**NATA Orientation Retreat Meeting Minutes**

**January 25, 2020**

**8:30am -12:00pm**

**Hilton Garden Inn, 14725 Lincoln, St. Thornton, CO 80023**

**NATA Attendees**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Kent Moorman** | Thornton Staff | **Jenny Willford** | Northglenn Mayor Pro tem |
| **Chris Montoya** | Brighton Staff | **Steve O’Dorisio** | Adams County Commissioner |
| **Julia Marvin** | Thornton Council | **Malcom Fleming** | Erie Town Manager |
| **Gregory Mills** | Brighton Mayor | **Elaine Sweeney** | Federal Heights Council |
| **Brook Svoboda** | Northglenn Staff | **Anita Seitz** | Westminster Mayor Pro tem |
| **Jessica Sandgren** | Thornton Mayor Pro tem | **Sara Dusenberry** | Northglenn Staff |
| **Julie Mullica** | Northglenn Council | **Joan Peck** | Longmont Council |
| **Celeste Arner** | Federal Heights Council | **Karen Stuart** | Smart Commute |
| **Tammy Herreid** | Smart Commute | **Carson Priest** | Smart Commute |

**Welcome and Introductions by Chair Julie Mullica**

**Attendees were provided with a resource book with materials covered in the power point presentation.**

* **2020 NATA Board Representatives**
  + Karen Stuart introduced the 2020 NATA representatives from the 13 participating jurisdictions along with positions saved for Metro North Partnership (Chamber) and ACED. NATA Board leadership for 2020 was also announced: Julia Mullica is Chair, Jessica Sandgren is Vice Chair, and Joan Peck is Treasurer.
* **Brief History of NATA Formation**
  + Karen gave a brief history of how NATA was founded. NATA was initially created to address the recognized need to speak with a unified voice advocating for improvements on I-25 North and N-Line. Using the successful efforts of the US 36 Mayors and Commissioners Coalition as a model for collaborative advocacy, the 13 jurisdictions on and near the I-25 corridor became the north Area Transportation Alliance in 2009. Karen presented the current NATA mission, bylaws, membership dues list, boundary map, guiding principles and shared values. These documents can be updated or changed by amendment, to better reflect the current positions and needs of NATA. Chair Mullica suggested that NATA look at increasing the dues for 2021 since they have not been updated since 2014. Karen highlighted the resolution process that requires consensus from NATA membership to send out a position letter or approve a policy resolution; consensus doesn’t mean a unanimous vote, but a majority support that all members can live with and agree not to undermine.
* **NATA’s relationship with SCMN** 
  + Karen gave a brief history of NATA’s relationship with Smart Commute through a DRCOG TMO start up grant in 2012, creating it as a legal non-profit organization with the ability of the TMO to leverage private investment, pursue public and private investment, pursue grant funding, and participate in local community outreach, providing information, programs and advocacy for transportation improvements and investments, and mobility and transit improvements . Smart Commute is the current administrator for NATA on a part-time basis.
* **Review of NATA’s Past Advocacy**
  + Carson reviewed a list of NATA’s past position letters from 2012 - 2019 and pointed out that all of the letters along with every PowerPoint presentation are online in-full for each member’s reference. Brook pointed out that the position letters have had a direct impact the progress of projects along I-25 North and other specific areas.
* **Resource Materials**
  + Tammy reviewed the resource materials included in the reference binder and presentation regarding transportation acronyms, CDOT Engineering and Transportation Commission regions, RTD Directors regions, and the project segments along I-25 North.
* **NATA Partnerships / Matrix of Influence**
  + Tammy and Karen discussed the partner organizations of NATA presented in the resource binder and presentation. Those partner organizations include DRCOG, RTD, CDOT, HPTE, Cites, Counties, ADCOG Forum and SCMN. Karen noted that NATA membership has made it a priority to pursue influential positions within each of these partner organizations and beyond, resulting in the matrix of influence presented in the reference binder. Kent noted that Carson should be added as an Advanced Mobility Partnership member, and that the federal delegation staff members should also be included.
* **Review of 2018-2019 Master Project List** 
  + Brook spoke to NATA’s position papers and advocacy efforts that influenced the I-25 TIGER Grant for Segment 2 and got the ball rolling on that project. Brook also noted how the priority projects list was created with the help of a facilitator. Kent gave a brief synopsis on the process that NATA uses to make edits to the master project list and referenced the white paper included in the reference binder. Kent explained the three tiers of projects on NATA’s master project list, including Priority, Endorsed and Horizon projects. In order to provide an example of specific projects that need a strategic advocacy effort by NATA to see success, Karen presented the North I-25/84th to Thornton Parkway PEL Improvements project, and, the SH7/I-25 Mobility Hub project. Both are regional projects with multi-jurisdictional stakeholders that have both highway and transit components that would benefit every one of the 13 jurisdictions within NATA’s boundaries. Attendees saw an illustrative flythrough video of the proposed configuration for the SH7/1-25 mobility hub and interchange that includes a diverging diamond, local transit options, regional transit center loading platforms and protected bike/pedestrian paths through the center of the interchange. Malcolm mentioned that when the diverging diamond interchange that was built at McCaslin Blvd & US36, it resulted in a 30% decrease in left turn lane crashes.

