

**Citizens' Capital Improvement Plan Committee (CCIPC)**  
**November 13, 2014**  
**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**Attendance**

Melissa Beck	Lindsay Gomez	Leanna Principe
Larry Coates	Ken Haack	Julie Rasmussen
Michelle DeLaria	Harriet Hall	Ron Slinger
Ascenzo Di Giacomo	Cindi Kreutzer	Janet Steinkamp
Kelly Eargle	John Malito	Don Wood
Nancy Ford	Kelly Mueldener	
Michelle Glasmann	T.O. Owens	

Presenters and Observers: Mark Bowman, Lori Gillis, Tim Hoos, Bob Manwaring, Bill Ray, and Christopher Yaney

Facilitation Team: Heather Bergman (Peak Facilitation) and Niki Koszalka

**Welcome**

The facilitator welcomed the Committee and proceeded with introductions.

**Unfunded Transportation Projects Overview – Tim Hoos**

- The City has identified 40 unique unfunded projects.
  - All of the projects are important to Arvada's transportation needs.
  - The list has developed over many years based on Arvada's Transportation Master Plan.
  - Needs continue to grow due to changes in development (i.e., residential areas, schools, and shopping areas) that impact traffic patterns and transit needs.
  - Most project locations on the list are known problem areas.
  - The previous citizen CIP committee also contributed to the list.
- Total amount needed for unfunded projects is \$347,393,000.
- The City has developed criteria for prioritizing projects:
  - Is outside funding available? Is there an opportunity to leverage funding or expedite construction? Does the project meet the qualifications for grant funding?
    - Examples include: Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) grants; Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grants; and Funding Advancement for Surface Transportation & Economic Recovery (FASTER) grants.
    - The federal government prefers to have "shovel ready" projects, which is a challenge for agencies. Arvada now has projects ready for future opportunities. This will likely be a key to prioritization.
  - Does the project solve a chronic problem?
  - Does the project positively affect the most residents of Arvada?

- Will this complement another project that is already funded?
  - Does the request come from many citizens or possibly another entity?
  - Is the project part of a City Council Strategic Goal?
- The presentation reviewed/summarized six of the highest-priority unfunded transportation projects; these projects are estimated to cost \$45 million total. The 6 projects are listed below.
  - W. 72nd Ave. Improvements - Indiana St. to McIntyre St.
    - The project cost is estimated at \$6 million, and there is \$800,000 in upfront funding available.
    - Arvada has submitted a grant application to DRCOG, which may result in 80% of the project cost being covered. Arvada will find out in February if the grant is approved.
    - The City has studied the alternatives and is developing a construction plan, which includes additional through lanes and bike access.
    - The traffic signal will have to be reconstructed.
    - There is potential Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) participation, though the project is not a current CDOT priority based on regional usage.
    - West Brothers Farm on the southeast quadrant has potential for development, including the option of a right-of-way that could result in a \$1 million savings for the project if the developer completes this component of the project.
- Ward Road Extension
  - The project is estimated to cost \$15 million and is part of Arvada's official Transportation Plan.
  - Currently there is nothing at this site, and the goal of the project is to ease traffic congestion on both Indiana and Simms Streets.
  - The land has been acquired, and Arvada owns the right-of-way.
  - The preliminary design was completed in 2013.
  - This was the second-highest scoring project based on the prioritization process used by the 2001 Transportation Implementation Committee.
  - The project is currently not designated as a regional priority by DRCOG; therefore, grant funding is not available at this time.
- Ralston Road Corridor
  - The project is estimated to cost \$16.6 million and was designated as one of the top priorities by the 2008 CCIPC.
  - There have been two studies completed on this site (one to assess what the project will look like and another on implementation of the project).
  - The project involves reconstruction and widening of an existing road to 12 feet and existing sidewalks to 8-10 feet. The hope is to relieve congestion and make the area more bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly.
  - A conceptual engineering design has been developed, and funding has been made available for 30% of the design and some short-term improvements.
  - There will be a connection into AURA (Arvada Urban Renewal Authority) redevelopment west of Garrison Street.

