



PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
Regular Meeting

Date: December 7, 2015

Meeting Called to Order: 5:30 p.m.

Meeting Adjourned: 7:07 p.m.

Present: Steven Peterson, Richard Follmer, Jacob Kuntz, William Leung

Staff Present: Bob Goebel, P.E. Public Works Director; Dan Sailer, P.E., Assistant Public Works Director; Thomas Reiff, Transportation Planner; Ryan Germeroth, P.E., Transportation Planning & Traffic Engineering Manager; Dave Corliss, Town Manager; Linda Angus, Administrative Supervisor

Absent: Langford Jordan, Mike Riedmuller, Kira James, Paul Donahue (Council Rep)

Visitor: Eugene Howard, Transit Mobility Program Manager-Douglas County

ITEM/SUBJECT	ACTION/BY	DISCUSSION/REPORT
Call to Order	Steven Peterson, Chair	Meeting was called to order. A quorum was present.
Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda		None
Minutes	Motion made by Commissioner Bill Leung; seconded by Commissioner Jacob Kuntz	It was motioned, seconded and approved by the Public Works Commission to accept the action minutes of October 5, 2015. Motion carries unanimously.
Douglas County Transit Demand Study	Eugene Howard, Transit Mobility Program Manager – Douglas County	<p>Mr. Eugene Howard, Transit Mobility Program Manager, Douglas County, introduced himself. Eugene is responsible primarily for administering Federal grants that provide transportation services for seniors and/or persons with disabilities in addition to evaluating the County's need for transit and transportation.</p> <p>Eugene began his presentation with a brief update and overview of the Transit Demand Analysis project. This project was approved by the Douglas County Commissioners in March 2014. Following that approval, a Request for Proposal was sent out and in November 2014, Fox Tuttle Hernandez Group was chosen to complete this analysis. In February 2015, a stakeholder committee was convened which included representatives around Douglas County i.e. municipalities, businesses, seniors, developers, school district, etc. During the summer, a transit demand survey was issued to the residents of Douglas County to help get a feel as to what their experience has been with transit and what kind of service they expected the County to provide.</p>

		<p>There were 1300 responses to the survey. Based on the survey results, a draft of transit alternatives was produced. The three areas that were focused on were; 1) local circulator; 2) fixed route; and 3) commuter solutions.</p> <p>There were three main goals set as guiding principles for this project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Develop a transit system that meets basic mobility needs while providing essential mobility services to all Douglas County residents.2. Develop a transit network that maintains and enhances the quality of life and economic development potential of Douglas County.3. Develop a transit network that is cost-effective, affordable, and fiscally resilient. <p>Also, the County wanted to assume no Federal dollars to create this system thereby providing a true cost. The public doesn't really know what it costs to provide transit. The fare box only pays 18-20% of their needs; the remaining is found somewhere else.</p> <p>A lot of demographic data was looked at to see where the growth is going to take place in Douglas County between now and 2040. The County wanted everything that they developed to be relevant in 2040. Employment sensors were looked at to see where employment would be in 2040 so the routes developed would be beneficial to employers. Many of the national surveys are pointing to employers making location decision choices based on transit access so it was important to make sure the County would be kept on the short list of businesses for their location choices.</p> <p>Focusing on key geographic areas and employment/population centers, Eugene provided an overview on transit alternatives utilizing low investment, moderate investment, and a high investment options. This gave a sense of what options would be beneficial using local circulators, point-to-point connectors, regional commuter, or rail.</p> <p>Next steps – Based off of the eleven options that have been worked through, it needs to be narrowed down even more. Costs need to be drilled down</p>
--	--	--

