

MEETING NOTES

PROJECT:	Arapahoe County Transportation Forum
PURPOSE:	First Meeting of the Technical Committee Meeting
DATE HELD:	June 11, 2018
LOCATION:	Arapahoe Lima Boardroom at Lima Plaza at 6954 South Lima St. Centennial
ATTENDING:	Bryan Weimer-Arapahoe County, Travis Greiman-Centennial, Kate Williams-DRMAC, Keith Reester-Littleton, Todd Cottrell-DRCOG, Mike Rocha-Bennett, Devin Granbery-Sheridan, Brian Love-Arapahoe County, Mac Callison-Aurora, Josie Ortiz-Greenwood Village, Jay Hendrickson-CDOT, Lizzie Kemp-CDOT, Chris Quinn-RTD, Maria D’Andrea-Englewood
COPIES:	Invitees by email

The invitees were sent via email: The Agenda for today’s meeting, DRCOG Regional Share Evaluation Criteria, and the 2016-2021 TIP Policy

Bryan, (chair of Technical Committee per IGA) began with introductions and a statement that the meeting was publicly noticed on the County’s website, as well as DRCOG’s website. No attendees were there from the general public.

Summary of discussion:

1. **A quick overview** of the DRCOG TIP selection Dual Model process was given. Regional projects will be submitted to DRCOG, these are large, transformative projects. The DRCOG Board decides on these projects on a regional level. The sub region is the second part of this dual model, sub region will be allocated dollars themselves which go to the 8 regions in the DRCOG area. The sub regions will make selections of projects that will make a portfolio that will be given to DRCOG for a decision on what projects will be selected. Regional dollar amount is estimated roughly \$46 million, CDOT will use one of their two project applications for the \$25 Million to fulfill commitment by DRCOG for Central I-70 Project. \$35 million is estimated to be available for allocation to the Arapahoe County sub region. Each sub region has the ability to submit 3 regional projects to DRCOG, CDOT can submit 2, and RTD has the ability to submit 2.

2. DRCOG Regional Share Evaluation Criteria: Will the sub region use the same criteria?

The regional criteria is more qualitative than previous criteria, i.e., there is more explanation of reason behind project, and expected benefits of the project. Then there is the quantitative criteria: making the case of why project fits the eligibility of criteria. There is scoring of both quantitative and qualitative aspects of project.

- a. Should we (Arapahoe County Sub-Region) use same Regional criteria, as is?
- b. Should we (Arapahoe County Sub-Region) use same criteria, but tweak it?
 - i. Perhaps to change scoring?
 - ii. Add additional criteria: such as giving more points to a project if an entity provides an overmatch of the Federal requirements?
- c. We can tweak the criteria as long as it is not a contradiction to the established criteria.

The Technical Committee has been directed by the Executive Committee to review the regional criteria and start looking at how we are going to use it for the sub regional projects. And what projects to advance to the Executive Committee for review.

3. Each member of the Executive Committee will get one vote, as long as they have signed the IGA. The Technical Committee will give recommendations to the Executive Committee for their vote. All cities in Arapahoe County have signed the IGA, except for Glendale, Foxfield, Deer Trail, and Bowmar. Deer Trail

and Bowmar are still interested in signing. The Forum in essence, become a mini DRCOG.

4. Is the Forum going to ask DRCOG to do the scoring for sub regional projects or does the Technical Committee? DRCOG has a certain capacity for each sub-region in terms of what they could review. Does anyone have any thoughts on the regional criteria?

Mac: In regional context: the #21 million of remaining regional funds is typically seen as a transformational project

Bryan: some of us felt that it should be last money in terms of the criteria. Past regional projects were projects such as Denver Union Station, FasTracks, Central I-70 Project, etc.

5. There were three focus areas provided by the DRCOG Board in the regional criteria:

- a. Improve mobility and services to vulnerable population
- b. Increase reliability of existing multi modal transportation network
- c. Increase transportation safety and security

These focus areas are weighted at 30%

The more focus areas that you can address with a project, the higher ranking you can achieve.

