

**NATA Board Meeting Minutes
March 28, 2024 @ 7:30-9:00am**

In-Person Only

**Adams County Regional Economic Partnership, Community Reach Center
1870 W. 122nd Ave., Westminster, CO 80234
Longs Peak Conference Room**

NATA Members (who signed in)

Lisa Hough	AC-REP	Tim Williams	Federal Heights Staff
Lynn Baca	Adams County Commissioner	Kevin Ash	Frederick Staff
Brian Staley	Adams County Staff	Jay Jaramillo	Northglenn Council
Greg Mills	Brighton Mayor	Sara Dusenberry	Northglenn Staff
Tom Green	Brighton Council	Carson Priest	Smart Commute
Jeanne Shreve	Brighton Consultant	Danielle Ranum	Smart Commute
Austin Ward	Broomfield Council	Kathy Henson	Thornton Council
Sarah Grant	Broomfield Staff	Justin Martinez	Thornton Council
Steve Douglas	Commerce City Mayor	Kent Moorman	Thornton Staff
Rocky Teter	Commerce City Council	Nancy McNally	Westminster Mayor
Shawn Poe	Commerce City Staff	Chris Chovan	Westminster Staff
Bonnie Sellers	Federal Heights Council		

SC Members (who signed in)

Jordan Meadows	Broomfield Chamber	Jessica Sandgren	Smart Commute Board
-----------------------	--------------------	-------------------------	---------------------

Agency Partners (who signed in)

Karen Stuart	CDOT Commissioner	Tom Magenis	CDOT
Steven Henry	CDOT	John Gregory	CTIO/CDOT
Crystal Armendariz	CDOT	Vince Buzek	RTD Director
Jessica Myklebust	CDOT	Troy Whitmore	RTD Director
Danny Herman	CDOT	Michael Davies	RTD
Andy Stratton	CDOT		

Guests (who signed in)

Beverly Stables	CML		
------------------------	-----	--	--

Welcome and introductions- Chair Nancy McNally

Chair McNally: We're going to not do introductions, so we can get right on to things. We have approval in a minute from the February board meeting.

Councilmember Sandgren: So moved.

Councilmember Ward: I'll second, but I have an amendment. It has me stated as Brighton City Council and not Broomfield.

Carson Priest: Okay, thank you for pointing that out, I'll amend the minutes and we can approve them with that in mind.

Chair McNally: We will make that change, and so, is there anything else? And that brings us to our CDOT presentation.

CDOT I-25 Segment 2 Safety & Operations Update - Casey Martinez and Tom Magneis

Carson Priest: We're going to let CDOT go nice and early this morning, because they have their transportation symposium downtown today. So, thanks to them for being willing to come up and give this presentation early. We've been waiting for a couple of months for this, so I'm going to turn it over to their team.

Jessica Myklebust: Thank you, Carson. I'm Jessica Myklebust. I'm the Region 1 Transportation Director for CDOT. I think I've met a lot of you. There's a lot of new faces here, so if I haven't met you before, please stop by and say hello. So Carson mentioned you've been waiting a few months. I feel like some of you have probably been waiting a few years for this project. Thank you to Commissioner Stuart. She really has maintained a lot of momentum and encouragement with CDOT for this project as well. So today we're going to, and I'll let the team introduce themselves as they step up, but today we're really going to give you an update on where we are with this project, what we've been doing, where we think we're going, and how fast we think we might be able to get there. So if you're familiar with our 10-year plan, this is CDOT's North Star. This is our planning pipeline for the next 10 years. We've been able to move through the first four years of the plan, and Region 1 has delivered some substantial projects, including the gap on I-25 South. We're currently in the process of building Floyd Hill, another very substantial project. We've been able to replace a lot of our aging infrastructure, including bridges, many bridges on I-25. We've done some not-so-big but I call them tiny-but-mighty projects along I-70 between I-25 and Wadsworth. So on our 10-year plan, it really gives the energy and the momentum for my teams to be able to move ahead with projects. It kind of aligns where are we going, how are we trying to get there. So the good news about our I-25 project, we call it Segment 2, is that it has been on a 10-year plan. It's been on a 10-year plan from the beginning. That's fantastic news. It has some dollars, real dollars, allocated in the term that we're kind of in right now. So 19-22 we have \$4 million. 23-26 we have \$16 million. We've got money currently that we've allocated toward design, analysis, engineering, NEPA, public engagement, and that's what the team is going to talk about today, how we're utilizing those near-term funds that we have. The out-years of the plan, it's generally unfunded. It's going to take all of us in this room to figure out how we construct this portion of I-25. We understand that there's an urgent safety need, there's a lot of urgency around getting that portion of the corridor where it needs to be as we travel into the future for transit and mobility for the citizens of Denver. We know that there may be some who are really excited to see this move quickly and you're wondering what's been taking so long. Thank you for sticking with us as we've been kind of going forward for several years on this. Many of you have been around since the I-25 environmental impact statement and you remember those

early conversations. So we're here, we're back in force, moving this project ahead as much as we can. We'll talk about a few of the scope changes in terms of the length of the corridor where we're starting and ending as well. Without much further, I will turn it over to Andy Stratton who's our Region 1 Program Delivery Deputy Director and he's going to jump into the rest of the presentation.

