

## MEETING NOTES

<b>PROJECT:</b>	Arapahoe County Transportation Forum
<b>PURPOSE:</b>	Technical Committee Meeting #7 (A Sub-group of DRCOG)
<b>DATE HELD:</b>	September 10, 2018
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Arapahoe County – Colorado Extension Office 6934 South Lima St., Centennial CO
<b>ATTENDING:</b>	Todd Cottrell-DRCOG, Josie Ortiz-Greenwood Village, Travis Greiman-Centennial, Keith Reester-Littleton, Maria D’Andrea-Englewood, John Hersey – RTD, Bryan Weimer – Arapahoe County, Lizzie Kemp – CDOT, Mac Callison – Aurora, Jay Hendrickson – CDOT, Jim Thorsen-Cherry Hills Village
<b>COPIES:</b>	All who were invited by email

The invitees were sent by email:

- Today’s agenda
- Denver Subregional Forum Request for Support for the Broadway Station Project and another for the I-25 Alameda Improvements project
- DRCOG TIP Application Form for the US 285 Congestion Study
- DRCOG TIP Application Form for the US 85 PEL Study
- DRCOG TIP Application Form for the High Plains Trail Connection Project
- CDOT’s response letter regarding Littleton’s application for support for the Federal and Bowles Intersection Improvements Project
- CDOT’s response for the Signal Connectivity project
- Meeting Minutes from August 20, 2018.

No members of the general public were in attendance. All these meetings will be posted and documented.

Lunch was provided by Arapahoe County.

### **Summary of discussion:**

1. Self Introductions were made, no public was in attendance, no comments.
2. August 20, 2018, Meeting Minutes were approved and will stand as written.
3. Item 4 on the agenda is the CDOT /RTD Participation/Concurrence Forms.
  - a. First project was the High Plains Trail, a concurrence was all that was requested because it crosses Parker Rd., (State Highway 83), no funding from RTD or CDOT.
  - b. Second project: PEL Study for Parker Rd; Mississippi to I-225, participation from CDOT was requested. Joint project with Arapahoe County, Aurora, Denver, and CDOT. The response from CDOT was a concurrence with doing the study, but no funding available. Further discussions decided that the County and Forum would not pursue this Study as a Regional Application.
  - c. Third project was the US 85 (Santa-Fe) PEL Study, from 470 to Alameda. CDOT wrote back with a concurrence and participation of \$750,000, which is half the local match.
  - d. Fourth project was the US 285 Operational Improvement and Congestion Management Study, a joint project with Arapahoe County, Englewood, Cherry Hills, Sheridan, Denver and CDOT. CDOT came back with concurrence and a contribution of \$250,000.

- e. Littleton requested concurrence from CDOT on two applications: one for intersection improvements at Federal and Bowles and CDOT concurred with this project. The other project was for a signal connectivity study which CDOT also concurred with. No funding was requested. These projects will not be submitted as Regional Projects, they will be submitted as subregional projects.
- f. Lizzie with CDOT mentioned that if we choose to go forward with the Parker Road PEL Study as a subregional project, Forum members are not precluded from requesting concurrence and funding from CDOT during the subregional application process. CDOT had several requests from Arapahoe County and they had to prioritize projects within the County, given CDOT's limited funding and other regional requests.
- g. John H. with RTD stated that they did not have funding for this project at the regional level either, but could be reviewed at subregional level.

**4. Leading three projects being considered for regional funding:**

**a. US 85 PEL Study**

- i. Bryan: I finished the US 85 application and sent it out to the stakeholders for review to see if there is anything they want to incorporate or add. There is still some data to populate into application. Boundary was extended from I-25 to Alameda at the request of Denver. Bryan did contact Jane at Denver regarding the expanded boundaries of this study and asked if this would change the dynamics of the study too much. Jane said their expectations, in terms of public outreach, are the same whether they extend the boundary further to the north or not. If this project is selected, we need to include special language in the IGA to cover situations that may arise because of any special needs that the communities might have who are included in the study and payment for such. Jane indicated that if that were to happen Denver would be willing to pay for those special increases caused by extension to Alameda.
- ii. Jay: the State Highway facilities are close to the Alameda boundary, seems to make sense that the boundary should be Alameda. To be as comprehensive as possible though, it seems that we should include that last little part to I-25.
- iii. Jefferson County declined to participate. However, Bryan requested a concurrence letter from them on the project and they are willing to provide.

