
 - For external trips (E-E, I-E, and E-I), the MCRTM uses the statewide model information
- Dean assumes that Erik Sabina (CDOT) would prefer to use the MCRTM for the 29 Road effort.
- The land use assumptions in the MCRTM and statewide model should be the same; Dean has sent that information to Erik.
 - Paul--it would be beneficial for the project team to do a comparison between models to see any difference.
 - Andy--There could be some newer large projects in the MCRTM that are not yet reflected in the statewide model.
- What is conveyed to us in the MCRTM will clearly identify any land use changes. Redlands360 has been incorporated for the most part.
- Be sure to coordinate with the GVMPO and Grand Junction (i.e., Trent, Tamra Allen, Community Development Director) before making additional changes to land use. The following projects and land use changes have already been incorporated into the model land use.
 - Redlands360
 - Three Arrows Development
 - Community Hospital expansion
 - Small adjustments to TAZs within the City
- Cambridge Systematic has been the modeler for the MPO.
- There are 100s of projects within the Model. As they were migrating from 2040 to 2045, 29 Road and 30 Road Interchanges have been coded into the model and will be able to evaluate either alternative.
- Frontage Roads have been included on the north side of I-70 between 29 and Horizon, 29 to 30, and 30 to I-70B.
- Dean noted that the FAA provided a letter stating that the frontage road north of I-70 is a non-starter, but this may not be the latest information. The letter should be part of the record for the PEL. Not intended to confuse the matter but wanted it in there to assist in evaluation.
- Future land use is included in the Comprehensive Plan from City that was done in 2020. That is the latest available and does show land uses north of I-70 in the project vicinity. The Comprehensive Plan is a policy document that guides changes to the zoning code but is not itself a change to development regulations. A discussion with land use planners will be critical to determine how future land use should be modeled for a given alternative scenario. Suggest contacting Tamra Allen (tamraa@gjcity.org) when ready for this discussion. Any change to modeled land uses from the 2045 RTP baseline forecast should be well documented and clearly articulated in the 29 Rd Interchange scenario.

Model

- Grand Valley MPO is using TransCad 8. Cambridge Systematics is their consultant modeler. FHU actively uses TransCAD and has version 8.
- Do we want simple output files or the actual model? -- Given Dean's timing, Melanie can take the actual model.
- May need Dean's help with the GUI that was developed by Cambridge. It is a bit unique. Dean would like to walkthrough the GUI on screen with Melanie and Andy to make sure everyone is comfortable with the model. Dean would also like to make sure that the model doesn't crash for FHU.
- Is there any documentation regarding the model details? The model documentation and the user guide will be provided to FHU; they are draft now.
- Kevin--Can you force to the model chose the more efficient route? In reference to the GHG Rulemaking. Dean noted that the model will show VMT for the fiscally constrained network and additional modeled scenarios.
 - The interchange will be regionally significant. Trips will be rerouted by the new interchange, but it will also generate new trips.
 - TDM measures will be required to offset new trips.
 - The model will also have VHT and numerous other output available (volume, link length, travel speed, etc.).
- Dean--TransCAD and their model has several idiosyncrasies and when it is up and running here, should do some QC runs.
- Longer Term--The MPO should be available to the project team for coordination.
- Be sure to look at City Circulation Plan on their website.

Next Steps Action Items

- GVMPO to confirm snapshot Land Use scenario with the City (F I/2 Road)
- Dean to send Model and Documentation to Melanie
- Melanie will try and work with it. Review the City Circulation Plan.
- Set up mtg w/ Melanie, Dean, and Andy.
- Walk through on-screen with the GUIs and nuances.
- Confirm it is running correctly on FHU environment
- Complete some QC runs