Andy Stratton: Alright, good morning. Like Jessica said, I'm Andy Stratton. I'm the Deputy Director of Program Delivery for Region 1. I've been working in this north area here for the last 14 years since I've been at CDOT and so it's great to be back at NATA here. I attended these meetings regularly for the first 10 years of my career with this group and have been trying to keep I-25 moving forward here. So excited to be back and hopefully with the plan of where we're going and getting one of these projects out the door. Before we get into introducing the new team that I have here today that's going to be working on this project moving forward, just kind of want to take a step back and like Jessica mentioned, we're here to acknowledge the EIS was completed in 2011. We constructed the express lanes through this segment and opened those in 2016 and while we've seen a lot of benefits of those express lanes, we've also seen a lot of operational and safety challenges since those have been opened. I think all of you have been involved in helping us analyze and figure out exactly what's going on since we opened those express lanes with the road safety audits we've been doing over the years looking at the crash data, trying to identify the operational improvements taking a look at how the PEL recommendations that we did in 2012 before we implemented the express lanes, how those really fit now that we have data and safety challenges with the express lanes. Since they've been operating we've just been taking a look at a bunch of different ways to help the mobility and safety challenges through here with the white paper that we did to take a look at the analysis, not necessarily through 84th to 104th, but took a step back and really took a look at US 36 up to 104th now because we saw additional challenges and operational issues south of the corridor that the previous PEL hadn't identified. Then we also did a white paper in 2023 that looked at the transit and mobility challenges in this area especially with the parking ride there at Thornton Parkway or Thornton Parkway just south of 88th and really looking at what the current transit needs are in that area with those slip ramps and the access to that parking so all of these things the team is going to talk about, what they've come up with so far and how that sets the stage for us to be able to move efficiently and quickly and identifying solutions right now, getting through our environmental phase and actually coming up with a solution and out to construction so really excited to be here and have the team talk about what they've got. We have our organizational chart that shows Jessica Myklebust as our RTD and myself as Deputy Director. We are 100% supportive and going to make sure the team has the support resources they need to continue to move this project forward quickly and efficiently. Stephen Henry is our program engineer and main point of contact for the north area, you'll see him at all the NATA needs and he's been here before so I think you guys all know who he is. Now I'm going to turn it over to Tom Magenis who's the resident engineer overseeing the I-25 corridor and he'll take us through the rest of the presentation introduce the rest of his team so you guys know who the team actually is moving some of these things forward

Tom Magenis: I'm Tom Magenis and I'm the resident engineer here at North Program. Beyond our internal organizational chart, we do have Atkin Trialis as our consultant. They've been on board for a few months now so they're going to be supporting us through design and NEPA. So, we have a lot of talented folks, we have a lot of subject matter experts in design, we have a lot of subject matter experts in environmental internally. Not a ton has changed in terms of the project overview other than we've moved further south from 84th, we've moved down to 270 and US 36 to kind of study that, safety issues further south as well. We have \$110 million right now in our 10 year plan strategic funds and \$20M of it is budgeted right now for our preliminary engineering, our NEPA and final design. Our planning level estimates for this entire project is roughly around \$300 million, design, construction and right of way so again along the way here we'll be working for other funding sources

and partnerships and grants along the way to help fund this whole project. Our current scope effort is broken up into two components. We're currently in our preliminary design and NEPA phase. Sometime next year we'll get into final design and right of way and construction phases. The project started in January and then in February we had a scoping meeting for environmental and we also had our NEPA kick-off with stakeholders as well. As Andy and Jessica mentioned, we've been studying this corridor a lot and we want to move forward efficiently, and we think we have the framework to do that. We've studied it basically to death, we really know what we need to do so let's be efficient, let's reuse some of our past studies. From the draft EA from 2020, the limits have changed now but we would like to reuse a lot of the technical reports for environmental as much as possible with this new effort now so we're not reinventing the wheel. Then white paper number one and white paper number two is kind of our due diligence and justification that we did when the draft EA was stalled but did not move forward. A lot of that had to do with funding at the time in 2020 so with white paper number one that focus was supplemental options, roadway alternatives to the EA and then validating the EA's traffic assumptions so the recommendations out of that from our headquarters traffic group was that they did validate the assumptions from the EA. Also, that northbound climbing lane was an alternative that came out of this white paper that was different from the EA. It also included a collector distributor (CD) road to help solve that weaving and safety issues in the northbound direction with I-270 with I-76 and US-36 all coming onto I-25 within an eighth of a mile. So moving forward from that white paper we want obviously to extend the limits as I've mentioned and include the collector distributor road in this new NEPA process for further analysis. Then the white paper number two took a dive further into transit and safety and we wanted to look at the center median station that was proposed in the EA. The white paper showed that the preferred alternative includes the center median station. That piece coupled with the collector distributor road and with the climbing lane coupled with the widening for safety is wanting to move forward with.

We're calling this alternative option "F" if you've ever seen the white papers. I mentioned that the \$90 million construction funds aren't available until the middle of 2026, so we have a lot of tasks kind of broken up as NEPA tasks, design tasks to get there. Our first level of effort is getting to 20% design, so that's roughly a little less than a year from now we'll have a good idea of what the final costs are and then we'll look into things like alternative delivery, CMGC, design-build, phased approach, etc. I think that choice is going to be important too depending on what funding sources that come through. We're continuing to work on identifying funding and grant opportunities along the way. We have a good consultant staff that are going to help support us with this effort. Then, of course, along the way this entire project public information and stakeholder coordination will be mixed into the work. I'm going to turn it over to Casey Martinez and he's going to walk us through the remainder of the presentation.

Casey Martinez: Alright so like Tom said my name is Casey Martinez I'm the CDOT project manager for I-25 US 36-104th Avenue safety and operations improvements. Jumping into our draft project's purpose- to relieve congestion, improve safety, improve transit facilities and operations, and improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Jumping into our project's needs starting with improving traffic operations. The existing traffic volumes are nearing exceeding capacity. With the population and employment growth on the rise we're going to see an increase in travel demand by 2050. The next need we have is to improve safety. We've seen that the accident rates steadily increase since 2012 and we've determined that the predominant accident type or rear end accidents typically associated with congestion. As Andy mentioned before, in our road safety audits we've identified this predominant accident type and our previous white paper studies have investigated solutions to improve safety. We have some identified solutions in these studies that we're going to continue to explore. The next need we have is improved transit operations. We currently have safety and operational issues with the bus and pedestrian movements of the existing RTD parking lot and we

