

MEETING NOTES

PROJECT:	Arapahoe County Transportation Forum
PURPOSE:	Technical Committee Meeting #3 (A Sub-group of DRCOG)
DATE HELD:	July 9, 2018
LOCATION:	Arapahoe County – Lima Arapahoe Boardroom 6954 South Lima Street
ATTENDING:	Bryan Weimer–Arapahoe County, Mike Rocha–Bennett, Mac Callison–Aurora, Brian Love–Arapahoe County, Todd Cottrell-DRCOG, Josie Ortiz-Greenwood Village, Maria D’Andrea-Englewood, Travis Greiman-Centennial, John Hersey-RTD
COPIES:	All who were invited by email

The invitees were sent by email on 7/03/18 the following: ArapCo Transportation Forum – Sub-Regional Coordination Form, Project List by Jurisdiction, Technical Committee Meeting Minutes from June 25, 2018, ArapCo Transportation Forum Level 1 Screening Criteria, and the Agenda for today’s meeting.

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.

Summary of discussion:

1. Self Introductions were made, no public was in attendance
2. Minutes of the June 26th Technical Committee Meeting were approved
3. Bryan gave an overview of the last Forum Meeting on June 28, 2018
 - a. County Level of Service was discussed by Ehlers Group
 - b. One point that became clear was that we need to explain what metrics the County used to come up with our level of service ratings
 - c. We used a level of service for the network of operations which is essentially DRCOG’s Mobility Grade which includes five factors
 - i. Hours per Day Congested (Duration)
 - ii. Percent of Travel Time in Delay in Peak Hours (Severity)
 - iii. Travel Time Index (Variation)
 - iv. Total Daily Hours of Delay (Magnitude)
 - v. Crashes per year per Mile (Reliability)
 - d. We took the model and stripped out all except the Arapahoe County Arterial system and then looked at Arapahoe County Freeway system separately.
 - e. Just looking at the County’s arterial grade of which 34% are considered poor or very poor on a Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor scale.,
 - f. From surveys done through the telephone Town Hall meetings over the past 2 years, traffic congestion concerns rate higher than other concerns of the citizens
 - g. Projection was the arterial system would go to a rating of 54% poor or very poor
 - h. Travel Time Index was 1.57, which means that on average travel during peak hours takes nearly 60% longer than non-peak hours.
 - i. We felt level of service in transportation should be a medium to high level, but currently at a low rating.

- j. Was cost to remedy or mitigate figured into this at all? No, cost was not a discussion item to date.
- k. Currently, capital funding in the County for capital improvements, which includes transportation is \$4-5 million annually and has been this way for the past 20+ years. Maintenance side is an annual budget of \$15-16 million, and we have roughly estimated the need of an additional \$6 million.
- l. Obviously, an education piece needs to be figured into all this for additional funding.
- m. IGA update: Bowmar, Foxfield and Glendale have not executed the IGA.
- n. Nominations were made for the Forum Co-chair, and Sally Daigle; Mayor Pro Tem for Sheridan was elected. Arapahoe County's appointee is the other Co-Chair, which is Commissioner Jeff Baker.
- o. Summarization was given of Technical Committee work to date: the forms were submitted for review and approval.
 - i. The request for participation in the Adams County I-70/SH 79 improvement project was discussed, it was determined that the Forum would review it and score it as a project with both Regional and Sub-regional funding. In addition, the request may only be a County funding only request that the County would consider on its own.
- p. The Full Arapahoe County transportation Forum Meeting on July 26th was cancelled, meeting is set for August 2, 2018 revised invitation will be sent out.