**b. US 285 Congestion Management and Operations Study**

- i. Maria: application was a little challenging since the application is a Study, not a project. The last two pages show the crash data; Federal to University, the accidents are spread through the corridor. This corridor serves about 69,000 vehicles a day, and would be a good candidate for a study of this type.
- ii. Bryan: was there any specific data for pedestrians/bike crashes? Maria: No, I didn't break that out, but that's a very good point, and I will look at that.
- iii. Mac: Is there any information on vehicle type? Maria: no, not specific, I will look for that and see if I can break it down.
- iv. Bryan: I did notice in your application, that you would be willing to accept less funding in order to get the project approved. In terms of strategies, is that a good idea for US 85? The question becomes: if we are willing to accept less dollars from the region, how do we make up the deficit to keep the project whole? There are a couple of possible solutions:
  - 1. The partners come up with funding difference
  - 2. Ask for more monies from local stakeholders
  - 3. Dedicate a share of the subregional funds to make up difference

- a. So if on an application we say yes, we will accept less; does this become a detriment to keeping the project whole, or does this increase the likelihood of not getting the project at all or increase the likelihood of getting the project?
- b. Maria: It was my thought that if we did receive less funding, we could change the boundaries of the study and decrease the scope of the study.
- c. Jay, would you make this project a subregional request then? Yes
- d. Todd: it seems to make sense to always choose yes we would accept less funding.
  - i. You could always decrease the scope of the project,
  - ii. You could make a commitment to say if we receive less regional funds, we will make up the deficit with subregional funds, or
  - iii. Have an agreement in place that says all stakeholders will kick in additional funds
  - iv. Todd indicated that reduction of funding is a last option for DRCOG and by saying you would accept less does not mean that DRCOG automatically reduces the request.
- e. Travis: As you were putting this together, comparing the two scopes, did you have any sense of whether one was more transformative than the other in terms of the regional criteria and intent of regional pool?
  - i. Maria: As US 285 as a corridor, it would make more sense to do it more as a pool. Travis: does the data that you're showing here just go to Sante Fe? Maria: yes, we had trouble with the data, we intend to update the data and go all the way to Federal so it's more accurate.
- f. Bryan: since the funding partners of US 85 are here, would you like me to put together a discussion of a strategy assuming something less and what that might entail?
- g. Keith: I can only speak for Littleton, but I think I could go back to Littleton Council and get them to agree to help close the gap. It doesn't make sense to change the scope of the project to smaller boundaries.
- h. Bryan: the way the question is stated: "would you accept less and keep the same intent of the project". That doesn't really mean you couldn't change the scope and keep the same intent.
- i. Maria: there just isn't a good piece to cut out of the study. We need to keep the south and north boundaries.

**c. High Plains Trail**

- i. Joint project with Douglas County, Parker, Arapahoe County, E470, and Aurora to construct the trail that includes a bridge over Parker. The application has been filled out by Open Spaces, but Public Works will do some more embellishment with the application. The application will be requesting \$2 million. And Todd, is there an opportunity to ask for a specific type of funding for this project? Bryan was thinking of SB18-01 funding. Are there certain project requirements for receiving state funding? There would still be environmental permitting issues, but maybe not so many requirements about details.