Sub-regionally, we could have additional focus areas: we would also like to address the 2035 Transportation plan, Metro Vision 2045 plan etc. and there are different ways of doing that. Different communities will have different values about where the funding should go. And we could come up with additional sub-regional criteria to address each community's needs.

6. In the Agenda are some ideas and examples about where do we want to go with the Criteria as a sub-region. Executive Committee felt that it would be appropriate for the Technical Committee to take the regional criteria and tweak it, then present it to the Executive Committee for consideration.

The schedule as planned right now:

July: TIP Policy adopted by DRCOG Board

August/September: Call for regional projects

December: Decisions being made on regional projects

After the first of the year, maybe February: Sub-regional call for projects (we will know if any submitted projects will be accepted on the regional lever, or can be resubmitted on the sub regional level)

With this schedule in mind, the Technical Committee should have some sub-regional criteria established by November/December and ready to move into the new year.

And remember even if an entity hasn't signed the IGA, they can still submit projects. Even "Quasi-governmental agencies". The example would be state university.

Todd: if you are interested in changing the criteria, you could do it one of two ways:

- a. Add additional questions to the regional criteria
- b. Or, as a forum, you could decide once all the sub regional projects come in, you could give special consideration to special projects: small community projects, last mile projects, bike and ped, etc.

7. Do we want to set a limit on number of projects communities can submit?

a. It may be beneficial to have more projects than money: it allows us to be ready in case money comes forward that was unplanned.

b. Realizing we have a fiscal constraint of roughly \$35 million, if the project doesn't score high enough to get funding, then can we swap projects? Maybe move another project forward to balance fiscal constraint.

c. This dual model program is a two TIP cycle pilot program. (Eight years) maybe we should set up capital program for the eight year cycle?

- d. DRCOG gave us the number of projects to submit, based on the size of Arapahoe County, as 20.
- e. Obviously one project could use entire 35 million, if chosen to do so.

Katy: Does any match have to last as long as the eight year TIP cycle?

Bryan: Yes, match requirement is tied to the funding year(s) of the project. It is also critical with regional projects. Who will provide match for the regional and sub-regional project is required. Projects involving CDOT and RTD are examples of projects that need their support at a minimum and ideally some type of financial commitment.

8. What should the emphasis be of sub-regional projects?

- a. There could be a project emphasis; for instance how does project address incident management, or bike and ped concerns, last half mile potential emphasis, or Metro Vision?
- b. There has to be local match requirements.
- c. The negative impacts, as well as the beneficial impacts of a proposed project may be additional criteria to considered.
- d. Additional criteria or considerations for small communities and what do we consider a small community?
- e. Project readiness as a consideration. Use Federal dollars for “brick and mortar”, not just planning, or use for studies to get ready for additional federal funding.
- f. There is current TIP criteria, is some of that criteria useful for the sub-region?
 - a. Adams County is looking at inter sub-regional benefit and how does a project connect with other sub regions? A pre-screening could be considered that may use:
 - i. Number of focus areas, and Metro Vision or RTP goals that are being addressed.
 - ii. Agencies like CDOT that project addressees.
 - iii. And funding matches from other entities, partnerships that are being considered?

Travis: There were some comments from the Executive Committee that Arapahoe County is more suburban and has less opportunity to tie into transit, what flexibility do we have to throw out portions of the Metro Vision that don't apply?

Bryan: we don't have to emphasis in sub-region (ie scoring/weight adjustment) criteria, but we do have the three focus areas that we do have to address. And consider that multi modal means lots of different means of transit that we can include. We have to go back to what our values are and how to address those within the criteria.

Todd: Focus areas increase reliability of existing multi modal networks, improve flow of buses for instance. There are many ways of looking at the three focus areas, and objectives and emphasize the ones you value more.

