The Arapahoe County Board of County Commissioners typically holds weekly Study Sessions on Monday and Tuesday. Study Sessions (except for Executive Sessions) are open to the public and items for discussion are included on this agenda. Agendas (except for Executive Sessions agendas) are available through the Commissioners’ Office or through the County’s web site at www.arapahoegov.com. Please note that the Board may discuss any topic relevant to County business, whether or not the topic has been specifically noticed on this agenda. In particular, the Board typically schedules time each Monday under “Committee Updates” to discuss a wide range of topics. In addition, the Board may alter the times of the meetings throughout the day, or cancel or reschedule noticed meetings. Questions about this agenda? Contact the Commissioners’ Office at 303-795-4630 or by e-mail at commissioners@arapahoegov.com

Study Session Topics

9:00 A.M.  Calendar Updates (WHR)
BoCC Administration Manager

9:45 A.M.  BOCC Updates (WHR)
Board of County Commissioners

11:00 A.M.  *Executive Session (WHR)
Executive Study Session and County Attorney Administrative Meeting [Section 24-6-402 (4)C.R.S.] (As required by law, specific agenda topics will be announced in open meeting prior to the commencement of the closed and confidential portion of this session) (WHR)

Ron Carl, County Attorney

Break

1:00 P.M.  *Align Arapahoe - Quality Of Life (WHR)
Align Arapahoe - Quality of Life

Request: Information/Direction

Manisha Singh, Director, Department of Strategy & Performance
Elected Officials and Department Directors

2:00 P.M.  *Fixed Assets Request For Emergency Operations Center (WHR)
Discussion of a request to authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to approve the assignment of a fixed asset number for the construction of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and approve any other subsequent fixed asset numbers required for the EOC and relocate the Office of Emergency Management office space to provide workspace for the Behavioral Health Response Program

Request: Information/Direction

Olga Fujaros, Sheriff's Finance Manager, Sheriff's Office
Tyler S. Brown, Sheriff
Keith Ashby, Purchasing Manager, Finance
Tiffanie Bleau, Senior Assistant County Attorney

Documents:

EOC DROP IN BSR 2019.DOC
PAGES FROM PROJECT PLAN SO ADMIN EOC NEAR FINALS (003).PDF

2:30 P.M.  *Neighborhood Outreach Code Change (WHR)
Discussion of a request for direction from the Board of County Commissioners on whether to change the Land Development Code to require public outreach in certain circumstances

Request: Information/Direction

Kelsea Dombrovski, Planner I, Public Works and Development
Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager, Public Works and Development
Bryan Weimer, Director, Public Works and Development
Keith Ashby, Purchasing Manager, Finance
Robert Hill, Senior Assistant County Attorney

Documents:

BSR - NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH STUDY SESSION.PDF

3:00 P.M.  *Innovative Transportation Update (WHR)
Discussion of a request from Public Works and Development staff for direction from the Board of County Commissioners regarding Arapahoe County engaging in advanced mobility planning and deployment efforts

Request: Information/Direction

Peter Kozinski, Transportation Division Manager, Public Works and Development
Bryan Weimer, Director, Public Works and Development
Keith Ashby, Purchasing Manager, Finance
Robert Hill, Senior Assistant County Attorney

Documents:

ADVANCED MOBILITY SS BSR 6-17-19.DOC

3:30 P.M.  *Drop In (WHR)
Board of County Commissioners

1. HOME Allocation Habitat For Humanity Hillside Avenue Project
   Discussion of a request from Housing and Community Development Services staff to withhold funding from the duplex project at 2002 West Hillside Avenue for the amount of $70,000 because construction for this project commenced prior to Arapahoe
County receiving the Environmental Clearance for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a legal requirement

Request: Information/Direction

Liana Escott, Community Development Representative, Community Resources
Don Klemme, Director, Community Resources
Keith Ashby, Purchasing Manager, Finance
Tiffanie Bleau, Senior Assistant County Attorney

Documents:

DROP IN REGARDING HABITAT FUNDING.PDF

* To Be Recorded As Required By Law
WHR - West Hearing Room

Arapahoe County is committed to making its public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Assisted listening devices are available. Ask any staff member and we will provide one for you. If you need special accommodations, contact the Commissioners’ Office at 303-795-4630 or Relay Colorado 711.

