**NATA Board Meeting Minutes**

**April 26, 2018**

**7:30-9:00am**

**Adams County Economic Development, 12200 Pecos Street, Westminster**

**Welcome by Chair Lynn Baca and introductions.**

**NATA Members (who signed in)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Steve O’Dorisio** | Adams County Comm. | **Julie Mullica** | Northglenn Council |
| **Chaz Tedesco** | Adams City Comm. | **Ashley Kaade** | Northglenn Staff |
| **Kristin Sullivan** | Adams County Staff | **Catherine Sanders** | SCMN |
| **Lynn Baca** | Brighton Council | **Cathy Bird** | SCMN |
| **Christopher Montoya** | Brighton Staff | **Sam Nizam** | Thornton City Council |
| **Kevin Standbridge** | Broomfield Staff | **Kent Moorman** | Thornton Staff |
| **Maria D’Andrea** | Commerce City Staff | **Kevin Forgett** | Thornton Staff |
| **Daniel Dick** | Federal Heights Mayor | **Maria DeCambra** | Westminster City Coun. |
| **Renae Stavros** | Federal Heights Staff | **Herb Atchison** | Westminster Mayor |
| **Joan Peck** | Longmont City Council | **Debra Baskett** | Westminster Staff |
| **Phil Greenwald** | Longmont Staff | **Jeanne Shreve** | Adams County Staff |

**SCMN Members (who signed in)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tony Marcello** | DEA | **Mark Shotkoski** | NWP |
| **Joe Zufall** | Michael Baker Intl. | **Ina Zisman** | WSP |
| **Sean Oroho** | Michael Baker Intl. |

**Agency Partners (who signed in)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Aaron Greco** | CDOT | **Donny Herrmann** | CDOT |
| **Adnana Murtic** | CDOT | **Alex Gordon** | NRFMPO |
| **Alazar Tesfeye** | CDOT | **Henry Stopplecamp** | RTD |
| **Andy Stratton** | CDOT | **Judy Lubow** | RTD |
| **Angie Drumm** | CDOT | **Paul Solano** | RTD |
| **Dan Marcucci** | CDOT | **Doug Rex** | DRCOG |
| **Morgan Cullen** | CML |  |  |

 **Guests (who signed in)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ben Stein** | Rep. Mike Coffman |
| **Ryan Hanson** | Sen. Cory Gardner |

* **Approval of March 22, 2018 Minutes**

***Approval of March 22, 2018 Meeting Minutes:*** *Motion to approve minutes made by Mayor Atchison, seconded by Councilmember Sam Nizam and approved unanimously.*

* **Treasurer’s Report – Commissioner Tedesco**

**Commissioner Tedesco:** I’ve asked Debra to present for me.

**Debra Basket**: We are in great financial shape – everyone has paid their dues. We currently have a balance of $46,138.83. First quarter expenditures included paying Smart Commute for dues and administrative services ($32,744.00) and paying remaining fee to Revolution Advisors ($3,787.50). There are no outstanding or anticipated expenses or income.

* **Legislative Update- Morgan Cullen, Legislative and Policy Advocate, Colorado Municipal League Morgan Cullen**: (Provided Memo as a quick review of the transportation funding items happening in 2018, plus history from 2017). There are less than two weeks in the session, so this is a very busy time, thank you for letting me speak at the beginning of the agenda.

SB1 – (reviewed details from the memo, including changes to amendments in the bill, how it will interact with SB-267 in 2017, and how SB-1 and HB-1340 interact). I spoke with Rep. Faith Winter, Chair of the House Transportation & Energy Committee. The Bill will be heard May 1, which doesn’t leave much time in the session. The House has a lot of ideas on how they would like this money to be spent. The House is also worried about allocating $250M each year when there are so many other funding needs (for instance, education). They are also concerned about a Bond. They also have their own funding priorities – for instance, they would like to see a local share-back, and see a multimodal component for funding. SB1 still has a lot of steps and readings to go through before it is passes, and not a lot of time.

HB 1340 – (reviewed details from the memo). This is the “default” bill in case SB1 fails, to make sure transportation funding is provided this year. Both parties want to see Transportation funding.

SB 267 (2017) – (reviewed details in the memo). Starting in July, SB 267 can move forward, and they can issue COPs. If any funding becomes available in the fall, then the COPs will need to be paid back before bonds can move forward (all of these bills are interrelated).