want to improve bus lane connectivity with all of these mobility hubs being developed in the northern segments of I-25. We want that to have consistency throughout the corridor and then finally we want to improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities because I-25 is a barrier to the east-west movement for peds and bikes. Ultimately, what improvements we implement is going to be determined by the traffic modeling that will be determined by the travel demand modeling in 2050. We want to implement standard width shoulders and express lane buffer for the inside and outside shoulder and express lane. We want to build a new CD road from I-270 to 84th Avenue and then shifting the 84th Avenue northbound off-ramp to the south. Then we want to realign and modify the northbound on-ramps to mainline from I-76 and US-36 to accommodate future direct ramps. Then we'll build a northbound climbing lane northbound to 104th Avenue and then implement auxiliary lanes between interchanges. Finally, we have the median bus station and some RTD parking reconstruction. This goes along with a full 88th Avenue bridge replacement and then finally some trail realignment and connectivity. So, we broke out this project into three segments starting with our south segment. (*see slides for visuals of project design*) As a visual we have the standard width shoulders both inside and outside and the express lane buffer that you've seen here. We also have a new location for the 84th Avenue off-ramp which has been pushed to the south. Over here on the right we have the CD road from I-270 to 84th Avenue which is barrier separated to control any weaving from the CD road to I-25 mainline. And then I just want to point out we have an existing CDOT main insert right here. So again, as a reminder this isn't the exact location for where the northbound 84th Avenue off-ramp is going to be, this is a rendering. It's going to be determined by our traffic modeling. I forgot to mention our south segment limits are from the I-270 US 36 interchange up to 84th Avenue. Moving just a little bit more north we have here a two-lane CD road to the point where the off-ramp has merged with the CD road making it a two-lane CD road connecting it from I-270 to 84th Avenue. Our standard width shoulders both inside and outside in our express lane buffer. And then again, our barrier separated CD road from mainline to prevent any weaving. And then 84th which is just here at the top of the picture. Okay here's our center segment. So the center segment limits are from 84th Avenue to Thornton Parkway and right here you can see this is the median transit station with right now showing the pedestrian underpass of Thornton Parkway. But we're also going to look at the option of adding a pedestrian underpass versus a pedestrian bridge overpass. Lastly, some trail realignment connectivity. Then we'll move to the north segment which is from Thornton Parkway to 104th Avenue. Today you can see that we have substandard shoulders both in the inside and outside shoulder. Right now, we have a two-foot express lane buffer with three general purpose lanes. And then for what we're proposing for our alternatives are to have standard inside and outside shoulders and a four-foot express lane buffer. Moving to outreach and public engagement - our outreach goals and tactics are going to comply with Senate Bill 21-260. What that means is ensuring diverse public participation and presenting the information in a manner that's easy to understand and accessible. We're going to be working with local businesses, chambers of commerce, community groups, other orgs to gather information and get their input and feedback. We'll also be ensuring that we're working with all the different levels of government agencies as well so that they're informed at every stage. And then our outreach approach here is we're in the process of developing a project website, a new project website and a project email where you can get all the information on what we're doing. We'll also have social media posts, bus and walking tours, local government outreach and meetings, some public meetings and some informational material. So now I'm going to hand it over to John Gregory to give you a CTIO update.

John Gregory: Good morning. I'm John Gregory and I work for CTIO. Piper Darlington normally does these types of presentations for the board here, but she's enjoying some time away on spring break. So, the Safety Enforcement Program is my topic to present today. This program is aimed at reducing the safety crash rates and incidents on the corridor. The program went live September 1st. That first month of September, the first infraction was waived with a warning sent out starting October 1st. On

the second infraction, the fine structure kicked in at \$75. Since then, we've been collecting and analyzing a lot of data. We've been getting data from our roadside equipment, public input. We're studying ways that we can improve signage and striping, and even just our ingress-egress locations. So, moving forward, we'll be looking at making some of those programmatic improvements throughout the network, throughout our express lanes network. Even I-25 North, we took a tour last week, got in a bus, and drove the ingresses and egresses just to get a better feel for what AASHTO's recommending as minimums versus what we're seeing out here in driver comfort levels. We'll be working through optimizing those. It's going to take several years, three or four years, to look at the safety data and do a true before-and-after comparison of the program. So, you know, to work out the peaks and valleys and get a baseline for each. But right now, what we're seeing is just our early data coming in from violations being mailed out. We're seeing positive behavior changes in drivers. Eighty percent of people who receive one violation are not repeating. And from the time that the program went live, like I said, in September, we've seen a 70 percent reduction in the number of violations being mailed out. So, those numbers are very encouraging, very exciting. Like I said, it's going to take some time to get the traffic safety data back in, but those are very positive and encouraging. So, just moving on from there, I mentioned the warning period.

So I've provided this slide just to show, you know, this center section here is the I-25 data, you know, roughly 5,000 warning notices we're sending out. And you can see from that, you know, this is from a couple weeks ago, so pretty safe to say that we're sitting right at about 150 total violations on the corridor right now, you know, taking out the warnings. So moving forward, we're going to continue our outreach of, you know, our ad campaigns, looking at different ways we can update websites to help educate the public on how to use, what the striping means, what signage to look for. We're adding some new visuals to our webpage to help with that driver education piece. And then, you know, the big thing here is the revenue that's generated is treated like toll revenue, so it goes through the same flow that the toll revenue would. The idea is that revenue stays on the corridor for future improvements.

Casey Martinez: All right, so we're just going to get into some next steps now. Some of the items that are in process right now is we're meeting with our technical working groups, and we're doing that on a monthly basis with FHWA, our CDOT internal discipline leads, our consultant leads, and with stakeholders as needed. We're also in the process of developing our roadway design alternatives and refining that. We're also working on our traffic modeling and gathering data collection, and then NEPA research and investigations. And then some of the items that are going to be upcoming is we're going to finish our project website and publish that. We're going to be doing a full topographical survey this spring, and then we're anticipating on having our first public meeting this summer. So that's it, that's it right now, what we have for next steps, and I want to jump to questions.