Suggested action items:

* + NATA representatives individual staff will review existing projects spreadsheet, update and add a column with details about the status of each specific project.
  + The updated priority project list will go to the NATA reps for review and any project amendment (addition) can be discussed (and approved) at the May NATA meeting .
  + Malcom Fleming asked if there is a way to quantify the impact of projects on the priority list to show their relative value compared to other transit/transportation options or alternatives. For instance, is it possible to evaluate whether adding transit service where it does not exist, or more frequent transit service where it exists a more cost effective way to move people through a corridor than adding additional vehicle lanes.
* **2013 Transportation Connections Handout**
  + Chair Mullica discussed her desire to update the *Transportation Connections* (2014) leave behind pamphlet that highlights NATA’s region wide background and priorities.
  + SMCN staff will edit this document with updated stats. The insert page featuring individual communities can be customized with local information to insert into the booklet.
  + Target for the updated pamphlet is early March so jurisdictions can have it for their DC visits the end of March.
* **Focus for 2020** 
  + Chair Mullica led a discussion around what 2020 should look like for NATA as a regional organization and came to the conclusion that the following things will be discussed at future NATA meetings as a part of the organization’s 2020 work plan.
    - SCMN staff will provide a brief synopsis of the monthly NATA meetings and disseminate to NATA membership by COB of the Monday following a NATA meeting.
    - NATA reps staff to begin updating the Master Priority Project list for the May NATA meeting.
    - Commissioner O’Dorisio expressed interest in seeing a series of videos that would help public and elected officials better understand the various technical project development documents (i.e. EA, EIS, NEPA, CatEx, etc) so that they are proficient in discussing them in a policy setting. SCMN staff will research what existing resources may exist in this area from DRCOG and CDOT.
    - Discussion on how is the best way to communicate status of projects, policies etc. to the public in a way that is easy to understand
    - Joan Peck suggested the NATA Board evaluate the list of bullet points from the letter originally sent to Dave Genova to determine actionable follow throughs.
    - Chair Mullica mentioned we need to look at how our transportation needs are going to change over the next 10 years and what we need to do to meet that, for example aging population, technology advancements, younger incoming generations, etc.
    - Chair Mullica suggested forming a series of subcommittees at the February meeting to address NATA’s priorities heading into 2020. List of possible subcommittees to be determined at February SPC.
* **Other Discussion**
  + There was a general consensus is that no one has faith in “Re-imagine RTD”. Karen said RTD doesn’t look at anything logically and that 58% of RTD staff have problems with their supervisors.
  + Brook suggested NATA has the opportunity to give RTD a consensus policy point around what NATA wants RTD to actually accomplish, especially during a time of transition with new management at RTD.
  + Brook polled the room on positive and negative actions that RTD is taking for/with each jurisdiction:
    - What are they not doing or doing wrong:
      * Northglenn (Mullica) – everything
      * Longmont (Peck) – too much focus on First & Final mile
      * Thornton (Sandgren) – refuse to provide information to their constituents
      * Adams County (O’Dorisio) – too much focus on Denver south
      * Brighton (Chris) – not focusing on increasing ridership
      * Brighton (Mills) – we pay into RTD like everyone else, but still no service
      * Erie (Malcolm) – almost no service, period
      * Northglenn (Sarah) – the N Line, still not opened
    - What are they doing right?
      * Adams County (O’Dorisio) – we have good board members for the north now that give us a voice
      * Thornton (Kent) – the board is starting to take back control
    - Brook said NATA needs to find out what the actual dollar number is that RTD has received from the NATA area since taxes began and the actual dollar amount that has been reinvested in the north metro area. Karen said that RTD is currently doing this internally.
  + Commissioner O’Dorisio said the DRCOG data for population and development is detrimental to our north end and affects the grading systems for project selection so that the NATA region walks into the room and loses out immediately. This stresses the important of the DRCOG/NATA subcommittee on Data for 2020.