Please contact our office at least 3 days in advance to make arrangements.
Date: June 6th, 2019
To: Board of County Commissioners
Through: Tyler Brown, Sheriff
From: Olga Fujaros, Sheriff’s Finance Manager
Subject: Emergency Operations Center – Fixed Assets Request

Request and Recommendation
Request the Board of County Commissioners to authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to approve the assignment of a fixed asset number for the construction of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) and approve any other subsequent fixed asset numbers required for the EOC and relocate the Office of Emergency Management office space to provide workspace for the Behavioral Health Response Program.

Background
The Arapahoe County EOC is currently an “EOC in a box.” All equipment is shut down and stored in closets until activation. The Community Room within the Sheriff’s Office is the designated location for the EOC and is consistently booked for other trainings or events. In a no-notice event there is a significant delay in setting up the space. If in use, we need to relocate the existing training class and rearrange furniture and set up technology and associated equipment. The equipment is slow to start up due to being shut down and often requires an update once connected to our County servers. The ability to host regular training is limited in a shared location. In order to maintain acceptable Emergency Operations Center training skills sets, employees need the opportunity to train more frequently in a dedicated space.

During the 2019 budget process the Sheriff’s Office was approved to establish a Behavioral Health Response Program. This program requires office space and equipment for 7 full time and contract employees. As configured, the Sheriff’s Office does not have the appropriate space to house the Behavioral Health Response Program.

Links to Align Arapahoe
- Service First
  - The full time EOC will allow Arapahoe County to more efficiently activate during disasters and states of emergency to support our citizens.
  - A full time EOC provides the training and exercise space to improve and enhance skills sets required during an emergency.
Discussion
When the Sheriff’s Office staff evaluated the two above listed challenges, they identified one solution that would resolve both issues. Remodeling space on the first floor of the Sheriff’s Office Administrative building would be able to provide office space and a full time EOC for the Office of Emergency Management. This would allow the Behavioral Health Response Program staff to operate in the space vacated by OEM staff.

This project would construct a “hot” full time Emergency Operations Center (EOC) suitable for coordinating all-hazards incidents within Arapahoe County. The primary use is real-world activations, both planned and no notice events. In addition, EOC personnel would regularly use the space for training and exercise to maintain knowledge and skill sets. Equipment, to include technology, would remain permanently connected to County systems and require no set up time upon EOC activation. The space is dedicated to EOC functions and therefore not a competitively reserved location for other trainings. A full time EOC improves our County wide ability to coordinate all hazards incidents in an efficient manner.

Alternatives
The alternative to this proposal is to take no action and continue to address the space needs for the Behavioral Health Response Program and EOC separately. We would continue to share a training space with the rest of the Sheriff’s Office and outside reservations. Training would be limited due to frequent use of the space for non-EOC related activities and trainings. Equipment would continue to be slow to start up as a result of being kept shut down and stored in a closet. If the EOC is needed during another section’s training they would be disrupted and relocated to open the EOC. We would still need to identify how to house the Behavioral Health Response Program staff which could add more delays to having the program operational.

Fiscal Impact
The project will be funded with existing budget and will be offset by the use of Emergency Management Program Grant (EMPG) funds in the amount of $85,000. This is a reimbursement grant awarded annually through the completion of work plan activities developed by the Office of Emergency Management. All EOC equipment is designated on the Authorized Equipment List. Full project budget is approximately $195,966 which includes a contingency of 5%.

Concurrence
Command Staff of the Arapahoe County Sheriff’s Office are in concurrence with this decision.