4. Projects to discuss:

- a. The spreadsheet form can be used to keep track of projects for each jurisdiction and how projects can be identified as regional vs sub regional. This list is not a way to eliminate projects, but rather a way to keep track of projects, and how they can be funded, or need advocacy from other agencies.
 - i. Projects identified to date:
 1. I 70/ SH79 Interchange Improvement – Adams County/Bennett request
 2. Parker Rd: Mississippi to I-225, dealing with connectivity issues and lack of parallel bike and ped trails
 3. Inverness Drive West bike facility, from County Line to Dry Creek
 4. I-25 and Dry Creek SB ramp, may qualify as regional and sub regional
 5. Peoria and Easter Intersection operations
 6. EB Lanes Dry Creek on Inverness Dr East and West
 7. Santa-Fe PEL
- b. Todd pointed out that what he is seeing on the list so far was that the Bike and Ped facilities on a non-eligible roadway (one rated lower than principle arterial), would be ok, as long as we avoid changing the curb or aspects of the roadway, just put in bike or ped project (ie a side path).
 - i. Clarification: If it is a regional bike facility connectivity it would be ineligible if you were to do more on that roadway than just put in a new bike/ped path, DRCOG would have to see what was being constructed before making that determination.
 - Federal eligibility goes down to collectors.
 - Todd will get more information and get back to group.
 - ii. Open Space can fund an off road side path, but not on roadway bike lanes per the enabling legislation.
 - iii. DRCOG is tentatively planning to have an end of August and then September discussion on what the project review panel for regional share would look like, we would need a nomination from Arapahoe County Forum for the technical person the Forum would want on this review panel representing the Arapahoe County Forum.

1. Peer Review panel would like be established for the October/November time frame.
 2. So we need to make a decision on August 2nd meeting of Forum on the recommendation of this technical person and if suggested a non-Forum selection of a subject matter expert (SMEs).
 - a. Shall we, as this group, make a recommendation today about who we would like to recommend?
 3. The Regional Project Peer Review Panel will receive a score from DRCOG staff, they will sort and make recommendations, and hear presentations from the sponsor of project from top tier of submitted projects.
 4. One name that has been suggested so far was Dave Schmit, however, he is retiring, not sure how he feels now about being on the review panel. Any other names today: Travis: "as far as SMEs go, how about Chris Fasching? I haven't talked to him about it yet though".
 5. Bryan suggested Larry Warner.
 6. We have one more Tech Mtg., on July 23rd, we can take an official vote then about who we would like to recommend, before then, we can talk to potential people who may be interested. The name of potential candidates will be included on Agenda for the next meeting.
- iv. Please go through your projects and start talking about the ranking and scoring of your projects, at least regional. And populate form. Even projects that don't make sense for this TIP cycle, keep on list.
 - v. Todd: one thing to think about is Countywide programs: Such as a Countywide resurfacing project, what would provide a benefit to everyone with a relatively small cost. ADA compliance could be another program countywide. It's not just projects specific to one community, but is projects that are Federally eligible and must be on a principle arterial.
 1. Regional TOC? Put it on the list
 - vi. Josie suggested the Greenwood Village project at Arapahoe Station-Yosemite n/s ped connection easements. Check on eligibility. We are looking at how to make Yosemite a more through street all the way up to the Arapahoe Station.
 - vii. RTD is looking at the BRT Study, one of the things we hear is the East-West connection, east-west bus connectivity?
 - viii. RTD might want to connect to stations
 - ix. Parker Road is bits and pieces for RTD and bike paths connectivity, BRT relies on population density
 - x. Have we heard anything from the Denver South TMA?
 1. The regional TOC is something we have been talking about.
 2. First and last half mile connections and bike corridor are major projects. There are some operational things that Lone Tree and Centennial will pursue funding for.
 - xi. Reach out to Karl Packer at the County for information about signal connectivity
- c. Any topics, discussion, ideas that you would like to talk about for the next meeting?
5. The informal date for the call for regional projects is: July 30-September 21st. When communities are filling out project applications and they have data requests from DRCOG, you will be provided with a website that will link to the data or have it and the entity will be able to download that data. DRCOG either has or are getting the latest ridership information from RTD. DRCOG is trying to provide one source for the data.

6. As part of the evaluation of the projects for determining what three projects the Forum will submit regionally, this committee's will self-score the projects and determine priorities/ ranking.. This will show where areas of the application will need to be strengthened, how to emphasize solutions, etc..

7. **Agenda for next Technical meeting on July 23rd:**
 - a. Suggestions for Peer Review Panel
 - b. Prioritization of Projects
 - c. Populate spreadsheets and we will send this out to everyone
 - d. If everyone could get information back to Bryan by Friday, he will populate master list and have it ready
 - e. Centennial volunteered to provide the lunch for the 23rd.