

## MEETING NOTES

<b>PROJECT:</b>	Arapahoe County Transportation Forum
<b>PURPOSE:</b>	DRCOG Dual Model Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Process, Meeting #13
<b>DATE HELD:</b>	October 25, 2018
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Colorado Extension Center at Lima Plaza at 6934 South Lima St. Centennial
<b>ATTENDING:</b>	Laura Christman – Cherry Hills Village, Todd Cottrell – DRCOG, Mac Callison – Aurora, Maria D’Andrea – Englewood, Travis Greiman – Centennial, Ron Rakowsky – City of Greenwood Village, Tammy Mauer – Centennial, Bryan Weimer – Arapahoe County, Jeff Baker – Arapahoe County, Brian Love – Arapahoe County, Jim Thorsen – Cherry Hills Village, Devin Granbery – City of Sheridan, Sally Daigle – City of Sheridan, Daniel Hutton - DSTMA, Mike Rocha - Bennett, Nancy Sharpe – Arapahoe County , by phone: Karina Elrod – Littleton, Stephanie Piko - Centennial
<b>COPIES:</b>	Attendees, Invitees Not in Attendance

All invitees were emailed the following documents: Arapahoe County Transportation Forum Agenda for Meeting #13, Minutes from the #12 ArapCo Transportation Forum for approval, Arapahoe County Transportation Forum Criteria 10-23-18, ArapCo Transportation Forum Mtg 12 Sub Region Governance 9-13-18, and the Regional and Sub-regional Share Approval Process.

Commissioner Baker called the meeting to order at about 3:10 and began with introductions. There were no members of the public present.

### Summary of Discussion:

1. The minutes from the September 13, 2018 Arapahoe County Transportation Forum were approved as written.
2. There were a couple of handouts available at the meeting: The Executed IGA for the Forum, and the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Sub-regional Share Project Application Form. (To be emailed to Technical and Executive Committee Members.)
3. Regional Projects:
  - a. US 85 PEL Study
    - i. C-470 to Alameda
    - ii. \$1.5 million in Federal Funds, other funding provided by CDOT, Arapahoe County, Douglas County and Denver/Littleton/Sheridan/Englewood. Total project cost: \$3 million
  - b. US 285 Operational Study
    - i. An extension of original study was submitted which included US 285 from I-25 to Knox
    - ii. \$1.8 million total cost of project, \$900,000 in Federal Funds, other funding provided from CDOT, Englewood, Denver, and /or other communities.
  - c. High Plains Trail
    - i. E470 Trail extending from Ireland to Cherry Creek
    - ii. Total Project \$7 million, \$2 million of Federal Funding specific to SB18-01 Multi Modal funding
  - d. DRCOG has reviewed projects and the Peer Review Panel has discussed projects and had

presentations of some projects by applicants and asked questions of some applicants. Next step will be the Peer Review Panel to come back together in a couple of weeks and choose the projects that will receive funding.

- e. Mayor Rakowsky thanked Travis Greiman and the City of Centennial for being our peer representative, it is not an easy job.

