



TRANSPORTATION & MOBILITY **ADVISORY BOARD - STUDY SESSION**

CITY OF LITTLETON AGENDA

Thursday July 22, 2021

6:30 PM – 8:30 PM

Council Chamber

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call
- 3. Approval of June 2021, July 2021 (Study Session) minutes
- 4. Finalize Potential Project List for a Sales Tax Ballot Initiative
- 5. Project Updates
 - Platte Canyon Road Intersections Project
 - Mineral Station Mobilityshed
 - Santa Fe & Mineral Intersection
 - Mineral Ave Panel Replacement
 - Santa Fe PEL (Council Presentation 7/27 @ 6:30p)
 - JeffCo Bike Plan Update
- 6. November & December 2021 Meeting Dates
 - Decide on new meeting dates as current dates fall on holidays
- 7. Board Comments

TRANSPORTATION & MOBILITY ADVISORY BOARD CITY OF LITTLETON MINUTES

LOCATION: City Council Chambers
Thursday June 24th, 2021 6:30 PM – 8:30 PM

Board Member Attendees

- Stephanie Kelly
- Dan Flynn
- Dan Radulovich
- Geoff Selzer
- Kelly Honecker
- Jon Buck

Board Members Not Present

- Kent Bagley
- Tom Grant
- David Pulsipher

Staff Attendees

- Shane Roberts, Aaron Heumann, Brent Thompson, Tim Weaver, Keith Reester, Heather Ferrari

Other Attendees – Presenters

- Mike Sutherland - Deputy Planning Director, City of Littleton

Legend

- S – Staff member
- B – Board member
- C – City Council member
- O—Other Attendees
- Bullet - Indicates an important note or point of discussion
- *Italicized Bullet* – Indicates a note for clarity to the reader
- **Bold Bullets** – Indicates info related to a motion/action that was made
- **Highlighted Bullet** - Indicates an action item for the Board or Staff

Call to Order: Dan Radulovich 6:31 PM

Agenda Item#2) Roll Call

Agenda Item#3) Adoption of May Minutes

- Kelly Honecker (B) moves to approve and Dan Flynn(B) seconds. Everyone moves to approve.

Agenda Item#4) Public Comment

- No public comment

Agenda Item #5) ULUC Update – Michael Sutherland

- Mike Sutherland (O) 3 + year program. Bring life to the goals and policies in the Comp Plan. Modernize the way we think and plan in the City. 12 new chapters. Interactive and web based on the website with emphasize on design. Old code had next to zero graphics and this new one is heavy on graphics.
 - Dan Radulovich (B) How long are comments open for?
 - Mike Sutherland (S) July 30th
- Geoff Selzer (B) Mid Mod Mile?
- Mike Sutherland (O) Mid-Modern Style buildings. Several along Littleton Blvd. Study of that whole corridor a couple years ago showed its one of the most concentrated models of this style in the central range. It'll involve a lot more study and community outreach. We have this set in the code – no timeframe yet but its there to study in near future.
 - Building a brand-new zoning code. Current has 37 existing and moving down to 14. There's some familiarity but also lots of new processes. Go to EnvisionLittleton.org webpage and on next page there is a place for comments and navigate where to review and take surveys. Also, can talk to City staff. Use search function so you don't have to read through every page and all the code. Comments are extremely helpful with this to take back to our consultant and go to council.
- Keith Reester (S) – Want to build a single-family home. What's the difference/processes now vs. in past.
 - Mike Sutherland (O) Single family homes go to the building department. Pain points we've seen in past from resident's limits heights. You must go through public hearing or process. A lot has occurred downtown and that's a unique animal downtown. Tried to cutdown on conflicts. Council has given marching orders to keep "suburban residential" – don't mess around with it.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) – Areas that directly affect transportation mobility.
 - Mike Sutherland (O) Corridor mixed use area, near the major corridors - Bellevue, Broadway, Santa Fe. It allows for more multifamily development. Downtown pieces done earlier last year – parking is one of the major drivers for development. Transidorian (?) development criteria would help development with rail stations. This is a work in progress. Leave your comments on the site and search for what we're interested in here with this board to give planner guidance.
- Jon Buck (B) Why a complete redo?
 - Many sections came from the 70's and antiquated pieces to it. People have been feeling the pressure of the old code. Easier to start over. It's time to reinvent it. Form based were not in the old code.
- Dan Flynn (B) Documentaries about "Strodes." Criticism of how these developments, interesting to look it up. Broadway might be like that. No recommendation of videos off the top of head.
- Keith Reester (S) Challenge is with European cities, everything you need in a neighborhood complex within 20-minute radius. Building transportation systems, requires mixed use and transportation around that. You would never build Manhattan's road system right now like they did, around the island. That's the evolution of planning. I70 rebuild is building highways right through the middle of neighborhoods. How do we build cities as they change over time to reflect what they want in them?