		<p>looking at all options i.e. creating a Douglas County Regional Transit Authority, looking at Federal funds, looking at public/private partnerships – nothing is off the table. We need to look at technology as a player i.e. autonomous circulator to reduce the need for the human factor.</p> <p>The plan is to have this project wrapped up by January 2016 and eventually placed on the website for everyone to view. On the wish list is to convene a working technical group from the key stakeholders and discuss how we can implement some of the options. Also, work on an online virtual community conversation survey of the eleven options and take this survey with the recommendations from the technical working group back to the Douglas County Commissioners.</p> <p><u>Questions</u> <i>What jurisdictions in Douglas County are participating in RTD?</i> Highlands Ranch, Lone Tree, and approximately ½ of Parker; Castle Rock voted itself out of RTD in the early 2000’s.</p> <p><i>What’s the status of the Ridgeway light rail connection?</i> RTD has received the approval from Federal Transit Authority (FTA) to go forth with the project but the Federal funds are not expected to be awarded until spring of 2016.</p> <p>The Commission thanked Eugene for his very informative presentation.</p>
<p>5-Year Capital Improvement Projects</p>	<p>Dan Sailer, Assistant Director of Public Works AND Bob Goebel, Public Works Director</p>	<p>This is an informational item to provide understanding to the Commission of what is in Public Works 5-Year Capital Improvement Program that was recently approved by Council. There is a long list of project needs that have been identified. This list is created using the Transportation Master Plan, staff (through safety studies, operational analysis, etc.), and development (although development helps build the majority of the roadway network, we look at opportunities to identify joint projects).</p> <p>Revenue that comes into the transportation fund is divided into three areas; 1) capital projects; 2) obligations (bonds, etc.); and 3) operations and maintenance. Our funding sources are impact fees, Highway User Tax fund, sales tax, and deferred revenue.</p>

		<p>Dan reviewed the projections for the next five years and the funds available for capital projects. Every year, as part of the budgeting process, staff works with Town Council on what projects need to be adjusted according to community needs and feedback. The recent survey that went out to the community identified traffic congestion as one of the priority areas. Based on this, we looked at what projects would provide that relief.</p> <p>The projects summary map along with the proposed transportation projects for 2016-2020 was discussed. The majority of the projects identified are geared toward trying to provide the needed congestion relief. There are some projects that take advantage of the collaboration with the Utilities Department to deal with some upgrades of ancient infrastructure (Craig & Gould). So there is a balance between congestion relief and coordination projects that affect our residents.</p> <p>Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) collaboration projects on SH86 (Founders Parkway) were discussed.</p> <p>The need for the traffic signal on Ridge Road at the King Soopers shopping center entrance/exit was discussed. The design of the signal will accommodate the evidential widening of Ridge Road.</p> <p>Improvements along Fifth Street were discussed. This is a safety hazard since there are no paved shoulders, guardrail, or turn lanes for the private residents. The widening of Fifth is on the future list; just not within the next five years.</p> <p>Crystal Valley Interchange was discussed. Staff recently met with CDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to discuss the project and potential construction phasing. FHWA representatives were not receptive to phasing the construction of the interchange; they like to build "all" the movements at the time of the initial project construction even though it is not needed at that time. Staff will continue discussions with them but so far our request to "phase" has been rejected.</p>
Projects Update	Bob Goebel, Public Works Director	An overview of the current Public Works projects/programs was provided to the Commission in their packet.

		<p><i>How's the Taxi Voucher program doing?</i> The program is working well. The number of rides has declined since the \$2.00 fee was introduced so we are able to stay within budget for the program this year.</p> <p>Quiet Zone was discussed. The 5th Street crossing needs some minor modifications to become compliant with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The median on the west side needs to be extended 10-15' and the alley on the northwest corner needs to be closed. The Fire Department does not want 3rd Street closed due to safety issues but the Police Department is in favor of closing 2nd Street due to the fact that when the train is crossing, they are blocked in. In January, staff will be hosting an open house that will get into the details of the different options. After the open house, staff plans to go back to Council in February with the results from the open house and hopefully make a decision at that time. With Festival Park being expanded, which closes 2nd Street from Perry to Wilcox, it seems logical that 2nd would be closed from the railroad tracks to Wilcox. With the improvements on Fifth and closure of 2nd Street, the risk index would be low enough that 3rd Street wouldn't need a treatment and a Quiet Zone can be established.</p>
Council Comments	Paul Donahue, Mayor (Council Representative)	Absent
Commission/Staff Comments/Concerns		<i>Can you please have the Project Manager for the North Meadows project look into the flagging on Santa Fe?</i> It seems to be for the convenience of the contractor not to move construction equipment safely across Santa Fe.
Adjournment	Steven Peterson	There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.