- Conduit and Fiber Interconnect
  - The project cost is estimated at \$2.25 million with a goal to provide connectivity to police stations, utilities, facilities, and traffic signals.
  - It will allow for rapid coordination of traffic signal timing patterns.
  - The project is a City Council Strategic Goal.
  - Several segments have already been installed throughout the city, but funding is needed to connect the gaps so the network is usable.
- Arvada Ridge Access from Kipling Street
  - The project cost is estimated at \$2.5 million.
  - It will provide access from Kipling Street to the Gold Line Station and Red Rocks Community College.
  - There will be development and increased traffic in the area due to the Gold Line Station. There will be a connection to make off of Kipling Street into the station, which will ease traffic loading up the area residential streets.
  - The project is a City Council Strategic Goal.
  - There is a developable piece of land north and east of this area. Development of that parcel that could help fund this project ..
  - There is potential development activity to the east, which could also result in possible cost sharing opportunities.
- Missing Sidewalks
  - Over 25 miles of sidewalk gaps currently exist in Arvada.
  - The project is a City Council Strategic Goal.
  - There will be a focus on gaps found near the Light Rail stations to encourage pedestrian and bike access.
  - The current funding level is approximately \$200,000 per year, which purchased about 300 feet of sidewalk connections last year. This is an inadequate funding level to make substantial improvements.

### Questions/Answers

- *Are the 40 unfunded projects listed in priority order on the slides?* No, they are not.
- *In terms of grant availability, does the City of Arvada have a lobbyist to address issues and advance its interests?* No. Arvada will occasionally contract out for lobbying activities but does not have a lobbyist on retainer or permanent contract.
- W. 72nd Ave. Improvements - Indiana St. to McIntyre St.
  - *How do you know that the connection on 72<sup>nd</sup> will take pressure off Indiana and McIntyre?* There have been assessments and traffic counts. Additionally, there are not a lot of north-south connections, so any additions could draw traffic and pull some of the heat off of that area. The City is utilizing information from the 20-year Northwest Arvada Transportation Study as well as following recommendations from years past. There have been several studies by CDOT and Jefferson County performed while evaluating for alternatives for Jefferson Parkway that have been referenced as well.
  - *Is it true that the traffic in this area is not only local use?* Yes. There is some probability use is not only users trying to get to 80<sup>th</sup> but also people getting

on 72<sup>nd</sup> to get to Louisville. There is certainly traffic from other cities and/or areas using this as a de facto beltway.

- *Why has traffic in this area doubled in the last 5 years?* Growth in the northwest area of the city, the high school, and additional use by Boulder and Broomfield traffic.
- *When were the studies on this area done?* The Northwest Quadrant Study was in 2001-2002. The CDOT planning study was completed in 1998.
- *Are grants or other funding available through CDOT for this area?* SAFETY, FASTER, and TIGER grants may be available. CDOT grants are very tough. Indiana is not high on the priority list for CDOT.
- Ward Road Extension
  - *Does this project extend to Alcott?* No.
  - *Does it extend to Five Parks?* Yes.
  - *Would it be sensible to combine the project with an extension to Alcott?* It would be sensible, and Arvada would like to do that. However, the north-south corridors will not be improved until the Jefferson Parkway is squared away. If we improve north-south connections now, we will train people to use our local streets for regional trips instead of using the Jefferson Parkway when it is built.
  - *Has City staff considered a traffic impact fee given at the building permit stage?* Occasionally. Arvada did assess one for Leyden Rock on Leyden Road. The challenge is assessing fees for impacts that occur farther away from the development area. We would need to be on solid ground in terms of cause and effect in order to withstand a legal challenge. *With traffic increases occurring after housing developments went in, would it be appropriate to say the housing is the cause of the increase?* This could be a factor but not the only factor. The Broomfield Mall is another of several factors. The Leyden Rock development had direct connections to increased use of roads, but it's not always that easy to make a causal connection. The regional use of the roads in the Ward Road extension area makes it harder to show the increased traffic correlation.
  - *Could Arvada consider traffic impact fees akin to the parks fee?* It could be considered, and the CCIPC could make the suggestion.
  - *Because of uniqueness of project and the historic factors being considered, could there be funding tied to historic preservation?* We are not aware of any such funding sources. This group could suggest and/or research this when creatively working on funding.
- Ralston Road Corridor
  - *How many takings (buying of private property) have been required with this project?* The City can get that list to the group, but there have been no full property takings.
  - *When discussing preliminary and conceptual planning, are these considering good/better/best options? Are the plans optimized?* Yes. The most economical design is always considered, as are options to maximize

effectiveness over time and historical factors. The City is not looking to take property or businesses; the goal is the best fit for the properties and the road.