Balance? Change vs. those that don't want change. One million people have moved here in the last few years and nothing has changed. Operational standpoints of older neighborhoods here don't work for us now anymore. Our cities are a mosaic of 60 years of buildings and sidewalks that happened in 30 days.

- Kelly Honecker (B) Is the code made to be more development friendly?
 - Mike Sutherland (O) Allows for greater use of mixed uses. Littleton residents could go on and on about what they don't want. This will help us understand more of what they do want. It doesn't favor development more than the existing code but allows for more new opportunities. There's not much more space for new development. We are 90% Redevelopment. This is all still slated for October. After July 30th we go right to public hearing.
- Dan Radulovich (B) Can you come back to us before that? We want to see it again from a transportation perspective. After next draft and more solid we want to bounce ideas and tweaks.
 - Mike (O) Go online and leave your comments first.
- Dan Flynn (B) Assumption, based on future land use map, is it likely that biggest missed opportunities going from business to mixed use? Also, (*referring to a map question*) outlining Mid-Mod Mile and Corridor areas—is the Mid-Mod Mile the special planning areas?
 - Mike Sutherland (O) Corridors are where the biggest opportunities are transportation-wise... Thinking has evolved since then. It's a combo of elements in the Land Use maps.

Agenda Item #6) Review Draft Project List & Map, Discuss How to Finalize

- Keith Reester (S) Staff perspective, pushing Council to have more meetings with boards and commissions and they've embraced that. Interpretation of the lack of communication up until now, Council was worried about our work plans. We're still trying to figure out, how do they get regular updates from boards and Keith thinks it'll change in November with new Council members. Council was affirmative of this group and diversity of our topics then other boards and like our work done and guidance for short-term. **Put our plans into more formal format.** Marijuana sales tax 45:15, lodging tax (hotel tax) and sales tax hasn't been updated in 51 years. ¾ cent increase and other appealing to voters to bring in money. Feedback from us that they want, if we want to recommend to the community a sales tax that would help with transportation. Staff put thoughts together for questions from the board by July. Also, continue to be a huge sounding board for community.
- Dan Radulovich (B) Council was taken back by the presentation. Council expected us to come with a list of projects and we gave them the sales tax/budget. They decided to take it and use it at another time. That's fine, it's just what we found were effective or not effective. Then "what the heck do you want us to do" and we got hammered for having no work plan. That's a lack of understanding how this board works. We provide feedback on items they've never heard of. Projects usually have clear start and end points and that's what council expected.
 - Keith Reester (S) It's broken down into two plans that they're committed to. 1) Feasibility of a Downtown Development Authority and 2) The Mobility Plan that we've talked about as a board for a couple of years. Staff is working with Community Services so we can actually manage those projects and budget for next year.
 - Dan Radulovich (B) Downtown Mobility Plan and Prioritized Project list is huge for us. High accident intersection list was brought up. PEL came up a lot and we need to give as much feedback as we can. Those were big takeaways. Comes down to council needing to communicate with us more, give us more communication.
- Jon Buck (B) Give them updates on what's going on. There was confusion on what we're doing. They want more initiative, prioritization, input on projects and downtown. We are doing less than what we could be doing. Why are we even doing the study on sales tax? There're more important things. They want more initiative and input. And from the board independently. We need to be clear on our identity and we have that ability. We haven't done a good job with that. I would have fired us a long time ago. We need to know that we have authority. They want to listen to us and we're undermining our own abilities. There's a confusion even among ourselves. They weren't ready for that as a ballot initiative.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) There was a lot of confusion of what we did/presented.