**4. Sub-Regional Criteria page 10 on the Power Point presentation titled Sub-Regional Criteria**

- a. **Technical Committee (TC) has met and discussed keeping the sub-regional criteria similar to Regional Criteria**
  - i. Sub-Regional Significance - 40% of weight
  - ii. Metro Vision TIP Focus Areas - 30% of weight
  - iii. Consistency and Contribution to Transportation focused Metro Vision Objectives -20%
  - iv. Leverage of Non – Sub-Regional Share Funds – 10%
- b. **The TC considered modifying the percentage of weights** and giving more weight on leveraging of funds; making the Federal funds go further, with a higher local match.
  - i. Is this reasonable to the Executive Committee?
  - ii. What was the discussion behind changing the percentages?
    - 1. To make Federal funds go further, and recognize communities who put “more skin in the game”
  - iii. Will it make it more difficult for smaller communities if they do not have funds, will they score lower then? Will it limit smaller communities from participating?
    - 1. Yes, it would for any community that doesn’t have the funds, but we can make special considerations for that scenario which we will discuss later
  - iv. TC also discussed the minimum share of Federal Funds, should it stay at \$100,000?
    - 1. Maybe we change it by project type: a project that is a study only would require a minimum of \$100,000, but a construction project, for instance, would be \$250,000
  - v. Then there is the Leverage of the local match: the TC came up with two options in addition to the DRCOG ratings of local matches
    - 1. Should small communities be scored differently?
    - 2. Or maybe their project should be funded by local matches, and not federal funds-Forum could collaborate, or work up a partnership?
    - 3. Would this inhibit small communities from even applying?
- c. Suggestion would be to round up or round down to next half point if Low, Medium, and High ratings are used
  - i. The recent scoring by DRCOG for Regional projects was: lowest was 1.5 and the highest was a 2.6; not much difference, there was a lot in the middle
- d. The TC suggests that the application needs to be less stringent and not require so much justification and explanation.
- e. To move forward with projects, the TC would review and score the project and then forward to DRCOG to provide oversight and review the TC Project Scoring and Ranking prior to presentation to the EC
- f. TC discussed an additional question regarding current delay and future delay with or without the project happening, should it be 2040? It was decided during the meeting that the 2040 should be taken out.
- g. Should “**Targets**” be considered, another way to compartmentalize or categorize projects being considered.
  - i. Construction projects, or just a study, or Pre Con ROW Project, Design, EA
  - ii. Consider an interim year
- h. **The criteria needs to reflect our values and reflect where we want to be as a County**
- i. **Special Considerations:**
  - i. Small Communities based on population: less than 1,000?
    - 1. Not sure we should label small communities: can they compete, does labeling them give them a disadvantage, can they meet the 20% match?
    - 2. If we don’t give them special consideration, then can they even compete?

- a. Well it could depend on the project, it would have to be on a case by case basis.
3. Or is small community defined on a revenue level, tax level, and assessed value?
  - ii. Maybe we keep the category of "Special Considerations" loosely defined
  - iii. The Forum has the chance to define this and whether or not to use "Small Community" as a special consideration
  - iv. The justification for a Special Consideration could be size of community, lack of staff for management, it could be a series of things that are unique to the funding request being considered.
  - v. It would be good to start out as not being too restrictive, maybe over time we can create more defined criteria, but leave it more fluid at this time
  - vi. Before creation of the sub regions, there was an argument about small communities not being able to compete with the larger communities, creation of the sub region and the Forums provides more opportunities to collaborate and include the small communities in the request for funding
  - vii. So what I'm hearing at this point is: Yes, we should have special considerations for smaller communities, use the special considerations on a project to project basis, and it would be up to the applying community to identify the reasons why special considerations should be given. And perhaps this would happen after the project itself had been scored, similar to what Travis' group is doing now.
    1. Yes, I would suggest that we have it as a special consideration category which includes: small community, lack of staff, funding issues,
    2. Should we include assessed value as additional criteria as opposed to population employment...
      - a. Would it help to create a table for these components and categories?  
A table that included: population, employment, and assessed value
  - viii. Other categories or criteria:
    1. Is it a construction project? Design project? Pre-Construction Project?
    2. Is it a capacity project? Then it must be on DRCOG's fiscally constrained plan, Is it an operational project? Or is it a program that serves the sub-region? (Shuttle system, ADA program, etc.)
    3. Has the Agency ever had funding taken away?
    4. Community goals and consistency with future goals
    5. See slide 10 of presentation for more
  - ix. The question then becomes, how do we score special considerations?
    1. Some kind of catch all?
    2. And maybe a requirement for disclosure of any factors that may cause a delay in construction or completion?
    3. Other contributors, like special contributors? This information can be included in the basic criteria in one of the questions.
- j. **Are you comfortable with the TC recommended sub regional weight?** Yes. (Slide #8)
- k. **How about the minimum Federal ask?** Should it become \$250,000 for all types of projects, or just infrastructure?
  - i. What was the background for the change to \$250,000? Was it really beneficial to Federalize a project for \$100,000? You could have costs that go much higher once you federalize it instead of paying for it on your own.
  - ii. Is dealing with the government for \$100,000 worth it? Does anyone ever apply for a \$100,000 project? Currently, the projects we are considering are not at this dollar amount.
  - iii. What about an operational study, maybe there should be consideration for less than the \$250,000 minimum.
  - iv. If we kept it at \$100,000, we have the opportunity to discuss the question: do we really want to ask for this project to be federalized? Remember this is minimum