Mac: Emphasis areas, for instance, let's also consider operational improvements, such as near locations of bottle necks; this will provide improvements for bikes, buses, cars, safety, transit, pedestrians, etc. From a project perspective it's incumbent on all of us to look at each potential project in terms of how it effects each community and Arapahoe County community as a whole.

Bryan: the qualitative aspect of the criteria gives us more room to explain why projects are chosen and what we need. Again, we have to be able to justify our selection, why and how it meets objects of focus areas and the values/needs of the Arapahoe County Forum, and how the goals of Metro Vision and the Regional Transportation Plan are met.

Travis: some sub regional projects may be cooperative with other sub regions, some recognition should be given to joint applications

Bryan: this process encourages this type of sub-regional sharing and cooperation and funding matches with multiple entities, such as boundary projects. This could be an emphasis of the criteria.

Kate: is there a google site or somewhere we could look and see a posting of projects by other Counties or cities or entities that are being considered for collaboration?

Bryan: Maybe one way to deal with this might be to establish a form that we could send out to different sub regions that are our boundaries: Jefferson County, Douglas County, Denver, and Adams County. We could send them our projects that we're looking at, and what are they considering, and are any projects of benefit to all of us, or a few of us?

Kate: RTD has a spot on their website to post minutes from meetings, can we post ours?

Bryan: we could post something on Arapahoe County Website.

Mike: Not to deviate from agenda, but a few questions please: how long is duration of the match requirement from the local community: is that for the project, the TIP cycle?

Bryan: it would be the funding cycle of that project. If it's in one TIP cycle then it is the years of TIP funding in which the match is required.

Mike: And that is upon a selected project? Local jurisdiction would have to maintain the match funding of the amount they are applying for.

Bryan: yes

Mac: There may be some program balancing relative with the FY 2020-23 time period.

Todd: In your application you would indicate what years you would like funding for. We are fiscally constrained within the TIP four year cycle. DRCOG will work with individual sponsors on this issue.

Bryan: Entities have to go into the project application with eyes wide open with regard to Federal rules and regulations. A commitment must be made to a maintenance agreement, fund matching, etc. Maybe the Forum could come up with ways to work on the project outside of the Federal funding constraints.

The IGA has discussions about partnerships, collaborations etc. outside of TIP Cycle process.

Mike: This first Technical Committee meeting is setting the stage for future collaboration on projects. Looking at it from a generally small community perspective, the response that Bennet has is that it is very open to the criteria already in place and the potential tweaks. Bennett is trying to look at ways to be more collaborative with other communities and open to all ideas. Smaller communities are in unique positions in that funding for a big project for a small community is a lot different than funding for a larger community. How will a smaller community be defined? Will it be by population, or money generated by community?

Bryan: one way Douglas County defined it was by how many projects each community could submit based on population size within their sub region. Littleton and Aurora are both within Arapahoe County and Douglas County, Littleton and Aurora can have two projects submitted through Douglas County, Lone Tree: four. Project should stand on its own, without any credit because they are a small community, or we could say a small community could have more points because they are under 1,000 people. This is a discussion that needs to take place, we can make a recommendation, and give it to the Executive Committee. Maybe a project needs to be reviewed on merit only.

Todd: TIP Policy defines small communities as communities that have less than \$10 million dollars in annual net in sales tax. This started because of Lone Tree, which has a small population, but huge working population. There are Federal laws that prohibit allocating funds, as a Forum, to a community without fulfilling the criteria.

Mike: It seems like a good idea that we look at it from a special consideration, no automatic points or project scoring toward projects standing on its own.

Travis: Can you send out the Douglas or Adams County examples criteria for us to look at?

Bryan: Not sure the criteria is documented yet for Douglas County. Adams County is having a meeting on Wednesday (the 13th), their documentation at least with ADCOG is on their website, I will download that and send them out with the minutes of this meeting.

Bryan: If we want to investigate and come up with some criteria ideas, some individuals could review, then bring back to the group to look at and discuss.

Mike: I am open to the idea of volunteering and helping to review and would be available, this is the technical committee and we need to start figuring things out.