Kent Moorman: I'd like to see CDOT take a serious look at the on ramp for 84th as we believe there's still some issues with that design.

Chris Chovan: But I noticed in your schedule that you just had two spots for public outreach. And I'm concerned about that because we've seen CDOT get – I use the term burn, but I don't mean that in a negative way – on Central 70 and on I-270, where you were working, you were working, you were working, and then the community came out and said, wait just a minute, we don't know what you're talking about. Then CDOT has had to go two steps back and pick it up and move forward again. So it's delayed 270, and it kind of wigwagged a little bit with Central 70. So, is there, at least in the early stages that you're talking about now, more aggressive outreach than just a simple public meeting, say, tabling events or going to festivals and setting up or working with local governments when

they're doing their own things? I'm just curious if the team has really gotten to that level of discussion.

Casey Martinez: That's a good point. I think we're going to – we should talk about that and discuss that, use I-270 and Central 70, like you mentioned, as an example. We have a team – we have a consultant team, CIG, who's going to be – who's a great team, who's going to help us and has mentioned some of the things that you said, having table meetings, workshops for people that don't have access or don't attend these public meetings, but just so that everyone has a word and we hear everyone's thoughts and everyone has a chance to comment on it.

Councilmember Sandgren: A couple things. So, I want to start off with positive because it made a big impact to us on I-25 and safety. CTIOs work on the cameras and the violations and notices has been wonderful. I think we heard from a lot of people that got shocked with their not just one violation but weaving in and out multiple violations. So, I appreciate the effort that went into that. The technology was incredible.

On the funds, though, that came from that that say that they're going to stay in that area, is there any effort being made to take those funds away? As usual, the funds that have gone into this area have always been promised to be given back later, and then we never see later. So, what can we do to make sure that those funds stay in that corridor to improve safety?

Jessica Myklebust: Thank you. I just want to jump in and help you guys out a little bit. So funding is a big piece of this corridor. At higher levels, Piper, myself, Andy, we're having those conversations. We're starting to piece together what grants can we pursue as a group and potentially leverage future tolling revenue. What is coming in from the safety violations? How can we utilize that money? We're having those conversations and starting to build kind of what the budget looks like. We have a high-level cost estimate. I would not broadcast that dollar amount too widely. It's kind of what we're using to maybe think about what we think we might need for the corridor. We could need more based on escalation of what we've seen on other projects. So, I would not say safely it's a \$300 million project. It could be more. I don't know if it would be less, but that's kind of the number we're using right now. What do some of our other funding sources have to contribute? What other enterprises are out there that we can tap into some of those funds? We are in a non-attainment area, so there might be some opportunity for some of those funds.

We're building out the funding picture kind of as we speak. And one of those really critical components is keeping some of the Segment 2 revenue that we're generating within the corridor. We don't have those dollars quite yet, but we will have those as we move forward.

Councilmember Sandgren: And just to clarify, when you say corridor versus this segment, are those the same? Because I think that's where we get into trouble. Corridor is not all Segment 2.

Jessica Myklebust: Right. So, we're working closely also with Region 4. Region 4, Piper, myself, and Andy - we're sitting down and having those conversations to figure out what's available, who is it available for, and when is it available so we can all get what we need in this segment.

Councilmember Sandgren: The \$300 million that you brought up on the one slide is most likely not going to be accurate by the time we see it through construction. The one slide that you showed with just the center loading, I would imagine just that piece would cost \$300 million.

Jessica Myklebust: We know that that's a big lift and a big task, and it's going to cost a significant portion of that \$300 million. I think realistically 2026, if anything starts, I think there's a lot of us that won't even be around. And I think that's sort of been the concern all along is it takes so long, and you guys have been working on this forever as well.

Councilmember Sandgren: If some of us are here, the next group that comes in, it's like we start all over. When you see how many studies have been done already since 2011, it's five at least studies, and we're still basically back to where we were in 2011. So, I guess we just want to make sure if there's only two stakeholder meetings, we've got to have more than that.

Jessica Myklebust: So, if you look at the schedule, you'll notice the public engagement line goes all the way across the bottom through the whole project. There will be many more than two opportunities. These are kind of your official NEPA meetings, and we can add more in. We're working with our public involvement team right now to do the public involvement plan, so that feedback is really important for us to take forward as we move on, like what fairs do you have coming up? Like here, I think it's the Adams County Parade or Commerce City Parade is this major Memorial Day event, so we might be showing up there with some -CDOT snowplows and some fun things. But, yeah, so public engagement and information is going to be ongoing. And to your point of 2011, we have a lot of information. We've challenged this team to use that information. In the next year, I would love to see a 2025 grant application, which means we need an alternative that we can get in a grant application with some real dollar amounts that we can show. We're excited to be here, and that was one of the things I want to make sure we convey is that we're moving forward in the process. We're going to take all of the feedback back that he gave us today. We hear Thornton. We've got some initial alternatives, but we've got a lot of work, which is why we want to have our first public meeting really soon. We've got everything we need probably to kick off the NEPA project and start really getting some tangible feedback from the public.

Councilmember Sandgren: Just make sure we know what we can do to help you. Writing letters, advocating, lobbying our legislators, whatever it is.

Jessica Myklebust: Absolutely.

Councilmember Martinez: Is there like a ranking of what we can get done in this project, or is this a package deal? Or what would be the priority if the entire project can't be funded, of all of those critical elements?

Casey Martinez: Yeah, that's a good question. We're looking at phasing the project out, and we look at, you know, all of the different safety and operations improvements and prioritizing, like, well, what can we get with, you know, \$90 million in construction funding? So, we prioritize it that way and look at what we can get with the money that we get.

Kent Moorman: You're invited to join me at ThorntonFest at our big event, we have space for you.

Casey Martinez: Great. Thanks, Kent.