Attorney Comments

Reviewed By
Ashley Cappel, Deputy Emergency Manager
Olga Fujaros, Sheriff’s Finance Manager
Kenneth McKlem, Captain
Glenn Thompson, Bureau Chief
Tyler S. Brown, Sheriff
### Project Plan

**Sheriff Office Admin**

**Ground Floor EOC**

Version #: 1.0  
Issue Date: May 30, 2019

---

**Appendix C – Project Budget**

**Sheriff Office Administration - Emergency Operations Center**

---

#### Budget Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description/Notes</th>
<th>Requested Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Drawings</td>
<td>Allowance – SO has requested informal process; contingency should formalize architectural coordination be required; includes $800 allowance for BOMA updates</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>per proposal + reimbursables</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>per proposal + reimbursables</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHI Fees</td>
<td>Assumes no permit costs</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Contingency</td>
<td>Allowance at 10% of design</td>
<td>$1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Budget (capitalized)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Services (inc. mechanical + fire strobe)</td>
<td>Estimated pending formal b/c</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Work</td>
<td>Per proposal, with 10% allowance for late drawing modifications</td>
<td>$17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove &amp; Replace Carpet</td>
<td>Estimate by Mohawk</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabling Costs</td>
<td>Per CNC estimate</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Equipment</td>
<td>$2,050 Monitors@$150, 12 computers with licenses @ $1000, $4,000 for IT stand-up; $3,000 allowance for switches &amp; ports</td>
<td>$2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Radios</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Furniture</td>
<td>$2,600 per RC Installations estimate + $4,000 for Workplace Res. Tear Down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Cabinets &amp; Shelves</td>
<td>$1,000 estimated at 2 cabinets Industrial Clear-View Uline H-2805BL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging Clips</td>
<td>$250 based on School Outfitters SKU: 8F5-504-D quan 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging Files</td>
<td>$216 Based on Displays 2 Go MSHVLSBK Quan 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC Commissioning</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Screen Monitors, Wired</td>
<td>$26,000 Per Jeff Strauss estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site Construction Waste Disposal</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc supplies and equipment</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$176,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$191,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Contingency</td>
<td>5% of construction elements</td>
<td>$4,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019 Expected Project Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$195,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Printed on: June 3, 2019
BOARD SUMMARY REPORT

Date: June 6, 2019

To: Board of County Commissioners

Through: Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager

From: Kelsea Dombrovski, Planner I

Subject: PWD Neighborhood Outreach Potential Code Change

Direction/Information
Staff is seeking direction from the BOCC on whether we should change the Land Development Code to require public outreach in certain circumstances. Research on neighboring jurisdictions’ practices has been conducted and is presented herein.

Request and Recommendation
Staff recommends developing regulations to require neighborhood meetings based on recent controversial land use cases that may have benefitted from neighborhood outreach. Staff have conducted research on seventeen neighboring jurisdictions’ practices and have developed possible alternatives for the Board’s consideration.

Background
The Arapahoe County Land Development Code does not require neighborhood meetings for most land use applications. The Code only requires a neighborhood meeting for proposed Commercial Mobile Radio Service (cellular) facilities within 500 feet of residential zoning. Staff consistently recommends neighborhood meetings when we identify potential land use conflicts or neighborhood concern. However, applicants are not obligated to follow staff’s advice.

Links to Align Arapahoe

Quality of Life
Requiring neighborhood meetings could identify issues early in the project and could result in design improvements for future land use projects.

Discussion
Background
While staff often recommends neighborhood meetings, applicants do not always opt to perform the recommended outreach. Two recent cases highlight the importance of neighborhood outreach: the Silver Creek Sporting Club and Waffle House. In both cases, staff strongly recommended reaching out to neighbors. Neither applicant followed that advice; both cases resulted in significant neighborhood opposition, lengthy public hearings, and denials. Administrative cases can
sometimes benefit from neighborhood meetings: minor changes such as relocating a tennis/pickleball court or trash enclosure could have impacts on neighbors, even if those changes can be approved by staff.

In addition, late citizen opposition to a project (as a result of the lack of early opportunity for input) often results in higher project-related costs for the County as well as for the applicant. High-impact cases without early neighborhood communication often result in a major out-pouring of comments and questions at the time of the staff report and hearing notice. This high-volume response requires considerable staff time to track and convey comments to the applicant and decision-makers, and may result in significantly longer and more complex public hearings.