Kate: Are we suggesting that we are starting with this as a format?

Bryan: Yes, we will start with the Regional Criteria and embellish and enhance it as the Tech Committee

Kate: Since everyone has this criteria, could have everyone add or subtract and edit their ideas and bring it back to the next meeting?

Bryan: Modifications, not necessarily deleting things from it, but add and enhance with more specific criteria

Todd: The DRCOG Board is not interested in eliminations or editing the existing regional criteria as much as adding additional criteria that defines what is really important for each sub region. Don't go too far off.

Bryan: In general it was presented at the DRCOG Board: 1. that the original criteria be used for each sub region as it is, or 2. the sub region adds to it and makes tweaks to the regional criteria specific to their sub region, and the 3rd and final option, which was thrown out, was for a sub region to come up with their own criteria. The third option wasn't accepted because the Board didn't want sub regions going too "rogue" in this first pilot cycle of the dual model process.

Mac: In the second option, there was a lot of discussion on the weights of the focus areas: Metro Vision, transportation objectives,

Todd: Yes you can adjust the weights, but keep it reasonable, maybe not more than 10- 15% in either direction based on what it is for regional.

Mac: Maybe what is reasonable could be up to the Forum given the community needs and values.

Bryan: Douglas County is considering the 10% overmatch criteria be adjusted by increasing the match requirement and lowering one other criteria. Increasing the leverage opportunity. Come up with a higher match, get higher weight of scoring.

Maria: that takes us back to being able to look at what other entities are doing, it would be good if

we all had that information.

Bryan: we need to decide for ourselves what we want to do

Todd: Nothing has been decided yet, it is all in the discussion stage with other sub regions. The most important thing is to have your regional projects nailed down by late July, early August that you want to submit.

9. Suggested Sub Regional Projects: (Point number five on the Agenda):

Remembering the coordination with DCOT, RTD, sub regions and others, has anyone thought of any projects?

Mike: The biggest project for Bennett would be the interchange of I-70 and SH 79. This would be to redo the bridge, increasing lanes, other minor operational improvements on the ramps to allow for signalization and left turns, etc. It's too small of an intersection now. We have had talks with CDOT, and with minor improvements, the current estimate is just under \$2 million for that project. The second project we would like considered would be the continuation of SH 79 crossing underneath the railroad as it goes into Adams County.

Keith: We have had discussions about improvements of the US85 (Santa-Fe) corridor, There is a PEL study on north, where US85 connects to I-25 and where it connects to County Line, but none in the middle. There are a lot jurisdictions that this goes through. Theoretically, US85 is an express way, but does not operate like one. It may be about a \$3 million project. PEL studies would help define the future of this roadway.

Maria: Englewood has discussed the widening of 285 west of Santa Fe as a potential project to submit. And the bridge at Broadway?

CDOT: Bryan suggested improvements at I-225 through Yosemite to I-25? This is included in various bills/initiatives that are out there. Or how about I-25 and Belleview?

Lizzy: \$21 million available, the funds are limited, and CDOT has already dedicated to a CDOT project (\$25M to Central I-70). We are trying to defer to sub-regional commitment at this point. The more we can do smaller operational projects, this will bode well in the DCRCOG process.

Devin: Santa Fe and 285 projects are on our minds too.

Todd: Are operational projects really regional enough? It's all about work activities and placement

Bryan: then it comes down to who does it really benefit, etc. CDOT can only submit two projects, but could coordinate with other sub regions to submit a project that CDOT would contribute to.

Jay: Do you have a list of projects from all entities that have been considered? Or bottleneck areas?

Mike: We had a 4P meeting where we discussed the Western, Central, and Eastern parts of Arapahoe County, and projects for each area. A list came out of this meeting of general projects for consideration

Bryan: Yes, and in this meeting we discussed: I-225, 285, US85, SH 79

Mac: I had a question for CDOT: with last week's announcement regarding infra funding for I-25 and I-70 as projects, does this open up any funds?

