

## MEETING NOTES

<b>PROJECT:</b>	Arapahoe County Transportation Forum
<b>PURPOSE:</b>	Technical Committee Meeting #2 (A Sub-group of DRCOG)
<b>DATE HELD:</b>	June 25, 2018
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Arapahoe County – Colorado Extension Center 6934 South Lima St
<b>ATTENDING:</b>	Bryan Weimer–Arapahoe County, Mike Rocha–Bennett, Mac Callison–Aurora, Brian Love–Arapahoe County, Jerry Peters-Glendale, Kate Williams-DRMAC, Todd Cottrell-DRCOG, Josie Ortiz-Greenwood Village, Maria D’Andrea-Englewood, Keith Reester-Littleton, Travis Greiman-Centennial, Devin Granbery-Sheridan, Lizzie Kemp-CDOT, John Hersey-RTD
<b>COPIES:</b>	All invited by email

The invitees were sent by email the following: The meeting minutes for the Technical Committee Meeting on June 11, 2018, ArapCo Transportation Forum – Sub-Regional Coordination Form, ArapCo Transportation Forum Technical Committee Agenda June 25, 2018, ArapCo transportation Plan Update Jurisdiction Questions, DRAFT 2020-2023 TIP Policy Manual, and the Project List by Jurisdiction.

Bryan W. began with introductions and a statement that the meeting was publicly noticed on the County’s website, as well as DRCOG’s website. No members of the general public were in attendance. All these meetings will be posted and documented in the event the Federal Government would ever audit us.

### **Summary of discussion:**

1. Self-introductions were made.
2. Meeting Minutes were accepted for the last Technical Committee Meeting June 11, 2018.
3. Regional Criteria: Questions related to Criteria? Our focus for the next 60 days or so will be for Regional projects and the regional criteria used to evaluate those projects. DRCOG can provide data if we request it. Once we have a project, DRCOG can provide necessary data.
  - a. Todd: anyone can access the Regional Data Catalog with a key word search and download the data they need to complete their application. It will be available in about a month or so. We also have our Regional Travel Model data that is available to evaluate other projects.

Remember: there is qualitative as well as quantitative evaluations both with regional and sub regional application submittals.
4. Do we want to have a “Level I Screening” prior to getting into the full evaluation of the documents using the DRCOG criteria for a Regional Project?
  - a. This may include: inter sub regional support
  - b. Inter-Agency support RTD, CDOT, agencies within the sub regions: TMAs, TMOs.
  - c. Who are the Financial backers, potential matches for funding
  - d. Focus areas: There are three that DRCOG Board identified as ones to strive to meet; how many are we meeting with the Regional Criteria, this could be a point to evaluate for the Level I screening (more qualitative)
  - e. Transportation objectives

Kate: maybe a letter of inquiry perhaps could be used?

Bryan: Yes, it’s up to the group, does it make sense to have initial screening to see where we need to put more emphasis?

Travis: Based on the size of the region pot, maybe the financial need of each project could be the first criteria to look at?

Kate: Also, then we could find out which projects would work together

Todd: Is a local match even possible: this may be one of the first points to consider with the Level I screening. We have seen this in other regions, and it can be a deal killer without a local match

Mike: In general, the Level I screening is a good idea, it allows us to look at potential collaboration and a chance to see what details we might be missing and may spur other ideas

Mac: It's a good tool, kind of a triage tool to get best projects identified and to the most competitive projects identified right away, ultimately we want to look at which project is the most competitive compared to what the other entities will want to submit

Bryan: Is there other criteria that we might include into this initial screening, maybe that DRCOG and the Board would be looking at that would enhance our application

Mac: Is there some criteria that comes from a problem statement: identify the problem that exists and the solutions that the submitted project would accomplish. This would truly be seen as a transformation project

Kate: and give some priority to projects

Mike: Looking at DRCOG criteria, the focus areas are good, and pretty general, so the problem statement would give you the ability to emphasize your project and how we are going to solve the problem

Bryan: Generally, I'm hearing that we like the Level I screening idea. We are not going to eliminate any projects, we will keep them all in a database, but we are trying to prioritize projects. We're looking all projects that are important to a region, based on our values, priorities, and this will be an important list of projects to look at during non-TIP years.

Mike: and then you end up with a list of projects that are shelf ready in case funding does become available

Josie: Looking at the DRCOG criteria, and how things are weighted that DRCOG evaluates projects on: for instance regional significance of projects are weighted at 40%, and local match is rated at 10%, it makes sense to look at that during the Level I screening

Todd: Another thing to consider during Level I screening, do you actually want to Federalize this project, or use Federal funds for this?