John Gregory: Sure. Yeah, I'd just like to address Kent's comment about the egresses, especially in the southbound direction from the 84th ramp. I glanced over it in the presentation, but we have taken an in-depth review of every single egress and ingress, egress and ingress in our network. We're looking at the lengths. We're looking at where they start. We're looking at where they end in comparison to where you get on the highway or off the highway. So we, are looking at the

northbound egress exit out of the express lane to exit Thornton Parkway, and also in the southbound direction, the egress. We're looking at both of those in depth to look at what we can do to lengthen them. We're also looking, and just as a public education piece, there is a way to get into the downtown express lane from 84th without crossing five lanes of traffic to try and get before the I-270 interchange. You can pass the I270 interchange and still get in the express lanes. There's a slip ramp right through there to get into the downtown express lanes.

Mayor Mills: My question might be for Jessica, we'll see, but if you can go back to the beginning of the slide, so that 10-year, I'll call it a wish list, because it's really a dream until you actually have funding and actually have a plan of what's going to happen. What's the timeline for a lot of this stuff? I respect that there needs to be maybe more of a reduced list like this versus what we've seen in the past.

Jessica Myklebust: Yeah, all good questions. What you're seeing here is actually a cropped version. I carry the other one with me. I feel like I should tattoo it on my back because I reference our 10-year plan almost every day. This portion you're seeing right here is the Interstate 25 piece. Our whole 10-year plan is an 11-by-17 piece of paper with all of our corridors, so the I-70 corridor, US-6 and Wadsworth interchange and some of those other things. A lot of our projects have come to reality. We're excited. US-6 and Wadsworth have received a \$20 million grant from IJJA, so that one should be moving forward. That was a 10-year plan project. Vasquez is not showing up on here because it's part of the I-270 area, but that project we just signed a FONSI, finding the most significant impact for. Sean and I were just celebrating in the back with Commerce City that that's a really long-term project. We've been working hard on that, and that's for the improvements at 68th and 62nd for that crazy seven-legged intersection. A lot of these things have come to reality. We work hard to deliver the things we've delivered. Just a note on the interchange mobility hub. When you first read it, maybe it sounds like it's an interchange. It's just the mobility hub that's at the southeast corner of I-25, and that one is getting ready to go to bid in late July. We should hopefully have a groundbreaking for that mobility hub shortly. You mentioned a project that US-85, I think. That's been on the wish list for a while. We're going to be relooking at our 10-year plan in a couple of years, probably a year plus or minus. These projects were all of the ones that came forward from the stakeholders when we did a really thorough outreach several years ago. So, this list is preserved based on all of the feedback from a lot of folks in this room and a lot of folks who have probably moved forward in their careers from now.

Chair McNally: Any other questions? Thank you so very much for coming.

Councilmember Ward: I just had a comment. And really, it's just a frustration that CDOT continues to believe that solving congestion is to expand highways, and I think that's really frustrating considering we're going to be spending at least \$300 million, probably not even more than that, on what is predominantly highway widening. I guess we're throwing in some transit stuff, but other than reconstructing the whole transit situation so that way buses don't have to cross four lanes of traffic, which is great, there's no expansion of services. I know that's not part of construction, but I just find it very frustrating that CDOT's answer to congestion is, we'll widen the highways, and we'll just continue widening the highway until we just pay more. Why not? So that's just my frustration.

Commissioner Stuart: I just want to piggyback on what you said about our 10-year plan. So, one of the things that's important about the 10-year plan is as we zero in on these dollar amounts, they're sort of based on anticipated funding being available, whether it's Senate Bill 260 or 267 or whether it's the amount that we typically get back from the feds or whether it's different pots of money. So, the thing that's important to me, always because I get frustrated, you can imagine, with this 10-year plan, the thing that's not on the 10-year plan is any new funding that we don't know about yet, any

grants that are available to us, any partnerships that come on board. While we look at the 10-year plan, we have to remember that this is a plan set up that says, here are the projects that need funding. And it's not the only project. They were physically constrained, just like they are at DRCOG. You can't put a project on there unless you have anticipated funding to kind of know where that funding is going to come from. I'm not always as disheartened as I am sometimes when I think about, yeah, that's all it says on the 10-year plan, but it doesn't talk about new funding sources, possibilities for grants. And I'm going to say that I think this project that we have for the Segment 2 could be a good candidate for some kinds of grant funding. Andy and I have been working on trying to figure out how to put grant funding together for 14 years now. But I think there may be, because of the multi-mobile components now, that isn't a highway expansion project. It's a highway efficiency project that's going to allow for transit coming down the center of that project, if that's what we're able to build.

Commissioner Baca: Yeah, just one comment. You have a lot of very highly motivated elected officials in the room that want to see this completed. So, if you can work with our technical groups, our staff, now is a good time. We're lobbying for our areas constantly and this is on the list.

Jessica Myklebust: And thank you for the momentum that this room, like I said, I know it's been years. We're pedal to the metal – our team knows it.

Mayor Douglas: I just want to ask real quick, all these different things you're doing at I-25, these different corridors, does this feed into the front rail passenger discussion as well? Because, you know, just look at multimodal – this has to all correlate eventually with the front rail because with the alignments and then trying to move people and all that, is this part of it?

Jessica Myklebust: Yeah, one of the most exciting things that CDOT has been doing is really looking at our transportation more holistically from all modes, which includes front rail passenger rail. We've got the bus-staying family of services that goes from the north to the south. We're looking at bus and rapid transit along several corridors. So as we're looking at, you know, Casey's looking at this project, the reason why the rest of us are here is we help bring that kind of umbrella vision from a regional perspective of how are we moving, how are people getting, what is the first and last mile connection? While we're not directly tied in with front-range passenger rail, we do have, we are paying attention to where they're going, where they're landing, and how we make tie-ins to that.

Mayor Douglas: Okay, because no matter where we're going to go to, we always talk about logistics moving, right? Yeah. You get all those big trucks coming through I-25, they really should be on our managed lanes. Get them out of the car lanes.