Lizzy: It makes funding plans feasible based on those grants so plans in place can go forward. We got \$65 million I-25 south gap and for I-70 \$25 million.

Bryan: Let me reiterate the priority projects from the 4P meeting:

- **Interstates:** 225 - Yosemite to I-25
- Sand Creek Bridge restriping
- I-70 corridor study
- Picadilly Interchange with I-70
- A couple of 1601s on I-70
- **State Highway:** 79 improvements
- US 85 Santa Fe PEL
- Kiowa/Bennett interchange improvement plans that came out of the PEL
- Parker/Quincy intersection which is operational improvement, is it sub regional? Mac: There was an operational feasibility study done earlier. We wondered if it could rise to the level of a regional project, probably not, but definitely a sub-regional level. Estimate cost: \$1 million.
- Gun Club Road widening north of Quincy (SH30).
 - This is challenging because once we talk about widening, it is a capacity type project: is it regionally significant? No. Ones being built right now: 6th Ave/Hogan Pkwy which has no Federal funding, just City and County dollars and E470 dollars. Parker Road (Quincy – Hampden) was another one on the list, going from 6 to 8 lanes.
- Arapahoe and Jordan was on the list
- I-25/Belleview
- Arapahoe Rd Parker to I-25.

Todd: for an interchange, if you're creating a new movement than it needs to be in the Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (FRTTP) as a capacity project. Otherwise, it could be considered an operational project and not listed specifically on the FRTTP.

- **RTD related projects:** east/west connectivity
- And how to enhance service to underserved community
- Enhance ridership

Bryan: Since \$21 million doesn't go very far; a good way to look at and choose a future project would be: where do we have a project that uses a minimal amount of funds, benefits the most communities. Are there things we want to get ahead of, for instance: the PEL of Santa Fe, do we fund it locally along with CDOT and then go with a priority along the corridor with Federal funding in the year 3 or 4 of the TIP cycle and then in order to fund a "bricks and mortar" project in the next TIP cycle? (Project readiness).

Lizzy: US85: is there funding in fiscally constrained plans so if you want to do the study, are you eligible for capital funding?

Bryan: There is no dollars from a capacity project, certainly operational dollars to pursue, If we felt that a particular intersection would be warranted, would a grade separation interchange be considered a capacity project or operational project?

Todd: I'd have to get back to you on that, it sounds like as a grade separation it would be a capacity project.

Bryan: historically that is how new interchanges have been handled.

Example: I-70 and Watkins with new development, not on the plan, all the movements are there, so it's an update of interchange, but there is no funding identified, so it is part of the 1601 process as a funding plan. We have to identify various stakeholders that contribute traffic to that area: local entities, local property owners, Developers, CDOT, and other partners, for funding participation

Lizzy: When we do a long range plan update, we come up with estimates of how much money that are reasonably expected from CDOT or other Federal sources. The fiscally constrained plan allocates those funds in their entirety, so when we come up with a funding plan for another project, for a capacity project, something else has to come out of the fiscally constrained plan or we have to come up with new funding sources. Coming up with funding, with no additional monies, our long range revenues are totally planned out

Bryan: Next plan cycle?

Todd: 2050, next call for projects will be early next year for RTP.

Bryan: there is additional funding capacity or re-prioritization of projects or phase of project.

Todd: an exception could be that you could bring an at capacity project in that was 100% funded by other sources.

Mac: Local funding could be a district, cities, counties, etc

10. Those regional projects that you're interested in, that meet eligibility criteria, start filling out the applications we could start that process.

RTD: Can apply for two. It is the policy to apply for projects that are already in the strategic budget plan. The two that have been talked about, but not taken to the board, are the SH119 and the "System Wide Optimization Plan" which takes a look at all the routes, the TNCs, and how to improve efficiency. We are willing to look at other projects out there, but in terms of a local match, we would likely need a lot of help.

11. Bryan: How often should the **Tech Committee meet**, what days, what times? Suggestions?

Mac: Once a month, twice a month at least initially.