Bryan: Everyone can start completing the spreadsheet that I will show in a minute, this will help us to start identifying projects and the details of each.

Mike: Since some of us have the opportunity to be in Adams County Forum, would it be beneficial to the group to share some of their projects or ideas? I say this maybe to bring up some more ideas.

- 5 Bryan: In order to encourage or identify Inter Sub Regional support: We can use the form I sent to everyone, the **Inter-Sub-Regional Outreach Form**, similar to Adams County's form. If someone is doing a project and they would like another region to participate, we can use this tool to find out if another agency is interested in participating. An example may be: that we have asked Douglas County to participate in the US 85 PEL study. Denver would be another one, (not as a sub region, just more for them to participate). I wanted to throw this out there to see if you think this form is a good idea and a way to document and to formalize the process of collaboration and inter sub region participation.

Travis: I think it's a good idea. Another thing to consider would be: where does the inter-regional project rank amongst their (other sub regions') priorities of projects?

Bryan: I will add a question to the form regarding the ranking of projects of other sub regions so we can see if our ranking and priority of that project is similar.

Mike: it is a good tool to get it all down in writing especially if it doesn't get looked at immediately

Maria: It helps to formalize our list as we take it back to the elected officials so that it isn't here say that such and such projects are being considered, but rather we have a formal list to take back to them

Bryan: I will make that change and send it out to the other sub regions, hopefully this week, and get some feedback from them. Hopefully, they are discussing projects. That way we can put it into our priority list

Todd: You can send it to me, and I can send it out on our letter head if you want, or you can send it out from Arapahoe County

Kate: Let DRCOG send it out, it may carry more "weight" then

Mac: Did Adams County send their form out through DRCOG? In terms of consistency, this may be important.

Todd: I am not sure if they sent it out yet, to the individual Forums, or to the jurisdictions? I assume the Forums, but not sure.

Bryan: That was my intent, to send it to the Forum leaders and let them talk about it as a Forum topic. My initial thought was, since it's information for the sub region, it should come from the sub region so that we get the information back. Then the Forum could decide what type of participation we want to have for that project. I will work on finalizing it, do you want to see it before it gets sent out?

Mac: would this be forwarded to the policy committee as an fyi?

Bryan: yes, we can go to the Forum and say this is what the Technical Committee is talking about on Thursday night: the Level I screening process, and the Outreach Form, the Tracking Form, and the projects we are starting to talk about. Once they give their blessing, it could all be sent out. I will make the adjustments: include priorities of other sub regions, clarify funding component.

6. Bryan: **next item on the Agenda is the Tracking Form.** As we have projects come up, we could use this form to identify what the project is, the scope, the limits, and all the details. We can see how we want to tie projects together, and all the steps of the project, it might include several phases for one project, and more than one TIP Cycle. This is one way to track all the projects that everyone would like to be considered. Each entity can fill it out and submit it

Mike: so each entity would fill it out for themselves, then submit it to the Forum?

Bryan: each entity will fill out their copy, and then I would populate a global one

Mike: in general, I think it's another good tool to track projects, especially with changes in personnel

Bryan: and as we utilize it, it can be changed to reflect those things that we find are unnecessary, or more important for consideration

Mac: yes, it's a good way to keep track of projects and helps us to be more efficient

Bryan: We'll go ahead and use this. I will go ahead and populate it with all the entities and show it to the Forum. It will be in an Xcel format for you all to fill out

7. **Number VII on the Agenda: Possible Regional Projects and or Inter-Sub-Regional projects.** Who has projects in mind? Let's keep track of projects discussed today and we can fill out forms and send them back to me.

Travis-Centennial: As an inter-sub-regional project, County Line Rd widening from University to Broadway, Douglas County is the lead, they have indicated they will submit for sub regional funding. The total cost estimate is \$20 million, \$9 from Centennial, \$9 from Douglas and their sub region, some from Littleton. This project is a capacity project.

Bryan: so were looking at \$10 million from regional funds? So if we pursued up to 50% regional funding, that would be \$10 million, and then local match would be \$10 million from Centennial, Littleton, Douglas County; I don't think there is anything that says a sub region couldn't put their funding into it as well to increase the federal share of it.

Travis: I think we intended it as an inter sub regional project for a sub region.

Bryan: The Split would be \$4.5M DougCo Sub-Region with a \$4.5 Match from Douglas County and a \$4.5M ArapCo Sub-Region with a \$4.5M match from Centennial and Littleton.

We have to remember that we cannot just give money to projects, as it would be inconsistent with Federal requirements. Therefore, ALL projects have to go through the scoring process.