Fall Ballot Initiatives – (reviewed details in the memo). This year, two groups must go out to get signatures for a ballot measure. If they succeed, then Bonding language will disappear from any passed bills. If the ballot measure fails, there will be the funding through SB1 ($500M this year, $250M every year after) or HB1340. CDOT is working on an amendment to make moneys available more quickly. There are also some amendments to make money available to local governments.

There was some managed lanes language added to SB1, but most people agree that language will be stripped out.

There are a number of ballot questions that are being reviewed. The CCA and the Denver Metro Chamber are waiting to see what the legislature does before finalizing language.

Any questions or comments? I’d love to hear what you all are hearing.

**Aaron Greco:** That $250M in perpetuity has an “asterisks” next to it – this doesn’t bind future assemblies from preserving that money.

**Morgan Cullen:** Yes, every year that allocation could change. We are also getting closer to our TABOR cap. Both create challenges.

**Ben Stein:** Is the argument only about all the funding going to highways, or are there other elements being discussed?

**Morgan Cullen:** I can’t specifically address. In 2017, the issue came down to the multimodal provision, the Republicans only had issue with multimodal, not with local government funding. This year, in the current form, local governments are getting more than they would have in 2017. The Governor’s Office of Planning and Budgeting has concerns about the $250M annually going forward, and also has concerns with the one-time $500M. It changes day-by-day. The memo is relevant until the end of this week, and then is obsolete (joke).

* **Smart Commute Metro North Update - Cathy Bird**

**Cathy Bird:** presented a short presentation highlighting upcoming events

* **TransForum:** We have a date for our TransForum: June 22. There will not be a NATA meeting in June, we ask instead that you Save the Date for TransForum, with registration opening in May. We’re grateful to be able to use the Panasonic space and hear from experts about our readiness for autonomous vehicles.

**Ben Stein:** There is a difference between autonomous and connected, will this just focus on autonomy?

**Cathy Bird:** No, both will be discussed. There will be a demonstration of an autonomous vehicle in the tour, as well as a tour of a V2V Communications Command Center.

* **Bike to Work Day:** This is coming up on June 27, and we can provide you with posters to promote the event. There is also an invitation for a workshop we are hosting here at our office on May 3, 7:30 – 8:30 (includes burritos). Please contact me with any questions. We do have a few Bike to Work Day stations registered in the north metro. On May 1, registration opens for cyclists.
* **Full Moon Bike Rides in Brighton:** Starting April 29 (this Sunday) through the summer, Full Moon rides happen every full moon in the evening. It’s a great family-friendly event throughout the summer.

**Chair Baca:**  If you have something happening in your jurisdiction that you’d like us to promote, please let us know. We’re adding Longmont to our agenda for May, to present on initiatives and projects in the City of Longmont, and Joan Peck will present.

* **CDOT Road Safety Audit for I-25 – Angie Drumm**

**Angie Drumm:** (Presentation available on the NATA website)

A Road Safety Audit is when CDOT reaches out to FHWA, brings in local staff, and both look together at a problem (slide shows steps). Light circle shows a “CDOT function,” dark circles show FHWA and local functions. Thornton reached out in 2016 with an observation about increased crashes on a segment of I-25. CDOT agreed, and decided a road audit was appropriate. That allowed CDOT to bring in others, to see the problem “outside the box.” The audit started it in the summer in July 2017. In September field reviews were done to observe what was happening. A menu of options were established. CDOT is determining the steps to move forward with.

**Alazar Tesfeye (CDOT):** We took a look at 2012-2016 crash data. As you can see on the slide, 90% of accidents are congestion related. The crash rate has been increasing since 2012. The crash rate before the toll was implemented was lower – however, for the study we only had 6-months of data with the open toll lane. This data shows that the crash rate is increasing with the opening of the managed lanes (seeing speed differential, weaving in and out of express lane). We will monitor the crash rate moving forward.

**Angie Drumm:** The Road Safety Audit comes from a place where “no idea is a bad idea” – it emphasizes collaboration. Options fall into Engineering, Enforcement, and Education. (more detail on slide). We also evaluated whether options were short-term or long-term. There were 34 options total.