Todd: The immediate goal is to have the Regional projects picked out for submittal so that they can be run by the Forum by end of next month. How close is this group to picking the three projects to take to the Forum?

Bryan: So we need to be ready for August call. Maybe we need to meet every two weeks to get us ready by July

The next Forum meeting is the 28th of June.

Keith: And we need to build in time for the reviewing and approving. Let's get through the regional level projects first, let's focus there so we're ready by August.

Bryan: Let's say then that we agree to every two weeks, at least for the time being, and we'll do 11-1 on Mondays.

Jay: What is the expectation about the partners attending?

Bryan: Monday, June 25th would be the next time to meet, then on the 9th and 23 of July.

Executive Committee meets on July 26th. So, pick some projects, and start drafting the applications.

Bryan will do some research in terms of criteria that others may be using to help supplement their decisions at the regional level. Maybe a pre-screening of projects....

Partner agencies: RTD, CDOT, if you have any ideas for projects within the sub-region that haven't been mentioned, please bring those to the meeting to discuss.

Mike: We talking about four meetings before the Executive Committee meeting, what about after that, will we then continue to meet every two weeks? What are our targets after that?

Bryan: the next target that will be a challenge will be to come up with formation of sub-regional criteria

Mike: are we then talking about meeting once every three weeks, once a month?

Bryan: We have about four months to come up with sub-regional criteria and choose projects for sub-regional submittal.

Mac: Call for sub-regional projects?

Todd: Probably will open in February, since we're not sure how this whole process will work. Maybe January, then the scoring will take place, turn in portfolio, and pick waiting list and submit it to the Board. Project review and final recommendations in April and presentations to the Board in May, the Board action to adopt sub-regional projects in June and public hearing in July, final induction in August.

Bryan: Once projects are submitted to us, we have 60 days to come up with portfolio?

Todd: yes

Bryan: One other thing that we need to come up with, and the Executive Committee will need to make an appointment of our representative on the DRCOG Peer group. Each sub-region can come up with the representative that will evaluate projects after they are scored.

Lizzy: It would be helpful if we could get the specific projects that you need feedback from CDOT on listed on the agenda. That way I can make sure the appropriate person attends the meeting. (And what time in the meeting it will be discussed.)

Santa Fe PEL Study project US85

Bryan: I had the opportunity to meet with CDOT PEL experts: FHWA and we talked about a focused PEL. A focused PEL concentrates on: what are your interests and what do you want to accomplish with the PEL? The Santa Fe Corridor has many challenges, what do we want to concentrate on? What issues do we want the study to address; all this plays in to how we scope it and keep it in a manageable dollar amount? FHWA said they were tired of scope creep and prices going up. Not all PELs fit into a certain mode. We need to address specific questions we want answered. What are our five topic areas of the PEL? The ones listed on the Agenda are just to spur ideas and discussion. Funding scenarios: If we pursued Federal funding for this 3 million dollar project perhaps we could look at a funding scenario that considers how much frontage do you have within your jurisdiction along the corridor and then perhaps this percentage may spell out the amount of funding each contributes. If we submit for half of that: CDOT would be \$500,000 and then in percentages, Denver had 38.9%, unincorporated Douglas County had .74%, Littleton had 37.5%, Englewood had 12.2%, Sheridan had 9.7%, unincorporated Arapahoe County had .74% and that gave 100% up and down corridor. Arapahoe County thought of putting in \$190,000 and Douglas Cty willing to throw in \$100,000. Another scenario for funding may be that CDOT would commit 1.5 million and then looking at how the rest of us could contribute to make up the \$3 million, and not looking at

Lizzy: what is the drawback to not taking Federal funds?

Bryan: possible timing issues, can we get far enough along. Why should we use Federal funding?