Casey Martinez: Yeah, we're adding that climbing lane to relieve that freight and heavy truck once you get them, they'll start getting out.

Chair McNally:

I want to honor these folks for they have something else to get to, but you have been very patient, answered our questions. Thank you so very much, and I'm sure we'll see you again. Thanks.

Beverly Stables:

Okay, good morning, everybody. So Bev Stables with Colorado Municipal League. I'm a legislative policy advocate. So, House Bill 1030 is that railroad safety requirements bill, that will address shorter train lengths, wayside detector systems, etc. The bill is scheduled for House Second Reading today. A little bit of a hiccup for us was that the Attorney General's Office was looking at the blocked crossing language, which was our favorite part of the bill, and is very concerned that it would be an

unconstitutional provision, at least in federal court. So, they are taking out the blocked crossing language and putting in some different amendments. We're still supportive of the bill, but that is certainly disappointing because that was our major concern from a municipal perspective. Next up, I have House Bill 1012. This is the front-range passenger rail efficiency bill. We're in a monitor position on this bill just because it's specific to front-range passenger rail, but just as a broad overview, it improves operational efficiency and removes some of the requirements on that board. It passed the House with Senate amendments, so it's well on its way to the governor's desk. Next is Senate Bill 36 - this one is another disappointing one for us. Vulnerable road user enterprise. We're supportive of the bill. It imposes a fee on the heaviest passenger vehicles that are more likely to be in deadly accidents with passengers pedestrians or cyclists. The funds raised from those fees would then go to pedestrian and bicyclist safety. Around municipalities, there were some issues in Senate Finance. The chair of Senate Finance really did not like the idea of the fee, and the sponsors just couldn't figure out a path forward for other funding mechanisms, so it is effectively dead in Senate Finance. Senate Bill 32, methods to increase the use of transit. This includes a youth free fare program and some studies for a statewide transit pass. Like I mentioned last time, they did take out that income tax credit to purchase the transit pass. We're in a support position on this, too, and that bill was just referred to Senate Appropriations. House and Senate are working through the budget right now, the long bill, so some things that have been referred to Appropriations are going to be delayed just for a little bit while they work through the long bill. And then Senate Bill 65 is that use of mobile devices while driving. Very straightforward. Prohibits use of mobile devices while driving. Under current law in Colorado, individuals under the age of 18 are not allowed to use mobile devices for any reason while driving that are not hands-free, and so this bill would just apply that to all drivers. So we're supporting that bill. It passed the Senate and is scheduled for hearing next week before the House Transportation Committee. And then Senate Bill 100 is the commercial vehicle highway safety bill. Lots of provisions in there specific to commercial vehicle highway safety, if you can believe it. We asked for an amendment that would require CDOT to consult municipalities in their chain-up study just so that there's municipal input in where chain-up stations are going to be located, which we did get, which was very exciting. It passed the Senate and is introduced in the House but has not been scheduled for hearing yet. And then the last two that I had not... Well, I think I had mentioned RTD governance last time, but there's been some updates. We do have draft language. It should be introduced tomorrow. Same, as I mentioned last time, lots of reforms to RTD governance, decreases the board size to be a combination of appointed and elected officials on the board. We were disappointed that on the board that only municipal representation are non-voting members. We'd really like to have a stronger municipal voice on the board, so we're working with the sponsors to see if we can get an amendment there. And then the last bill I wanted to mention is Senate Bill 184. I'm sure you've heard about this. This is the Senate president's rail funding bill. I should mention it is not just rail funding, and the title is Support Surface Transportation Infrastructure Development. The hearing was yesterday. Since it was just introduced, we have not taken a position yet. We're bringing it to our board. We are also just getting some feedback from some members. I think generally we're supportive, obviously, of greater investments in rail and other forms of transit, but we did have some feedback from members like Bloomfield that had some specific concerns that we're working through. One other piece to note on that bill is essentially they're trying to draw down federal funding for passenger rail expansion, so it'd be an 80-20 match for the state of Colorado, so they are trying to get there with that fee on rental cars, which is a bit of a controversial provision. Usually they're trying to draw down federal funding for passenger rail expansion. So it'd be an 80-20 match for the state of Colorado. So they are trying to get there with that fee on rental cars, which is a bit of a controversial provision, but we, again, are supportive of just the investment. Then I also want to flag that it is likely that there would be a tax increase brought to voters at some point in the future to try to also get to that 20% match. That's not in the bill, but that's kind of the direction that things are headed. I do also want to mention, just in our conversations with the Senate President's Office, the intention is to have a lot of flexibility for the use of these funds to avoid, we heard some

concerns from our members about fast tracks with RTD and wanting there to be greater flexibility. So that is in the bill. It passed in at Transportation Energy last night. There were a handful of amendments, but I haven't had a chance to really dive into them, so I don't want to comment on everything that they changed there, but it was referred to Senate Finance. So I definitely want to use this again, but it's definitely on a fast track. And that is all I have for my legislative update.

Chair McNally: Next up is our favorite commissioner, Commissioner Stuart.