This is a good time to remind everyone that this is an interim project, and when we implement a full project, we can make additional major changes.

Thornton was very vocal in the process. I can’t speak to what happened in the past, but I can commit that we are going to do an incident management plan. We heard from Law Enforcement that they don’t feel safe – there is no space to “sit” out there. We want to acknowledge that, and CDOT is looking into paying for overtime for more patrols in the area, that officers can drive through the corridor for additional presence. We are going to see what law enforcement thinks as well.

(Slide on completed fixes). We are working on clarity for driver cues with these initial fixes. We just implemented rumble strips between the buffer zone, to provide another cue to drivers, for instance.

(Slide on underway fixes). We have a draft report, and conclusions from the report will also feed into these steps. For instance, we observed that staged busses on I-25 were causing drivers to brake, so we’re asking RTD to address this with us.

**Commissioner O’Dorisio:** Would a middle bus lane increase the safety of this segment?

**Andy Stratton:** Yes, it would improve safety.

**Commissioner O’Dorisio:** So CDOT can acknowledge that this would improve safety for all, and perhaps provide funding?

**Andy Stratton:** The bus-station median project is in our list of projects for funding.

**Angie Drumm:** (reviewed slides on planned engineering fixes, educational fixes). We are looking to combine enforcement with education, because past projects have seen success with that method.

**Ben Stein:** The rate of accidents is up, but has the severity of accidents changed?

**Alazar Tesfeye:** The severity has stayed the same.

**Angie Drumm:** We aren’t seeing a deviation from the trend as the data moves forward.

**Councilmember Julie Mullica:** Thank you for doing this. I live near this area in 88th. I think the varying speeds and rushing of drivers contribute. This is an important issue for the communities in this area.

**Director Lubow:** How did it happen that this segment turned out to be so problematic? You guys build highways all the time.

**Angie Drumm:** That’s a good question. Sometimes you have a good plan on paper, but when you implement it, drivers don’t behave the way you thought. We are learning lessons from all our Managed Lanes projects and incorporating what we’ve learned into future projects. The lesson here is that we need to provide space for enforcement. Without enforcement, we can’t emphasize to people the behavior we want.

**Kent Moorman**: This is an interim project, and we were trying to squeeze extra lanes in there. There was no extra space. We looked at areas in Denver that have narrow lanes and shoulders but still seemed to work; however, we had no idea how the managed lanes would impact behavior. We need to have more space on the shoulder and between General Purpose and Managed Lanes.

**Commissioner Tedesco:** Did your study include arterial traffic? What we see in this area on 120th, 104th, 84th, once the highway gets congested, people start making bad decisions in these arterials to find a new route, creating more incidents.

**Angie Drumm:** We took a look at the feeding into the highway, but didn’t evaluate the arterials themselves – the focus was on the ramps. We had some options that would reconfigure ramps. But, no, didn’t look at arterials.

**Chair Baca:** We really appreciate your presentation, that is a major roadway for our north metro, and this corridor effects our economy up here. I personally try to avoid I-25 as much as possible. We appreciate your working with the jurisdictions. We look forward to an update in the future.

**Angie Drumm:** We plan to monitor the data every 6 months to see what changes occur based on solutions we implement, to evaluate the effectiveness.

* **Overview: DRCOG’s Sub-Regional Project process and NATA Advocacy**

**Chair Baca:** We have talked about this at SPC. We want to reiterate at this time that NATA is an advocacy group. I want to give some background from 2017 – we looked at our master priorities project list. We came up with a three-tiered project list (rather than ranking projects individually). For instance, in the sub-regional project process, NATA will actively advocate for projects in our Priority Projects list. This is all outlined in the process we approved in January.

I did have a question for Doug Rex. Is it too early as a board to have staff put together a list of projects to advocate for on the regional and sub-regional list?

**Doug Rex:** It isn’t too late to advocate for, we now understand what the criteria will be at the regional level for projects. I don’t think that Adams County has had it’s first formal meeting as a sub-region. Most sub-regions are going to use the regional criteria as a foundation for the sub-regional projects. You are in good shape as a sub-region because you already have a list of projects. I’d suggest that you look at your list and see how they score based on the regional criteria, if they meet the criteria set by the DRCOG board. I don’t think it’s time for letter-writing, but the fact you’re thinking about it is a good thing.