Third alternative: if CDOT is willing to be at 1.5 million or go up to \$2 million and then get local participation from local agencies to come up with same amount as if we did get Federal funds and go after the next opportunity. Maybe prioritize a specific location and pursue design or construction dollars for the TIP cycle. Douglas County may be interested in that, if we can come up with something that's meaningful that we can get to construction. Or look at clearance doc of some sort. Assuming the PEL could be done in a 12-18 month time period.

Lizzy: Most likely this would have to be an operational improvement project then.

Bryan: most likely it would be operational, unless we ask for something in 2050 plan? It wouldn't be eligible if it was a capacity project in this TIP. If we were looking at Mineral as a priority, is it a capacity or operational improvement? Maybe the argument could be made that it's operational. This is why it's important to come up with 5 topic areas and then meet with CDOT. What are CDOT's topic areas?

That would help establish the scope and dollar amount.

CDOT: After we come up with topics, and reconvene in a larger multi-jurisdictional meeting, do you envision a separate forum for the discussion of the scope?

Bryan: yes, separate meeting

Jay: We had a small group discussion, we definitely need to have a multi-jurisdictional meeting to go over everyone's top five. It may be a challenge to get all the discussion done and something chosen for this TIP cycle.

Bryan: Irrespective of whether we pursue local funds, or federal funds, we need to get through the process of choosing projects so we can get them into everyone's budgeting process.

Keith: Top 3-5 is right on target. I will be out of the country for a week, but will try to contact everyone the last week in June and compare ideas on projects, etc. Maybe we could have a meeting after the 4th?

Jay: Time wise that works well

Keith: we have talked to everyone along the corridor, it seems like they are all willing to work on this project and come up with funds, we just need to get them all to come to the table.

Jay: Have you had a chance to talk to Maria.

Keith: No, she just started six days ago. I am meeting with her tomorrow. Englewood and Littleton do a lot of work together.

Jay: going forward we need to start getting the multi-jurisdictional meetings on the calendars

Bryan: Yes, the Santa Fe project will be a regional level project to submit, it serves at least three sub-regions, and it is transformational. Not sure of northern limits – I-25 or do we take it to Alameda and deal with that at the same time (some in Denver have that thought)?

Jay: Let's keep it to the state highway

Bryan: That makes sense

Lizzy: There are challenges with the idea of CDOT committing funds ahead of the DRCOG TIP Cycle, if we decided not to go for the Federal funds, you would have to wait until after the TIP cycle to approach CDOT for the funds.

Jay: CDOT isn't going to commit funds unless we're doing it, and there are city managers that aren't going to budget the money if they don't know what CDOT is committing, it's the classic chicken and the egg syndrome with all the partners. It's a discussion that needs to take place.

Lizzy: And then what perception will that create if we commit funds ahead of the TIP cycle?

Jay: To clarify; when I talked to Paul I asked him what would he be willing to commit, and he said, I'd like to see the locals come to the table with half. Is that half of the total or half of the match? Paul didn't commit to anything.

Keith: we understand that, that's why we need to all get together and talk this out.

Jay: we have our work cut out for us, going through the funding scenarios, getting to a project as a partnership with the DRCOG process ...

Lizzy: I think there is an advantage to go for regional funds, and then if that doesn't come through, then we sit down and figure out to how to fund this. If we don't get the funds from DRCOG then we have that conversation and CDOT would be very present at the table. The option of not going to DRCOG, with all the other funding requests, I just don't see it being possible .

Bryan: So there isn't the commitment of 1.5 million?

Jay: Correct, it wasn't a commitment. It would be 1.5 million from the locals

Bryan: if we're talking TIP dollars at \$1.5 million , then CDOT is in for ½ of remaining \$1.5M?

Jay: That's the first scenario, \$750,000

Bryan: good to have that clarification

Jay: It would be great if CDOT could fund the study, but all the discretionary money is spoken for, for at least the next four years. That's where we are having to put this coalition together. CDOT has to look at the DRCOG applications. CDOT would like to see the locals came to the table with half.

Bryan: There have been discussions about doing that and I think there is a history of this region doing that.