- Keith Reester (S) It'll happen this fall. Sales tax isn't just for transportation but it will happen this fall, I bet. With this council, you don't want to surprise them. We're trying to get boards in front of them more is to help give boards more direction. They struggle to give us a mission. Part of this is on them and that's why they were surprised.
- Jon Buck (B) It was a lack of direction.
 - Keith Reester (S) They're your bosses. You can't bull-rush in. It's a combo of us not having a platform and they never came to us to give direction. It's a reflection. We were trying to work in a vacuum with no direction. There wasn't a mechanism for you to communicate with them.
 - Dan Radulovich (B) We haven't done a great job of defining what we are.
 - Jon Buck (B) Where do we exist if we don't have that. It could be a lack of leadership with them. We shouldn't wait around because we have an opportunity. I think they're looking for it.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) There's a lot going on and we haven't communicated effectively. They don't know what they want us to do. I agree with Jon, come up with an idea and go in front of them. Either way they'll be surprised. Get a "strong man" in front of them.
 - Stephanie Kelly (B) I'm learning, but even I've wondered what we do. We need to figure out what we want to be. There's an opportunity to get some clarity.
 - Jon Buck (B) We need a separate meeting without staff.
 - Keith Reester (S) I need to intervene because I've seen boards go out without staff and fail. I'm more than happy to pull everything together. You have 6 staff in this room which is more staff support than any other board in the city. There is a huge value to this board that's why I created. Staff has to give you support because of resource capacity to provide you research and materials.
 - Kelly Honecker (B) Is there anything we can do? We don't have the expertise, but the work plan, a matter of pulling things together. You can offload stuff on us. You were going to formalize and I want to know, can I help?
 - Keith Reester (S) I am fine with that. After we meet with Kent and Dan, yes she can help.
- Jon Buck (B) When we first formed, Council made it clear that they want us to be independent and have a voice.
 - Keith Reester (S) Jerry [Valdes] also said, "follow my lead." In the same meeting Council also said, "go do this for us."
 - Dan Flynn (B) From my notes, sounds like it would be helpful to have some sort of potential deliverable to bring about, to Council? Also, timeline of when things happen/vote on so we can forecast.
 - Dan Radulovich (B) They asked for a list of prioritized projects. Past that, the Downtown Master Plan is a huge thing that needs taken care of. What other things would people like to work on for our work plan?
- Geoff Selzer (B) Keith, do we have in a mission.
 - Keith Reester (S) Yes. It's in the original charter ordinance.
- Dan Radulovich (B) We have this time to go over our projects and agenda items. That is something that we need to do.
 - Jon Buck (B) We can push it to another time. This is important to me.
- Geoff Selzer (B) Powers and Duties isn't a mission statement.
 - Keith Reester (S) It has a list of plans, programs, policies. 18 bullet points. (*Keith reads mission statement*). That's in the packet of materials that council adopted in Nov 2018.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) Am I the only one that doesn't consider that a mission?
- Dan Radulovich (B) It is broad. The closest we came up with were our 5 Values. How often do we need to talk about it?
 - Jon Buck (B) Are we aligning with that?