**Chair Baca:** I noticed that this NATA meeting is on the DRCOG website calendar for today – I wanted to see if we need to have time for public comment at this meeting because our meeting is listed there.

**Doug Rex:** You do not need a public comment period, it is on the DRCOG website because there are three or more DRCOG board members present, and this is to make sure we are transparent.

**Chair Baca**: (Presented dates of upcoming Sub-Regional meetings, which can always be found on the [DRCOG’s website](https://drcog.org/programs/transportation-planning/transportation-improvement-program/2020-2023-transportationhttps%3A/drcog.org/programs/transportation-planning/transportation-improvement-program/2020-2023-transportation).) The sub-regional meetings are open meetings, so if you are a resident of any of these areas, you are welcome to attend and observe.

* **Quarterly Call for Amendments to NATA’s Master Projects List – Jeanne Shreve**

**Chair Baca:** We adopted a master project list in January after work all in 2017. One thing we observed as a board is that our list of projects in the past was very stagnant, so we changed our process and added a quarterly amendment process. If a local project meets the criteria to move up a tier, local governments can propose changing the tier for their projects.

**Jeanne Shreve:** This is all up on the NATA website. There will be a call for amendments in May. At some point between now and next Wednesday, there will be an email sent out to all NATA members and staff, and the document will be attached so that staff can review and send in projects.

**Chair Baca:** If your jurisdiction has an amendment, the email will come from Karen Stuart or Cathy. Smart Commute administrates items for NATA. If you have an amendment to submit, you will need to submit to Smart Commute (identified Cathy in room).

**Commissioner Tedesco:** I have a question about the process. We had a long discussion in SPC about this quarter’s call for projects. I thought that the process would be that we can submit anything we want to change in May, which would give all our NATA jurisdictions time to review and approve changes in July. Is that still the case?

**Chair Baca:** That is not still the case. There is already a process in place that the board has approved, and without taking an official motion to amend the process, we will ask for an approval in May. We won’t have a June membership meeting, but we will have a June SPC meeting to continue process.

**Jeanne Shreve:** The email should go out quickly from Smart Commute. Part of what we are assuming is that local governments will already have a list of amendments in mind for this quarter. **Commissioner O’Dorisio:** What is the difference between what Com. Tedesco mentioned, and the process?

**Jeanne Shreve:** Everything would be approved at the May meeting. If NATA doesn’t feel like there is enough time, you can push it out to July at that meeting on a meeting-by-meeting basis.

**Commissioner Tedesco:** If anyone hasn’t discussed the changes they want to see, it is difficult to see submissions on the same day they are voted on. I didn’t understand that there was a difficulty, that it has to be done in May. I thought it only needed to be done in the quarter.

**Cathy Bird:** One thing that went back and forth in the SPC meeting and after by email, we didn’t have the document outlining the new prioritization process as a resource in our SPC meeting, and after the meeting realized that the approved prioritization list already had a documented process for project list amendments, and that what we discussed did not correspond to the documented process.

**Commissioner Tedesco:** You say there were emails after SPC. I don’t recall seeing any emails after SPC.

**Chair Baca:** The emails didn’t go out to the entire SPC committee. Once we realized there was a documented process approved by the NATA board, the matter was whether or not we amend that existing process. We would need a formal amendment to the process in order to accommodate this one-time situation. I will own this, the call for projects should have come in April. It would then have been reviewed by SPC, and presented in May. This is the first time we are going through this process, and we wanted to talk through this process again. We wanted to acknowledge that this process exists.

**Jeanne Shreve:** Remember, we can always decide in our May meeting to vote on project amendments in July.

**Commissioner O’Dorisio:** For next year, can we amend the April/May process to accommodate the lack of meeting in June? Can we extend the decision to July for this quarter?

**Chair Baca:** It is a new process, and I wanted to be transparent with the board and have a full discussion. Com. Tedesco, you are correct, we didn’t have the dates at the SPC meeting that we needed to have a clear discussion. The call for projects needs to come the first month after the end of the quarter. The call for projects needed to come in April for May, and for July for August.

Before we leave this agenda topic, I wanted to reiterate that NATA is an advocacy group for the regional and sub-regional projects. We advocate for projects based on our projects list.

**Meeting adjourned at 8:35 am.**