- d. The applications for these projects took quite a bit of time to fill out, and still need more data, our GIS Division is still working on the data for our application. Maria agreed. It can be difficult to prepare applications for a Study, since the criteria lends itself more to projects than studies.
    - i. Todd: I agree 100%, we've always had problems with studies, the criteria is more difficult to come up with, the best method is to outline the problems and existing conditions to propose why you want to do a study in the first place and why you're requesting funds.
  - e. Bryan: Please review these three applications, especially the stakeholders of each application and get back to me preferably by noon next Wednesday, (September 19<sup>th</sup>) with any suggestions or concerns. Then project sponsors can make changes and get them to the Executive Committee. Concurrence Letters would be also be beneficial.
5. Do we need to prioritize these projects?
- a. Maria: I'm fine with these three in no particular priority
  - b. Mac: In fact, there might a downside to prioritizing them. Since we only have three, let's recommend all three.
  - c. Lizzie: Todd, was there \$10 million? Todd: \$9.9, multi modal options within the regional share. Would set asides be eligible for multi modal funding? Todd: Probably not.
  - d. Todd: in the regional call, we will be using CMAQ and multi modal funds first, that will be our highest priority, we will be applying the set asides also when we identify funding sources.
  - e. Bryan: we identified that our share of Multi-modal option subregional share, would be \$7 million.
  - f. So we won't score or prioritize projects, we will just submit the three.
6. Denver has requested participation from Arapahoe County for two projects. A request of \$150,000 each between two projects, this is a share of subregional dollars, spread over three years.
- i. One was for improvements of the Broadway Station off of I-25, total of a \$71 million project. Is RTD providing funding? Not sure. Other subregions were requested to make the same amount of funding.
    - 1. How do we feel as a subregion: Do we make a recommendation to the Executive Committee about our participation? Or should we score it and send it through the process that all subregional projects must go through?
    - 2. We did ask for Denver's participation in the US 85 project as a local match. Other than that, we aren't asking for Denver's participation in funding.
    - 3. Todd: Denver looked at license plate data at the Park and Ride and found that 35% was from Arapahoe County. And that is Denver's justification for asking Arapahoe to participate.
    - 4. This raises the question: should the owner of the corridor, roadway, highway, and/or intersection be the prime source of funding, or the users of the corridor, etc.? If the users have to provide the funding: everyone in and around Denver would have to provide funding. The Arapahoe County subregion isn't even close to Broadway and I-25.
    - 5. Most requests for intersubregional participation are made to the regions that have at least some proximity to the project location.
    - 6. All jurisdictions use other jurisdictions' roadways and highways, how can we structure funding on that? How do we pro rate funding on utilization?
    - 7. Or, do we charge funding based on pass through traffic? So everyone shares the burden of pass through traffic. At the Littleton Station, only 10% of the cars are from Littleton.

8. Arapahoe County, 20-30 years ago, generated a lot of the traffic that went through other jurisdictions, now traffic comes through Arapahoe County. Now, everybody uses everybody else's roads. Do you pursue funding then on a percentage type basis by users?
  9. We will see if this Dual Modal TIP process helps answer this question.
  10. We should prioritize Denver's project and score it based on our subregions needs, that will be the fairest way to do it.
7. Next Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for September 24<sup>th</sup> and that conflicts with the APWA Snow and Ice Conference. This meeting can be held on the 24<sup>th</sup> without Bryan, or do you want to delay the meeting to the first, or wait until the 15<sup>th</sup>, or the 21<sup>st</sup>?
    - a. Todd: once regional is done, then the next big thing will be presenting the subregional projects, maybe around April. Call for subregional projects will be in January.
      - i. You can change criteria for subregional projects, or change the weighting. You would probably want to do that by end of year.
    - b. Since a meeting is already scheduled for the 15<sup>th</sup>, lets stay with that as our next meeting date. Are there topics for us to focus on?
      - i. Criteria for subregional: using the regional criteria with a few modifications:
        1. Maybe continuing the 20% match, or change that amount?
        2. Score a project higher if the match is higher
        3. Special consideration for smaller communities
        4. Set targets for various categories of projects
        5. Change the weighting criteria
        6. Can we make the application less stringent?
      - ii. DRCOG doesn't score the applications for subregional, so maybe applications could be less wordy?
  8. The next meeting of the Technical Committee will be on October 15<sup>th</sup> in the Lima Arapahoe Boardroom at 11:00
  9. Action Items until then:
    - a. Finalize Applications
    - b. Subregional Partnerships
    - c. Please remind your elected officials to attend meeting on Thursday the 13<sup>th</sup> so we have a quorum. If designee or alternate cannot attend, the jurisdiction can appoint a person via a letter, or email to attend and vote in their place.