At those hearings, applicants often complain that changing their plans to respond to citizen concern is too costly and will result in unacceptable delays given the significant investment that has already been made in preparing detailed plans and undergoing staff review and agency referrals. The applicant team often overlooks the fact that they may have avoided these expensive and timely delays by heeding staff advice to offer an early meeting to the neighborhood.

Comparable Jurisdictions
Many communities in the region require neighborhood meetings in different circumstances or with staff discretion. Jefferson County requires meetings for any change in zoning and certain special uses. Adams County requires neighborhood meetings if one is deemed necessary by the Director, often for rezonings or conditional use permits. The City of Littleton requires meetings whenever a case will result in a public hearing. The Town of Castle Rock requires neighborhood meetings for certain case types and gives staff the authority to request neighborhood outreach for others. Fourteen of the seventeen jurisdictions contacted have a code provision requiring a neighborhood meeting for at least one case type. (See attachment for more details).

Thirteen jurisdictions require meetings for zoning/rezoning, including at least one stage of a new Planned Unit Development. Ten jurisdictions require a meeting for Conditional Use Permit, Use by Special Review, and/or Special Exception Use applications. For comparison to the County’s meeting requirement for Commercial Mobile Radio Service (cellular) facilities, three jurisdictions require meetings in similar contexts, but typically only if the case requires a Conditional Use Permit or other special consideration. Generally, jurisdictions required neighborhood meetings for cases with the most potential impact on nearby residents. For example, rezonings or uses by special review can completely change how a property functions within a neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Common Case Types Requiring Neighborhood Meeting</th>
<th>Number of Jurisdictions (of 17 total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning/Rezoning, including PUD Stages</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Permit, Use by Special Review, Special Exception Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMRS or Telecommunications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat, Preliminary or Final</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most jurisdictions have staff attend neighborhood meetings, and meeting location is typically selected at the applicant’s discretion, with some guidance from staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Attend Neighborhood Meeting</th>
<th>Number of Jurisdictions (of 17 total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends/Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
<th>Number of Jurisdictions (of 17 total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant’s Discretion, Community Site Encouraged</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Location, e.g. City Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six jurisdictions reported clear authority for a manager or director to require a neighborhood meeting if the code did not otherwise require it, while eight jurisdictions either did not have dedicated authority or did not have meeting-specific authority (e.g. they were able to request additional information, but perhaps not a meeting). Three jurisdictions were in the process of updating their code, had old guidance documents with unclear language, or had another reason to be uncertain about authority to require a meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Ability to Require Meeting if Not Required Otherwise?</th>
<th>Number of Jurisdictions (of 17 total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suggested Code Elements**
Staff suggest the following elements for the proposed code change based on Planning Division operations, case types reviewed, geographic layout of the County, and other relevant factors:

Case types best suited for neighborhood meetings in Arapahoe County are zonings, rezonings, Planned Unit Development stages that set zoning, and Uses by Special Review. These case types have the highest chance of impacting neighboring citizens and land uses. Meetings will no longer be required for most CMRS facilities; staff will refine outreach requirements in conjunction with updates to the CMRS code.

Include a provision for the Planning Division Manager to waive a required meeting; it may not always be necessary to hold a neighborhood meeting. For instance, increasing the number of residents in a group home by as few as one person may trigger a Use by Special Review and therefore a neighborhood meeting. If there is interest from citizens, however, a meeting would still be required. Meeting waiver guidelines would be documented via a memo and shared with potential applicants.
Include a provision for the Planning Division Manager to require a neighborhood meeting not typically required by code. Occasionally, non-zoning or special review cases may have the potential to impact the neighborhood. In this case, the Division Manager would have the authority to require a meeting to ensure neighbors are aware of the proposed project and have early opportunity to comment. Meeting requirement guidelines would be documented via a memo and shared with potential applicants.