Josie-City of Greenwood Village: Bellevue and I-25 interchange improvements, we are doing the EA now, so we don't have a dollar amount now, this could be submitted as a regional project given the nature of the project if we had a selected alternative. It does not look like an alternative will be selected by the Regional Call for projects. A 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the overall interchange would be more likely to be identified for the sub-regional call for projects at the beginning of the year. This would be an operational project, but could be argued as a capacity project (full interchange improvements).

Mac: City of Aurora, in collaboration with Arapahoe County and CDOT, as an operational project at the Parker/Quincy/Smoky Hill for intersection improvements. The project would be a pre interchange project since the grade separated interchange for the intersection is far off in the future. This would be a sub-regional project, general cost estimate: \$8 million. Another project would be bike and ped bridge over Parker Road by Light Rail Station and old Regatta Plaza. Near Parker and Peoria. This would be a sub-regional project, cost estimate at \$7 Million for bike ped bridge.

Bryan: Partners in this project?

Mac: in collaboration with RTD

Bryan-Arapahoe: US 85 will be one to throw on the list, not sure which jurisdiction it comes from, one of the entities along the corridor or the County. We have a meeting about the PEL for US 85 tomorrow, this will be discussed. We will try to define the scope and focus of the PEL. Other phases of study needed may be identified, but it may be too early to know. Estimated cost \$3 million and would be regional, to pursue 50% funding, may be 50% match from CDOT of the local \$1.5 million, and then the remaining local match funding coming from local jurisdictions of Douglas County, Denver, Arapahoe County, Littleton, Sheridan, Englewood, and possibly Jefferson County???

Another project may be: PEL study on Parker Rd. from Nine Mile to Mississippi. As a regional project.

Or: I-70 improvements, not sure what they would be yet, the County is working on a couple of 1601s, maybe CDOT could do a feasibility study, or system level study out east as well. Mac is about to complete some work out east (Picadilly) exchange.

Mike: Improvements on the EB Off Ramp at SH79 and I-70

Bryan: Is that an Adams County project?

Mike: Three jurisdictions meet at that interchange: Adams County, Arapahoe County and the Town of Bennet. So, the ramp itself is Arapahoe County side. This would be a safety and operations improvements for EB I-70. We're trying to throw it out to both Counties. This is

viewed as a regional project because it's an interchange and two state highways and three jurisdictions. Estimated cost about \$2 million.

Bryan: have you talked to CDOT about this as well?

Mike-Bennet: Yes, we've had preliminary cost estimates with them.

Maria -Englewood: Broadway, Evans to 285 including the bridge at 285. This would be reconstruction and non-capacity/operational improvements. This would be regional, cost not available.

**NOTE: Per email sent on 6-28 from Maria:** The three preliminary Sub-Inter-Regional Projects being considered by the city are:

- Rail Trail Bridge – Oxford Ave
- Broadway Infrastructure Improvements Project (US 285 to Yale Ave., including bridge over US285
- US 285 Operational Analysis – Federal Blvd. to University Ave

Bryan: Is there thought of a study on 285 through town: Broadway through Santa Fe to Federal, maybe Knox possibly.

Englewood: Yes

Mac: Additional projects from a street perspective, we hosted a consortium with Westminster, Arvada. Complete streets Case study was on Potomac, 13<sup>th</sup> Ave from east of Potomac to Peoria and possibly to Yosemite, new ped bridge and what types of improvements could be made for bike and ped movements east and west, and connectivity to light rail and Fitzsimons. This would be a Sub-Regional project

Another one would be to look at the Havana corridor from Montview south to Parker Rd., to look at RTD transit operational improvements, shelter improvements, signalization improvements, q-jumps. This would be to take it from concept study to detailed operational study. This would be a collaboration with RTD, and would be Sub-Regional.

Bryan: Another possible project- Denver South TMA has looked at a bike and ped network that runs east and west of I-25 from Meridian, or further south to 225, looking at connectivity along the entire corridor which could use the existing system. One expensive stretch is;

Inverness Drive West from Dry Creek to County Line of which could be a side path or on the street if we bump out the curbs. Cost is in the neighborhood of \$4-5 million without the ROW. Regional project as it is part of the regional bike facilities along I-25. May need to do design work up front before we jump into asking for Federal funding.

Maria: Bike/Ped bridge over Oxford Ave to Oxford RTD station

Bryan: Was there a study done on this?

Maria: I believe so

Bryan: The County, through the Open Spaces Department is kicking off a project that is looking at connectivity along US85 east and west. Felsburg has been placed on contract to handle this. East side of Santa Fe to West side of to get to Mary Carter. This would be going over Santa Fe.

Bryan: Let's go ahead and populate the spreadsheet and list those potential projects for review

Bryan: Travis was there anything else? Such as South bound on ramp on Dry Creek that came out of the Dry Creek study: for example, to convert the ramp to three lanes during peak hour.