- criteria.
- v. Since this is the pilot of this whole process, maybe this isn't the best time to change the amount, especially by that much. Shall we keep it at \$100,000 for all submittals? It was agreed to keep this amount at \$100,000. No changes to this policy as of now.
- I. **Leverage:** do we keep DRCOG's or adjust for the sub regional criteria?
  - i. The Technical Committee didn't really have a recommendation at this point on the options, (slide 8), until we knew what the Executive Committee was thinking. Option #2 is more quantitative, and provides more separation, because it has more distribution of the scores, however maybe a bit inconsistent with the policy and what I passed out.
  - ii. Will this make it hard for the applicant? It will add a level of detail that Bryan said is not consistent with the rest of the application, so if the rest of the application is judged on low, medium, and high; but it will differentiate between 1.9 and 1.95.( See slide 8 of the Power Point.)
  - iii. You are trying to give more credit to a higher local fund contribution.
  - iv. For those of us who prepare the applications, we will score our projects ourselves, we will look at a minimum 20% match, and then we will look at an additional match to bring the scores up to make us more competitive.
  - v. Slide #8, TC Option 2: This defines the level of low, medium and high. Remember, this is only one component of the criteria you are evaluating on. Both Metro Visions, Leverage and Regional significance all have to be weighed in on. This method might help give a little more differentiation to the scoring, but if you round up or down, it will wipe all the one tenths and one hundredths out. This Option #2, may add too much complexity, and become more work than it adds value. Keep it simple for the sake of time and effort.
  - vi. So far, it seems to be that everyone likes TC Option #1 on slide 8. And the Technical Committee should fine tune the Option a little bit. Maybe we could also look at a minimum for construction activity. We will look at making it less stringent, less complex.
  - vii. On a mid-level, mid cost operational project that may have 5-10 years of significant benefit before it's overwhelmed with growth and demands, that delta would be current delay with or without the project. We don't want operational projects to be short lived or short changed from an evaluation perspective or merit. Thus, the reason you may want to consider a delay in 2040 criteria.
    - 1. Recommendation was to eliminate 2040 considerations.
  - viii. The Technical Committee will bring back some suggestions on:
    - 1. "Targets"
    - 2. Special Considerations: yes we want to include these, however, what questions do we want to ask
- m. **Sub Regional Projects:** see slides 11 & 12; this may not be all the projects for consideration. And they are all listed at an 80% share, it may change. (However, the County Line Road Widening project did not have the 80% match.) And the I-25 and Belleview project was thrown out as a total project, we may consider it in phases. (Not included on the power point was the Denver request: I-25 and Alameda project, this project was added to the power point after the meeting and before sending to all Forum members.)
  - i. We are getting \$45 million plus or minus, we need enough projects for that amount and for a project list, and gives us a waiting list as well
  - ii. And, we will know more after November 6<sup>th</sup>. Ballot 110 does include some projects in Arapahoe County: I-25 and Belleview fully funded, and Gun Club from Quincy north. And I-225, which is technically in Denver, but benefits Arapahoe County. Ballot #109 does not include any projects in the County.
  - iii. We did include all three of the regional projects in the sub-regional projects in case they did not get picked at the regional level, perhaps they could be reconsidered at the sub-regional level.

- n. **Schedule:** See slide #13 of power point
  - i. DRCOG hope to recommend and approve the Regional Project in November, perhaps December
  - ii. DRCOG should be able to open the Sub-Regional call January 2<sup>nd</sup> 2019
  - iii. Once the regional projects are selected; then DRCOG can figure out funding type, based on what was selected, are there other regions to share the sub regional funds, by the time the call opens January 2<sup>nd</sup> , every Forum will have their final amount going forward.

5. Bryan: Next steps:

- a. Next meeting of the Executive Committee is November 29, 2018.
- b. Any particular items you would like to discuss?
  - i. Focus on Sub-regional Criteria
  - ii. We need a quorum, because we will be voting
  - iii. We will need a project list from the Technical Committee
- c. Action Items:
  - i. Issue the minutes from this meeting
  - ii. Email everyone the power point
  - iii. Finalize the sub-regional criteria
  - iv. Prepare information that will be on application
  - v. DRCOG will send out an email to begin the call
  - vi. Create a table