Agenda Item #9) Discuss Possible Second Meeting in July 2021

- Dan Radulovich (B) We need to jump ahead a little bit and discuss another, second meeting so we can prioritize before ballot initiative. July 7th?
- Keith Reester (S) End of July is fine.
 - Brent Thompson (S) Council is having a meeting with the Consultant on July 27th.
 - Keith Reester (S) Get a list put together of projects that will work its way through City Department. Doesn't go to Council first because departments advice Council—there's processes in place.
- Dan Flynn (B) Is it OK as is or are we creating more work for ourselves?
 - Dan Radulovich (B) It at least needs revisited. Especially after COVID.
 - Dan Flynn (B) Considering time restraints, I think we should just be looking for objections.
 - Dan Radulovich (B) Speaking of time restraints, we can't do it tonight and there's other items we need to discuss. I won't want to rush this.
- Geoff Selzer (B) Everyone go back and do homework independently with this list (in handout). How big is this list supposed to be? Certain size of budget? Number on the list?
- Keith Reester (S) Just had this discussion today with staff and Arapahoe County. Everyone is struggling with the same problem—other Transportation Boards, “what do we do and say?” Lots of lists and little money, “what do we spend it on?” Englewood specifically. Show them with the ½ cent increase – how that would help. Or bring them our priorities in a multi-model bucket. Pick ten projects for next five years.
 - Dan Radulovich (B) We took projects off the TMP and how long they would take. Staff ranked them on most impact and cost to impact ratio. Dan Radulovich took cost divided by impact and put together list. It was a good start.
 - Keith Reester (S) I will recommend, to set aside money for local match. We've never setup that framework. Our grants are at risk because we didn't do that.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) Finance isn't our job. Its projects.
 - Keith Reester (S) That's true. From a programmatic standpoint, I was just throwing that out there because one of our challenges this year is the Trail Gap Analysis that staff is working on, that's also tied into Bike/Ped Plan and the Open Space Plan. So, there may be some items we present that go with other programmatic, project specific things. There's generally not a process where boards create a list and goes straight to Council. We work with the Clerk to get it in the packet for Council. We want to make sure when it gets to Council it's in a good form and follows public process, under law. Make it look pretty. I know this is frustrating for you.
- Dan Radulovich (B) Adding an extra meeting? When/were works for staff? Staff pick 3 or 4 days that works for you and we'll go off that.
 - Keith Reester (S) The only reason we can't do hybrid is because Council isn't and we have to follow suit. Treat it as a “study session” but you can't meet on Council meeting days. Could declare as a work session. Still have to do minutes.
 - *All Board (date discussions)*
 - Stephanie Kelly (B) *Comments working in Finance and large numbers on screen.*
 - Keith Reester (S) These aren't even a drop in the bucket. Mineral and Santa Fe is \$90M to do a grade separated interchange.
 - Brent Thompson (S) ½ cent increase in tax is \$6.5M and ¾ cent increase is \$10M annually.
 - Keith Reester (S) I can tell you right now it won't be ¾. They won't pass that and also, some will go to facilities and grounds.
- Geoff Selzer (B) Looking at this packet and list can you give us a short version in the difference of what you've given us today and where we left off in 2020?
 - Brent Thompson (S) Short version is we've put this into three buckets like Council suggested: Vehicles, Bikes Peds and all safety mobility plans. Taking everything that's in the TMP as well as that list and identifying specific projects that fit into those buckets and plans. And to Stephanie's revenue question, with the \$6.5M in taxes we've also met with bonds. It would generate between \$30M and \$40M in bonds.