Commissioner Stuart: Okay, I'll try to make this quick because I know your RTD director, Vince Busek, has a lot to say today. SB 184 is an interesting piece of legislation. It's good news, bad news, I think, until it gets amended and we see the final piece of it. It's an enterprise that will be housed within CTIO. I'm the chair of CTIO. We're a seven-member board, four appointed by the governor, three appointed by the Transportation Commission. Typically, we were put in place to bring innovative funding to the state of Colorado's transportation projects. We can accept unsolicited proposals. We can work on P3s, a number of things we can do. And all of you in this quarter know that the toll lanes have used CTIO. They're under the auspices of CTIO. They've used CTIO to do financial arrangements to bond for construction of those quarters that didn't have funding elsewhere. So you look at the quarter on I-25, the gap and all the stuff up I-25, the plenary project that's now a lease option, a lease contract with US 36. It's no longer under CDOT. It's overseen by CDOT, but the funds don't go to CDOT. And then central 70 funds and 470 funds. From the onset, when this group talked about, yes, let's go ahead and do a toll lane, we have been in the room for a very long time, said when those obligations, the fiduciary obligations, the operation maintenance operations, when those obligations are done, any of the excess, with quotes, goes back into the quarter. And we're not the only ones who say this. We've said this, North I-25 said this, the corridor, I-70 coalition have all said this. Yes, we see that this is a good funding mechanism, but let's keep those monies in the corridor. So, on segment two in particular, we're going to be looking for excess. All of the corridors have some kind of debt on them, except segment two does not have debt on it. And so I think we were thinking in the future that a lot of that money that comes back after operations and maintenance and all that could be used as leverage for some kind of funding. Under 184, it's interesting because it's an opportunity to take enterprise funds from these rental car user fees that can generate up to \$50 million a year and put this into transit and rail. I think that was absolutely accurate that the governor's trying to put as much money as he can into a pot that he can say, look, we have local match, so give us some federal funds. It's a way to try to get some extraordinary funding that we wouldn't get otherwise. I think that's the theory behind all of this. As this legislation was written, it's very ambiguous about what happens to the toll revenue within CTIO. And we have had a number of people, we in this room, have had a number of people testify yesterday that it's important to honor the obligations that were made to us and to I-25 North and to the Mountain Corridor, that those monies stay within here. The thing that I'm looking at through CTIO is we had a read into this last week, and out of the seven members, I think five of us spoke about the importance of finishing the system, that there's a managed lane system. And I remember when we were told we were going to have managed lanes, we were also told everyone along the corridor is going to have managed lanes. We're not just picking on this piece of I-25. So CTIO did not take a stand on this. CDOT did take a stand on it, and support this bill, I believe. One thing I think that's optimistic for me is we have had on segment two, a very difficult time figuring out where does the transit money come in? Because we want to put that train, or train, I wish it was a train. We want to put that bus and Bustang in the center area to keep it from having to weave in and out. That's part of all the options you saw today. And so if they're saying the money has to be used for transit and rail, and we're going to take some of your excess revenue, that might be a good opportunity for us to figure out how do you allocate that to the transit component that's necessary in this project. I'm trying to be optimistic about this. I know many proposed amendments spoke to the integrity of the obligation that was made to keep those toll revenues within the corridor until the projects are done. So that's my big take on 184. I do

want to talk about the land use bills of 1313, and all of those are about local control. 1313 is particularly troubling from the Transportation Commission's point of view. CDOT has taken a support stand on that. But five of us on the Transportation Commission of 11 come from a municipal background. We were either mayors or city council members or had city managers, and we feel very strongly that local authority is for land use and zoning. We've been told we can't have a stand on that. But I want to tell you that when that language says, if you don't do what's in this bill, it's going to restrict your HUTF funds, and you should be absolutely opposed to that. So that's my take on the legislature. One thing that's interesting to me is that there's some percolation about rest areas. I have heard someone is crafting a bill that might raise some funding to rest areas, and it's interesting, because what they did after we had this dilemma about how we put our funding in is really looked at other states, what do other states do? And one of the things other states do is they use the money that they get for sign approvals along state highway land right away and they use the money that is brought in by people wanting to put signs on that right away and put that into a fund to go to rest areas. I haven't seen any of that language yet, but it seems like it might be appropriate. CDOT does charge a sign fee, but they haven't updated that for years and years. And so, I think what they'll do is look at what does it cost us on these right of ways to allow for these signs? What is the administration cost in all of that? And then figure out how they can tap a little bit more on. These are usually big commercial signs. I'm eager to see how that goes forward. I want to give you an I-76 update. Andy Stratton gave me this, so I'm just going to read it. And I know Mayor Mills, Mayor Mills, was concerned about the I-70 updates. At 2.30 p.m. on Monday, March 18th, the truck hauling equipment heading westbound on I-76 hit the bottom of Dahlia Bridge. The truck was hauling a backhoe and another piece of equipment. The boom of the backhoe struck the steel girders of the bridge, resulting in full closure of the interstate in both directions, as well as Dahlia Street above. The first two girders on the east side of the bridge were bent due to the impact, as well as a piece of steel sheared off the first girder bottom flange. The bridge maintenance crew and staff crew assessed the damage and structural integrity of the entire structure, determined it to be sufficient to reopen traffic underneath it on I-76, as well as the southbound lane on Dahlia Street. The northbound lane on Dahlia will remain closed to keep weight off the damaged girders and side of the bridge until a permanent repair can be made. Emergency authorization was received on March 20th. CDOT North Program and Staff Bridge are working on repair plans to provide contractors for pricing. Plans are expected to be completed mid-April, with bids from contractors expected in late April. Work is to commence in May. Exact time frame of completion is unknown at this time, until the extent of the repair is known as plans are developed. And so if you have other questions, send them directly to Stephen Henry.

Chair McNally: Thank you. Thank you. Next up, is our RTD representative, Director Buzek.

Director Buzek: I'm Director Buzek. I am an RTD Director for District J, for now. We had board meeting on Tuesday. Anyway, a couple things came up in the meeting that are of interest. We had a great presentation from our staff about the Northwest Rail Feasibility, the Service Feasibility Study. So, last year, I think, we commissioned an \$8 million study to take a look at the feasibility of running a peak service plan on Northwest Rail, you know, the B line that goes from Denver now to Westminster that's supposed to go to Longmont. So, we've commissioned the study. We've hired HDR as our consultant. We've had community outreach and all kinds of things. So, the update is we're hopefully going to see the final numbers early summer, late spring, early summer. So, based upon all of that, it'll be the job of the board to determine its feasibility, right? They're not going to come to us and say, this is feasible, we should do it. We'll make that determination based on what we see. The one surprising holdup in getting things done quicker is Burlington Northern getting us their final numbers, right? So, it's been a little difficult working with them, but they're coming to the table, and they have done a better job working with us. So, regarding SB184, there's a lot of language in there that had RTD doing weird stuff, right? Like using our FISA to extend the rail to Fort