Or additional lane from I-25 to Inverness Drive East as operational improvement, this could be a project to consider as a sub-regional.

Travis: Our focus would be adjustments at Chester and left turn lane. We submitted this to the transit stake holders list at CDOT request

Bryan: Let's use this list to start with, I'll send out the tracking form

What about CDOT and RTD? Any projects you want to see come from the sub region?

Lizzie and John: not at this point

Bryan: Let's go ahead and populate the spreadsheet and list those potential projects for review

8. Does anyone have **any agenda topics for the Forum meeting on Thursday?**

- Such as who will be on DRCOG's list for Peer Review Group? The Forum need's to nominate someone, does anyone want to throw any names in the hat? After DRCOG looks at the project, the Peer review group looks at the project to make suggestions in terms of recommendations. Each sub region has a person on the peer group and up to five subject matter experts.
  - Todd: This doesn't have to be decided on Thursday's Forum, you have until October/November
  - Mac: One suggestion was to nominate the Arapahoe County Public Works Director to represent sub region
- Another topic for agenda: who will be the Co-Chair? Not everyone has signed the IGA yet; Bowmar has indicated that they are going to sign, Glendale is taking it back to group to discuss, and Foxfield is going through administrative hiring, and want to wait until new person is on board to sign.
- Topics we discussed here will be on the agenda: Tracking Form, Initial Screening, Outreach form and then projects
- Todd: Roughly a month from now you would want to have your top regional projects, or top three that you can move forward and fill out applications for
- Bryan: that's the time line we're working toward

Make sure that we have a prime and alternate for the Tech Committee as well as the Executive Committee. Can we get names for Aurora? Let's see what happens tonight. Councilman Roth, Bob LeGare. Alternate for Tech Committee for Englewood: Paul Weller.

Still needed:

- An alternate for the City of Aurora Tech Committee
- An alternate for the City of Columbine Valley for Tech Committee
- An alternate for the Town of Deer Trail Tech Committee
- A prime and alternate for the Town of Deer Trail Executive Committee
- Contacts for Executive Committee for Englewood and alt for Tech (done 6-28)
- And if Bowmar and Foxfield decide to sign IGA, contacts for them for both committees

9. **Update 2035 Transportation Plan:**

We're looking at making it a county wide transportation plan. What role do the cities want to play with this county wide transportation plan, do we just combine the cities' transportation plans and see what connectivity there is? Because the county is so diverse, with a lot of congestion on the west side, we are trying to look at this transportation plan in a new way 1) How do we manage congestion, what is balance of different modes of transportation in the western portion of county? 2) And then to the east is a lot of development which is creating new transportation needs. Do we look at land use modifications to enhance and accommodate transportation?

How do we use technology, and how to use technology and private industry to make decisions as we move forward? Do we use the same matrix methods: travel time index, mobility grade from DRCOG for the county arterial system? How should issues be addressed? Do we move toward mobility options?

More east/west transit service based on demographics etc.?

We don't have current transportation plans for Strasburg and Byers, this should be addressed in the new transportation plan.

We need to look at Transportation Plan comprehensively, not just at the unincorporated portions, we have to include all jurisdictions in the Plan. How do you all see this as we move forward?

So please send feedback to Bryan regarding your thoughts on a new Transportation Plan.

Travis: When do you want response?

Bryan: Two weeks –Say end of day July 13

Keith: What is overall time line?

Bryan: I'd like to get out a RFP out July, get a consultant under contract in August or September. The Telephone Town Hall in October is strictly for transportation. That would be the first public meeting for the Transportation Plan. We are anticipating a 12 months or so project duration and come up with set of recommendations, both short and long term.

John: RTD is doing a BRT corridor study, so we may have some information for you too.

Travis: One idea is to look at ways to facilitate regional operation management and incident management through traffic or setting up a regional traffic center?

Bryan: Good idea. The more we can make the corridors in all jurisdictions work together, the better off we are.

Bryan: Please send any input back to me by July the 13<sup>th</sup>. At least so we have an initial list, this isn't asking for funding, this is just a list to start thinking about.

- 10. Bryan: desired agenda for July the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting:** Biggest focus will be looking at projects, first initial screening, let's say by the 6<sup>th</sup> of July, have your projects to me on that spreadsheet. Then we can go through a level one screening on those. This Thursday/Friday it is my intent to send out the spreadsheet.

**Action items:**

Bryan will: Update screening criteria, Tracking Form, Outreach Form, get those ready for the meeting on Thursday. **Tech Committee Meetings have been scheduled through August every two weeks.**