- Keith Reester (S) We could wait and trickle in money or front it with projected revenue—which we'll do and is typical.
- Brent Thompson (S) *(Starts presentation 27 projects identified off Excel sheet on screen.)*
 - First 9 are from "High Injury Networks" from TMP including 14 intersections needing to improve and we've done all but 2.
- Shane Roberts (S) FYI numbers on the left correlate with numbers on the map.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) Is there an easy way to cross-reference these numbers on spreadsheet with the last numbers we had?
 - Brent (S) Yes, should be easy because they're identified in TMP.
 - Shane (S) They're will be more explanation because in these two lists, one of the main projects the board wanted to identify is tied into a TMP project but doesn't directly call out yours by name—it's tucked in there. We'll take your top ten projects and tie in the explanations for the cross-reference.
- Dany Flynn (B) Any there any projects on list that are controversial? That individuals would feel concerned about? Take land or eliminate access?
 - Brent Thompson (S) Nothing that I can envision. They may come up but no guarantees though.
 - Shane Roberts (S) Any that I can think of, its minimal. Land that no one will miss.
- Geoff Selzer (B) Is there a framework to decide where our 3 most dangerous intersections are, relative to other communities like ours....are they way worse than average?
 - Keith Reester (S) Its crash data and high-volume areas. We apply for grants specifically tied to our high accident areas--DRCOG pulls that data together. It can be apples to oranges. We can try to show that one intersection is way worse than another. It's part of PEL. Can't compare factors from Santa Fe to Ridge Road.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) Not sure you're answering... If our worst intersection is Santa Fe and Mineral and we look at other intersections with similar volumes, even though in other communities, that number can be really good.
 - Keith Reester (S) That sounds great but the first place people look is right in front of their house. It's that myopic.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) I get it, just looking at the budgets and spending from second percentile to first on accident rates doesn't seem.....
 - Brent Thompson (S) Everyone one of these projects that you see if already currently funded. It's why we go after grants.
 - *Discussion of grant columns on list and how match varies by project and grant.*
- Aaron Heumann (S) There is process out there and a company that sells software and analyzes intersections throughout the state. We don't have it because it's too expensive but Arapahoe County does and last year helped us identify which intersections in our community fit within higher level zones. We used it before the TMP and identified projects. PEL also used to looked up and down the corridor. Santa Fe and Mineral is the second worse. Worst is Mississippi. The purpose for Arapahoe County was to search for grants that are on the HSIP (*Highway Safety Improvement Program*) program especially if there's a safety concern and pursue with CDOT.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) are there any on our list that weren't on Arapahoe Counties.
 - Aaron Heumann (S) Yes, Church and Prince #10 but we were able to get a "Safer Main Streets" grant to pay for that one. We only had to pay 20% of that total cost as our match. There's so many more specifics we could into on each of these projects because they cover such a wide range of needs our your list that we're blocking together and trying to maximize with grants.
- Dan Flynn (B) What's the difference between Video Detection and PTZ Camera?
 - Aaron Heumann (S) Video Detection actually detects the cars and counts them. Pan Tilt Zoom moves the camera, looks up and down the corridor to detection congestion, we see it, police see it and we can respond faster.
- Brent Thompson (S) *Continues to quickly read through other items*
- Geoff Selzer (B) So, these lists are basically a combination of all the items staff and the board want?

- Brent Thompson (S) Yes. There's no guarantee that all 27 will make it in front of Council though.
- Keith Reester (S) Here's the process: Voter lines can be long so not everything will be listed in detail....
 - *Shane Roberts (S) describes they're prioritized by categorizations and mapped accordingly.*

Agenda Item #7) Staff Updates

- Dan Radulovich (B) No more questions please. We may skip over this section unless there's important info about Construction and Maintenance and Downtown Planning update?
- Brent Thompson (S) I want to say, get it out to the community to please slowdown in cone zones. We're seeing a lot of speeding and near misses.
 - Geoff Selzer (B) It would be nice to have this conversation with the police department as well.
-

Agenda Item #8) Decide on New Nov, Dec 2021 Meeting Dates

Not met at this time due to late running meeting.

Agenda Item #10) Board Comments

Not met at this time due to late running meeting.