Jay: I'll go back and talk to my experts and give the other parties a chance to discuss, and then we can get on the same page as a multi-jurisdictional group.

Bryan: That's assuming a Federal project at this time

Lizzy: and assuming 50% DRCOG

Jay: maybe we have a workshop with the whole NEPA considerations and EA/FONSI considerations, but we don't have construction funding for signatures

Bryan: The focus PEL will help identify that we aren't looking at the entire corridor, but rather we have picked specific locations for improvements, and identify appropriate level of NEPA. This could be categorically improvements, operational improvements. So PEL and NEPA could be going concurrently.

Jay: There is a need to look at it holistically, and peel off out of the PEL.

Bryan: The PEL looks at it holistically, based on the areas of concern to focus on, but out of it comes the recommended improvement(s) and what they might be by segments. And then what are those next steps: an EA here, a categorical exclusion there, etc.

Bryan: The Open Space Department is hiring a consultant to look at barriers and east/west connectivity challenges.

Jay: yes, that's a big issue

Bryan: We are on the track of each community creating a list about what is important to them, and then as a group discuss: here are the local concerns by segment, here are CDOT's concerns by segment, and what does this mean in terms of a scope? Which we will need to write an application for regional funds. Is \$3 million reasonable, should we look at more, less? Another thing that needs to be looked at is if CDOT manages it, the whole 11% charge back, is that something reasonable, or if a local jurisdiction managed it, there would be no management fees, so all that money allocated to the project goes to the project and not management of the project.

Jay: Fair point.

Lizzy: do you all have an indirect allocation plan? Like when you charge back for overhead?

Bryan: we do not charge back for overhead, we put the federal dollars directly to the project whether it be design, study or construction. There have been situations where the charge from CDOT has been more than CDOT contributed. This is a concern of local jurisdictions.

Lizzy: that wouldn't be the case on this one.

Bryan: We need to avoid scope creep from specialty groups and costs going up because everything that is brought up goes in the scope.

Jay: it is a PM's role to ensure that we are sticking to the scope.

Bryan: once we make decisions, we don't want to go back. And maybe we use the Focus PEL as a pilot.

Lizzy: we need to get a little clearer on what is meant by a Focus PEL

Bryan: let's use the example of farm land:

- it's a resource, but is it an issue along this corridor.
- do you need to consider environmental hazardous waste, maybe along this corridor.
- is noise an issue, depends on land use.
- access? may be controlled in other areas, but might need to be updated in other areas?
- rather than not being focused and looking at an access plan for entire corridor.

Lizzy: that sounds like best practice for any PEL study, do we need to differentiate a Focus PEL

Bryan: it is best practice, but has it been done in the past? And one PEL doesn't fit it all.

Jay: there is no standard definition of a PEL. FHWA's concern is that a PEL can be a work around and can be trying to look at too much, trying to attempt too much and going too far. That is where the term focus came from; all PELs need to focus on the questions that need to be answered. A focus PEL is just a PEL.

Bryan: we should be able to use the screen criteria that comes out of the PEL to go to next level.

Jay: and that is the beauty of using the PEL if it's done right with proper coordination and approvals, so that you don't have to go back and rehash things.

Lizzy: FHWA is not excited about narrowing and screening down to one alternative. Get rid of the alternatives that don't make sense.

Lizzy: which projects brought up today do you think are regional in nature?

Bryan: US 85 corridor is certainly regional in nature, 285 probably is because of inter-regional benefits, especially considering Sterling Ranch development. Quincy/Parker is more operational that benefits the area... And State Hwy 79 and I-70 is more sub regional and probably more of an Adams County issue.

Lizzy: yes, it does seem like US 85 seems to be the most likely project, maybe 225 and Yosemite

Bryan: it would be easier if we knew what was going to happen with the Bills/initiatives, it would makes thing clearer.

Action Items:

- Bryan will send out minutes to the participants in today's meeting
- And send out some suggestions from other jurisdictions about the criteria they are planning on using after we work on Regional projects.