- Missing Sidewalks
  - *Of the 25 miles of sidewalk gaps, how much of that would be in the area of transit stations?* There is focus to get those done but it won't fill all those gaps. The CCIPC should feel free to offer suggestions about how to do this better. The sidewalk gap map is available on the website.
  - *Does this project deal with missing and/or narrow sidewalks?* It is just the missing areas. The direction the Transportation Committee took was to fill in the gaps first, then fix areas that are too narrow.
  - *Would the \$2.5 million cover the cost of the study?* The study is done. The \$2.5 million would be design and construction.
- *Of the 6 projects, which are City Council Strategic Goals?* There are four projects that are Council Strategic Goals: Ralston Road Corridor, Conduit and Fiber Interconnect, Arvada Ridge Access from Kipling Street, and Missing Sidewalks.

**Street Maintenance Division (Pavement Management/Street Infrastructure): Mark Bowman and Christopher Yaney**

- Arvada is not currently where it would like to be in terms of street maintenance.
- The best scenario would be to have street treatment on a proactive basis, every 8-10 years.
- Please see the chart in the presentation posted to the website for further information on work planning and the life-cycle maintenance program.
- In terms of costs associated with treatment, reconstruction has the highest price tag. It is most economical to do maintenance: crack and seal at the 7-8 year mark, followed by seal and chip coat to seal surface as needed, and finally overlay to bring the street back to a "good" status.
- 10-Year Analysis - Scenario Condition Fair or Better
  - The proposed budget to meet the Council Strategic Goal of getting 70% of streets to fair or better is \$17.5M budget per year to stabilized conditions.
  - The City is losing ground every year, as more lane-miles are added but insufficient work is done on existing streets.
- Please see the chart in the presentation posted on the website, which shows the average treatment costs per foot, yard, and lane mile (10' x 5280') for the following categories:
  - Crack seal – lifespan = 3 years;
  - Sealcoat – lifespan = 5 years;
  - Chip seal – lifespan = 10-15 years;
  - Hot chip – lifespan = 12-15 years;
  - Mill and overlay – lifespan = 12-15 years;
  - Patching – lifespan = 12-15 years; and
  - Reconstruction – lifespan = 15-20 years.
- Please see the chart showing a 10-year analysis for getting roads to fair or better condition. This chart compares the road conditions outlined in the Council Goals, the proposed budget, and stabilizing conditions.

- The proposed budget has 20% of roads to be at fair or better condition by January 2024.
- Stabilizing the condition of roads would require getting 60% to fair or better condition by January 2024.
- Between January 2014 and January 2024, a 20% increase of fair to better conditioned roads needs to occur and then be maintained to meet the Council Goal.
- The funding plan scenario includes the proposed budget, condition stabilization and council goals as well.
  - Total funding 2015-2024 for the proposed budget is \$43 million.
  - Total funding 2015-2024 for the condition stabilization is \$240 million.
  - Total funding 2015-2024 for the Council Goal is \$170 million.
- Aging Infrastructure
  - Please see chart on the posted presentation.
  - In 2012, good lanes were determined to be 245 miles or 17% of total roads, which has decreased in 2014 to 217 miles or 15% of roads.
  - In 2012, poor lanes were determined to be 605 miles or 42% of total roads; this has increased to be 694 miles or 48% of roads.
  - The City is losing ground on good roads due to lack of budget.