Adjourned 9:04 PM

Project	TMP Project #	TMB Ranking	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	SAFETY	CONGESTION	PEDESTRIAN/BIKE	NEIGHBORHOOD & MAINTENANCE PROJECTS	Downtown	Leverageability	Tech & Innov	Multimodal Accessibility	Notes	Grant	Local Match	Grant	Local Match	Total Project	Total Cost		
													Awarded	Obligated	Opportunity	Anticipated	Cost			
Block A	001	A17	7	Broadway and Littleton Blvd Intersection Improvements	X	X	X					High Injury intersection project, Mobility	\$ 1,440,000	\$ 160,000			\$ 1,600,000			
	002	A18	*	Broadway & Mineral Avenue Intersection Improvements	X	X	X					High Injury intersection project, Mobility	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 150,000			\$ 1,500,000			
	003	A12	N/A	Bowles & Platte Canyon Intersection Improvements	X	X	X					High Injury intersection project, Mobility, 100% CDOT funded	\$ 1,470,000	\$ -			\$ 1,470,000			
	004	A20	*	Mineral & Platte Canyon Intersection Improvements	X	X	X					High Injury intersection project, Mobility, 100% CDOT funded	\$ 980,000	\$ -			\$ 980,000			
	005	A22, BP37, BP45, A47*, BP82	2	Mineral Station East Mobility-shed Improvements	X	X	X					High Injury intersection project, Transit, Mobility	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 400,000			\$ 2,000,000			
	006	A1, A8, A9	N/A	Belleview Corridor Safety Improvements	X	X	X					High Injury intersection project, Mobility, 100% CDOT funded	\$ 2,900,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,900,000			
	007	A34, BP27	*	Santa Fe & Prince Intersection Improvements	X	X	X					High Injury intersection project, Mobility	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,200,000			
	008	A41	*	County Line Road Widening - Broadway to University	X	X	X					High Injury intersection project	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000,000			
	009	A3, A24, A47*, BP38	2	Santa Fe & Mineral Intersection Operations & Safety Improvements	X	X	X					High Injury intersection project, Transit, Mobility	\$ 9,152,000	\$ 2,289,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,441,000			
	010	A21, BP18	*	Church & Prince Intersection Improvements/Prince Street Link Project	X		X					Transit, Mobility, Downtown	\$ 615,000	\$ 154,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 769,000			
	011	A39, BP68	* 3	Broadway Traffic Signal Improvements	X	X						Pole Replacement, Fiber connection, cameras, signal timing	\$ 589,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 4,724,000			
	016	BP46	N/A	Slaughterhouse Gulch Park Trail Connection	X		X						\$ 254,000	\$ 420,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 674,000			
022	Maintenance	N/A	Windermere Street Bridge Replacement over High Line Canal	X		X	X					\$ 1,440,000	\$ 360,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,800,000				
													\$ 24,790,000	\$ 5,268,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000				
Block B	012	A34, A2, BP27	*	Advancing future improvements identified in Santa Fe PEL to leverage future TIP funds (Santa Fe/Prince, Santa Fe/Crestline, Sumner to Bowles NB lane addition, wayfinding). East/West Trail Connections to Mary Carter Greenway (north of Bowles Santa Fe underpass, others)	X	X	X					Three buckets - Early Action Projects, NEPA advancement, Long Term Projects. Early Action Projects anticipated to be funded by CDOT FASTER funds	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 25,000,000			
	013	BP47	N/A		X		X					ACOS grant trail connections study planned in 2022 to define routes, including Trailmark	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,400,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 3,000,000			
	019	BP86*, BP87*	1,4	Park-to-Park & trail connectivity	X		X					Wayfinding and trail connection improvements to Community Trail, Little's Creek, Slaughterhouse Gulch, Prince Street bike lane & sidewalk widening	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 5,000,000			
	020	BP87*	4	Downtown sidewalk/trail connection improvements	X		X					Improving connectivity and mobility in and around downtown. Mobility Study in 2022.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 15,000,000			
	021	T7*, T8*, T13*(Recommended Study in TMP)	5,6	Downtown Streetscape/Mobility Study	X		X						\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			
	024	Maintenance	N/A	County Line Road Bridge Replacement over High Line Canal	X		X	X					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,680,000	\$ 420,000	\$ 2,100,000			
	025	Maintenance	N/A	Bowles Avenue Bridge Replacement over South Platte River	X		X	X					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,720,000	\$ 680,000	\$ 3,400,000			
	026	Maintenance	N/A	Annual Street Resurfacing & Reconstruction			X	X					Resurfacing approximately 2.5 miles per year, including ADA improvements and bike lanes where appropriate (approximately \$600,000/year)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,000,000	\$ 22,000,000		
028	Maintenance	N/A	Signal Redesign Project	X		X	X					\$500,000/year	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 7,500,000				
29a	N/A	N/A	Set-aside for Local Match on future grant projects	X	X	X						\$1M/year	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 7,500,000			
													\$ -	\$ -	\$ 46,800,000	\$ 48,700,000				\$ 53,968,000
Block C	014	BP45	N/A	High Line Canal & Mineral Avenue Grade Separated Trail	X		X						\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 5,000,000			
	015	BP44	N/A	High Line Canal & Broadway Grade Separated Trail	X		X					Currently being studied by High Line Canal Conservancy & Arapahoe County	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 10,000,000			
	017	N/A	N/A	Sidewalk & Trail Improvements to Library/Museum	X		X	X					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 150,000			
	018	Maintenance	N/A	Rangeview Drive Trail Improvements	X		X	X					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000			
	023	Maintenance	N/A	Gallup Street Bridge Replacement over High Line Canal	X		X	X					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,520,000	\$ 380,000	\$ 1,900,000			
	027	Maintenance	N/A	Annual Street Resurfacing & Reconstruction			X	X					Reconstructing approximately 1.5 miles per year, including ADA improvements and bike lanes where appropriate. Examples include Aberdeen Village	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,000,000	\$ 22,000,000		
	29b	N/A	N/A	Set-aside for Local Match on future grant projects	X	X	X						\$1M/year	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 7,500,000		