Collins. A lot of that has changed, I think, already, but we took an amend position on that because it still needs a lot of cleanup work. There's been some allusion to the RTD reform bill that apparently sounds like it's going to drop tomorrow. There's been all kinds of iterations of that, you know, coming up through the, bubbling up to the surface. The last one we saw, and our CML person is right, it looks like it's going to be a seven-member board, two appointed by the governor, five elected. And there are air quotes around elected because I will say it is an illusion of an election, because those five people have to run district-wide, eight counties, 3.2 million people, bigger than congressional districts, for a \$35,000 a year job. And if no one decides to run, then, I don't know, how do you fill those positions? So, anyway, there's going to be a reduction in districts and there's talk about all of us just representing the whole district, so if you think you have representative government now, forget it. Anyway, as you can tell, I'm quite opposed to what I'm hearing about this bill, but we have to wait to see what actually comes out before we take an official position, before the board takes an official position. So, that's that. And I'm not a conspiracy theorist, but, you know, this bill is supposed to drop tomorrow and here's the front page of the Denver Post. "RTD cuts rail service". Well, RTD's work is about is safety improvements. We're not cutting rail service; we're making some changes to the schedule because we've got to replace 30-year-old track and coping panels. Safety improvements so we don't have derailments and problems on the line. There it is - the front page of the Post. We haven't been on the front page of the Post for a long time. So, we did talk about that, service changes because May service changes are coming up. There was some back and forth about doing light rail lines were going to be ending sooner and all this stuff, but that's all been resolved and that's not going to happen. We're keeping that in place. N line people - we are adding a late night trip on the weekend. It's little, but it's a positive, right? We're not cutting service. The N line numbers are incredible. People are using that line like crazy. If you go to the park and ride at the Eastlake station, it's like Wagon Road used to be in the olden days. We're doing a lot of work on the rail downtown, 30-year-old rail. It's interesting to see that you look at the surface and there's the rail, but there's all kinds of stuff underneath. So, any of the engineers in here, you know all this stuff, because it's not just pulling out a rail and slapping another rail down. It's really complicated work. So, that's kind of the highlight of our meeting. We talked about a lot of other things, but those are the two big things coming up. I'm sure next month we'll have more to say about the RTD reform bill. Maybe it'll be great. Maybe it'll be perfect. So, let's cross our fingers.

Mayor Mills: I know you're obviously opposed to the reform, and I respectfully understand that. I would like to know, and I know you may not have the answer to this, I'm probably preaching to the choir, but how is this going to improve rail safety and ridership? Exactly.

Director Buzek: I don't have an answer to that, Mayor. People criticize RTD, and believe me, we should be criticized when it's appropriate, right? But there are a lot of people that are critical of RTD that don't know anything about RTD and don't use transit, but they like to just jump on board and criticize us. If you think it's bad now, just wait.

Commissioner Baca: I just have a comment. So, I'm really enjoying a fired-up Mr. Buzek this morning. You are confirming a lot of what my gut was telling me, which it's really concerning. This feels like doomsday, and I just want to acknowledge all the work under Deb Johnson that the board and Deb have done. And it takes a long time to move the Titanic. You've done a lot of studies, you've done a lot of equity, you know, the fare structure, you've really looked at the hard questions and asking the hard questions and taking on the really hard, difficult problems, and I want to acknowledge that. I don't know what the future of RTD looks like. I'm not loving the two directed governor appointments, because as the governor changes, as you had stated earlier, Jessica, is that, you know, new elected officials come on and they have their own idea of what things look like. We're in a political environment of, you know, there's really good work being done, but then we have maybe a regime that comes in and dismantles, and then we have good work being done, but

we're back at square one. I know we all have our concerns from our own vantage point, and the density of the eight counties, when you start looking at that, and where you start looking at equity and economics, I would rather prefer geographical representation in this case, because I think we're going to be back at square one again.

Director Buzek: Elections are expensive, and who's going to run that? Certainly it's unlikely that somebody from one of the equity populations is going to be able to afford to run. So the representation, even if an election occurs, even if somebody signs up to run for one of those five spots, which I don't think that's happening, you're going to have a bunch of old white guys running RTD. Not that old white guys are necessarily bad. I happen to be one, but it's not representative. Anyway, it has nothing to do with the board being unprofessional or anything else - it has to do with the things that we've talked about before, funding for the rail to Fort Collins. Someone wants that, so that's going to happen.

Commissioner Baca: I appreciate you also showing a history of if we go this route, it's what it was before, and that didn't work, so we went to where we're at right now, right? I think as far as the governor taking that funding because what happens? Does that mean the cities and towns who are taking the money for RTD are going that way? Do they get that money back? Do we start over there? Because I think the governor is going to use those funds for something else.

Director Buzek: My prediction is that if Front Range Passenger Rail happens, Northwest Rail never happens. And they're apples and oranges, right? So, from Denver to Longmont, Front Range Passenger Rail has three stops. From Denver to Longmont, RTD's product has ten stops. So they're different products.

Chair McNally: And we've been building since 2004 for those, and have the density, which is conflicting with 1313. We've already done it, and if he doesn't drive that corridor and see that, he's blind.

Director Buzek: You know, we do an \$8 million study to determine if something is feasible, and it seems to me like Front Range Passenger Rail, it's a done deal. And they haven't even done their service development plan.

Carson Priest: Smart Commute always does summer outreach with each one of your communities and beyond throughout the summer. This is just a request to please send me any events that you'd like us to attend. We table, we talk to people about all the issues to do with CDOT, RTD, local projects that we're working on. I just put a list up there of the things that we've kind of signed up for this year, and then there's several bike-to-work-day things. The bike-to-work-day poster is on the left. It's one of our biggest days of the year, and we'll be out there in force that day. The smiley face only slightly creeps me out. That's it.

Meeting adjourned at 8:59 a.m.