### **Questions/Answers**

- *How is the road value calculated?* There is a computer application that puts a rating on each street, looks at every level, and computes out to the three choices (proposed budget, condition stabilization, and Council Goal). The current status is a calculation from the application as well.
- *Are the percentages shown related to aging infrastructure based on an average?* Yes, it is averaged out based on the lane mileage using a weighted percentage.
- *Do new roads rate good/excellent?* Once new roads pass warranty, they get entered into the City ranks. Those roads may bring up the average rating city-wide, but there are also roads that still have not been touched or maintained. The streets on the decline toward poor are dropping at a rate quicker than the addition of new streets. It is hard to keep up when on the downhill slide.
- *Do the qualifications for good/satisfactory/fair/poor take into consideration the types of streets (collector, arterial, etc.)?* Yes. There are 23 different points of distress looked at for each street. Arterials are weighted higher, as are collectors (though not as high). Local streets are assessed every 12 years, 10 for arterials, and 8 for collectors.
- *How did Arvada end up in such a declined situation in terms of its streets?* The streets have been underfunded for 20 years. There was significant growth in 1950s and 60s, resulting in lots of infrastructure introduced but not much maintenance being done. In the 1970s and 80s, Arvada started to take care of failing infrastructure. While it has been worked on, there was not enough funding and it has progressively become worse. Arvada is about 83% larger than it was in 1980. Funds have not doubled but the cost of projects has increased. In 2009 to 2010, there have been

10% and 12% increases in the cost of asphalt. Given a \$10 million budget per year, it would still take Arvada 20 years to catch up.

- *Is bridge maintenance included in the presentation?* No, there is a different program for bridges. Every year they are checked and fixed as needed. The bridges in the city are currently in pretty good condition.

### **Jefferson Parkway Public Highway Authority: Bill Ray**

- The goal is to complete the Denver Metropolitan Regional Beltway.
- CDOT had a 5-year Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process with 73 alternatives and \$15 million spent that resulted in no conclusion. At the draft EIS stage, the concept was repackaged as the Northwest Regional Parkway. There was no ownership for the project, no one who was moving it forward.
- Rocky Flats Transportation Corridor
  - The project was authorized in 2001 by the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge Act and studied by the US Environmental Protection Agency, the US Department of the Energy, CDOT, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service.
  - A southwest portion of the land in the Refuge, State Land Board Section 16, was transferred for \$2.8 million. There is now a right-of-way through this area to complete the connection for the Parkway.
- Short history of Denver Beltway
  - C-470 was started in 1980, and completed in 1990.
  - The E-470 Authority was created in 1988. The W-470 Authority was created in May 1988. The Northwest Parkway Authority was created in June 1999.
  - CDOT starts, then stops, the Northwest Quadrant EIS in 2003 and 2008, respectively.
  - The Jefferson Parkway Authority was created in May 2008.
- Short history of Jefferson Parkway
  - First identified in 1964 Arvada Comprehensive Plan
  - First US Department of Transportation Engineering Study in 1968
  - DRCOG Regional Transportation Plan – 1987
  - Northwest Corridor Transportation and Environmental Planning Study (TEPS) process 2003-08; terminated by CDOT
  - Jefferson Parkway Public Highway Authority (JPPHA) formed in May 2008
  - Included in the DRCOG fiscally-constrained transportation plan in 2010
  - Isolux Corsan confidentiality and exclusivity agreement signed in April 2011
    - Isolux Corsan is a Spanish global corporation focused on infrastructure privatization.
    - Isolux Corsan uses its own financial and engineering models that they consider proprietary. Arvada agreed to non-disclosure on the particulars of those models.
    - The exclusivity agreement states that the JPPHA will not solicit any RFPs or take any unsolicited RFPs during the life of the agreement.
  - The concept of the Parkway is to be a public/private partnership. JPPHA has not taken nor does it intend to take federal funding, which would

demand a federally mandated process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