Other Projects Mentioned

"Flume" Pedestrian Bridge at Littleton Station	\$5,000,000
Lee Gulch Pedestrian Underpass at Broadway	\$4,000,000
Powers Ave Traffic Circle Reconstruction	\$3,250,000
ADA Plan Funding	\$80,000,000
Medianscaping	\$5,000,000

\$ 24,790,000 \$ 5,268,000 \$ 62,440,000 \$ 83,810,000 \$ 176,308,000

Grant Awarded	Local Match Obligated	Grant Opportunity	Local Match Anticipated	Total Project Cost
---------------	-----------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	--------------------

Total Local Funds Needed \$ 89,078,000

**Work towards \$50M bond

Other non-transportation projects
 Building Improvements
 Belleview Campus
 Skunk Hollow Water Quality
 Reynold's Landing/Superchi
 Undergrounding

Reorganized Project List

Block A

- Block A, highlighted green, represents grants that have been won that need the local match by the City. During our discussion it was agreed that these need to be funded at \$5.3 million. We did not discuss the Broadway Traffic Signal Improvement line of \$2 million for 'grant opportunity' and associated match, it was simply overlooked and may need to be broken out as a separate project.

Block B

- Block B contains projects that were deemed to have good value during our meeting discussion. It was thought that these could all be funded at or below \$50 million which is our target. A miscalculation came when the Signal Redesign Project was originally listed at \$3 million but after discussion it should have been \$7.5 million for \$500K over 15 years. A new column was added to include the 'total cost' which is the 'local match obligated' from Block A added to the 'local match anticipated' of Block B. This currently sits just above the \$50 million goal.
- There are 2 shades in Block B, the yellow is possible grant funded projects and the blue are projects where the City is the only funding source. To be clear, we are hoping to get grants for all of the projects in yellow, if we do not the funding falls very short.

Block C

- Block C contains projects that are seen as less valuable than the others at this time.

Other Items

- None of the projects within the blocks have been ranked. We will need to do this in Blocks B and C (the A Block will be funded except for the Broadway Traffic Signal Improvements 'Opportunity').
- The five 'Common Values' we created were added to the list. The staff filled out the Safety column. The others were intentionally left unmarked. We should try to fill them in before the meeting and update this as we move forward with our discussions among ourselves and with staff.
- At the bottom of the page, 'other projects mentioned' was added. All of these were brought up during our discussion. Cost for these projects are high-level educated guesses at what the project might cost from staff.

- Items 026 and 027 were combined into one pool of money called ‘Annual Street Resurfacing and Reconstruction’. The total need/want here would be \$44 million. We can split this into other dollar values if we want to. Using this broader definition will allow the expertise of staff to make the call as to if a street needs resurfacing or reconstruction down the road.
- Item 029 was split into two items, a and b, at \$7.5 million each to match. We can assign different values if we like but the total value of the two should add up to \$15 million.

Suggestions

The projects tend to fall into one of two categories. The first is projects the City is completely on the hook for, think of Resurfacing and Reconstruction of streets. The second is projects that we hope to get grants for. Examples include things like the Downtown Streetscape/Mobility project.

Based on our meeting we need to have some of both. One way of looking at this is splitting the total dollars into ‘projects we have to pay for’ and ‘projects we can get help with’. From our meeting a suggested starting point would look something like this:

- \$50 million total budget
- \$30 million for “City Only” projects (resurface and repair as well as the signal redesign)
- \$5 million for grants that have already been awarded
- \$15 million for projects, hopefully grant assisted

This is an appropriate 60/40 split for rebuild/repair of existing infrastructure vs new projects that are needed. This board would then concentrate on coming up with a ranked list of projects that apply to the \$15 million of future projects.