- JPPHA will still do an environmental review, but it will be very different than a NEPA environmental impact statement (EIS). This will provide flexibility for construction, review, etc.
- Fast Facts –Jefferson Parkway
  - Phase 1 - 10.1 miles from SH 128 to SH93
  - Phase 1 – 2 X 2 lanes with intersections or partial interchanges initially
  - Phase 2 - 3 X 3 lanes with full interchanges
  - Phase 2 – southern terminus at W 64th
  - Initial construction est. \$204 M (in 2010 \$)
  - Arvada contribution to JPPHA to date - \$2.06M cumulative
    - Includes \$642,000 for Rocky Flats right-of-way and \$300,000 for staff support
    - All contributions to be reimbursed
- Fuel Tax
  - In 1992 the fuel tax equaled 20% of the cost of a gallon of gas.
  - In 2012 the fuel tax equaled 6% of the cost of a gallon of gas.
  - Over time, the income from the tax has drastically decreased.
- Arvada’s Growth Since 1990
  - The population of Arvada has risen 53%.
  - The vehicle miles traveled have increased by 57%.
  - The lane miles of Arvada have increased by 2%.
  - The chart also shows projections through 2023.
- Annual Funding Gap

<b>Transportation Category</b>	<b>Annual Gap*</b>
Maintain the system	\$157
Rural road safety/reliability	\$100
Congestion relief/mobility	\$500
Inter-regional transportation	\$15
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$772</b>
<b>*TBD Colorado in millions</b>	

- Annual Funding Gap – After Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships (RAMP)/ (TRANS)

<b>Transportation Category</b>	<b>Annual Gap*</b>	<b>Annual Funding</b>	
		<b>RAMP</b>	<b>TRANS Ret</b>
		<b>2013-2017</b>	<b>2018-2022</b>
Maintain the system	\$157	\$150	\$167
Rural road safety/reliability	\$100	\$0	\$0
Congestion relief/mobility	\$500	\$150	\$0
Inter-regional transportation	\$15	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$772</b>	<b>\$300</b>	<b>\$167</b>
<b>*TBD Colorado in millions</b>		<b>Deficit: \$432</b>	<b>Deficit: \$605</b>



- Fuel and Sales tax

		Highway (HUTF) 100%		Transit 0%	
Fuel Tax	Annual Revenue	CDOT 60%	Local 40%		
10 cent increase, indexed (includes diesel increase)	\$386	\$232	\$154		

		Highway (HUTF) 67%		Transit 0%	
Sales Tax	Annual Revenue	CDOT 60%	Local 40%	CDOT and Local 40%	Denver Metro 60%
.7 cent increase	\$605	\$243	\$162	\$80	\$120

- Arvada would see benefits from both fuel and sales tax increases as well as allocation of money for transit.
- There is no such thing as a “free” way; there are always costs associated with these projects.
- Toll roads seem to be the most fair – people pay for using it, and do not pay if they do not use it.

**Questions/Answers/Comments**

- *Would the proposed Parkway go to the north of 64<sup>th</sup>?* Yes. The Parkway would cover the gap where there is no road.
- *Even with the Parkway, will there be continued traffic problems on 58<sup>th</sup>, McIntyre, and 64<sup>th</sup> to get to 93?* Yes, some people will continue to utilize these roads rather than the Parkway. The hope is that the Parkway will provide a working system for all areas once the circuit is completed.
- *Why has a beltway around the Denver metro area never been pushed?* It has been pushed, but it is impossible to build 100 miles of highway at one time. There has been steady progress over the years and much of it has been completed. Arvada is the last leg to be completed.
- *What is the financial plan with Isolux?* The information is deliberately vague. At this point, we do not know what the final plan of finance with Isolux will be. There are also other partners involved. The State may directly or indirectly become part of the project. In putting all those things together, it is not clear what the final financial gap would be.
- *Will the Parkway be parallel to Indiana?* Yes.
- *Will there be a Parkway segment paralleling 93?* Yes, north of Highway 72. South of 72, Indiana is a local road. Once the Jefferson Parkway is completed, all of Indiana will revert to being a local road with a speed limit of 35 miles/hour.
- *Will there be intersections on the Parkway?* Initially there will be intersections, and Highway 128 will be a stoplight. Eventually, when traffic warrants, they will

become interchanges. (Intersections have stoplights; interchanges allow vehicles to turn onto other roads using ramps instead of stoplights.)

- *What is the obstacle to completion of the Parkway? Politics and money.*

**Next Meeting**

The next CCIPC meeting will be November 20, 2014.