The neighborhood meeting would occur after pre-submittal meeting and prior to full application. This will give the applicant the opportunity to incorporate citizen concern in application documents prior to submittal, reducing the chance of potentially costly adjustments late in the project. This timing will also provide staff with a sense of neighborhood feedback prior to review, rather than prior to hearing.

The applicant would be responsible for compiling a list of mailing addresses for landowners within the dedicated noticing radius, drafting notice letters, sending letters by noticing date, and attesting to proper noticing. Staff would review notice materials to ensure accuracy and clarity.

Notice would be sent fourteen days prior to the neighborhood meeting. Property owners within 500 feet of the project boundary if in an urbanized area, and property owners within 1,000 feet of the project boundary if in a rural area, would receive the notice. The Planning Division may expand or contract the notification boundary as appropriate and per existing code language in Chapter 17.

The meeting would be held at a community space close to the project site and would be chosen at the applicant’s discretion.

Staff would not attend neighborhood meetings. There is opportunity for conflict and confusion: staff attendance may indicate staff or County approval or support of the project. Staff may also be approached with questions on other projects, broader County questions, or other topics they are not able to discuss or speak on, which may lead to misunderstandings. The applicant would have the ability to present the proposed project without the distraction of staff presence.

The applicant would submit a meeting summary report at time of application, which would contain: sign-in sheet with attendee names, addresses, and contact information; a copy and/or a summary of the presentation; a summary of comments made and feedback received; and a description of how they will address concerns presented.

If directed to move forward with the Code amendment, staff will conduct outreach with developers, neighborhood organizations, and HOAs.

**Alternatives**

1. Move forward with the suggested code elements, detailed above.
2. Move forward with some changes to the suggested code elements.
3. Develop code alternatives, gather public feedback, and return for an additional study session.
4. Keep neighborhood meetings optional. Staff will continue to urge neighborhood outreach when appropriate, highlighting recent denials on cases that chose not to conduct neighborhood meetings.

**Fiscal Impact**
Management of high volumes of citizen comment at time of staff report and hearing strain staff’s time and add to the demands of case management. Longer and more complex public hearings can be a burden on staff and the Board, perhaps drawing valuable resources for a project that may not receive approval.

**Reviewed By**
Kelsea Dombrovski, Planner I
Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager
Jan Yeckes, Division Manager
Bryan Weimer, Department Director
Todd Weaver, Finance Department
Robert Hill, County Attorney
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Meeting Req. in Code</th>
<th>Case Types</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Staff Attendance</th>
<th>Noticing: Sign Posting</th>
<th>Noticing: Mailing</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Can Staff Req. Mtg. if Not Otherwise Required?</th>
<th>Unique Feature if Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Determined by Director; Often Rezonings, Conditional Use Permits</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 days prior/500 ft. radius</td>
<td>Location standard broken down by urban, semi-urban, rural</td>
<td>Yes – at director’s discretion</td>
<td>Meeting location distance standards vary for urban, semi-urban, and rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvada</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rezoning, Preliminary Development Plans, Preliminary Plat, Height Exceptions, Conditional Use Approval, Alternative Sign Program, Annexations, Out of City Utility Request</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 days prior/400 ft. radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion; in vicinity of proposed project, most often within half mile</td>
<td>Yes – at director’s discretion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If requested by public</td>
<td>After Application</td>
<td>Depends</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 days prior/1 mile radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion; close to site, often at fire stations or City Hall</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If mtg. requested by public and applicant opts not to hold one, staff mentions this at hearing and in report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Oil and Gas, CMRS</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 days prior/1000 ft. radius</td>
<td>Usually City Hall</td>
<td>Yes – at director’s discretion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Rock</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If deemed necessary; most often: residential development, downtown site development plans, some cell towers, USR, BOA variances</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15 days prior/300 ft. radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion; typically community space or applicant’s office close to project</td>
<td>Yes – at director’s discretion</td>
<td>Council and/or PC may table decision if seems neighborhood did not get enough information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rezoning, PUD, Height &gt;30 ft., when Traffic Study Required, Conditional Use; Projects &lt;1 mi. from HOA &amp; &gt;500,000 sf. floor space or 5,000 trips generated</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14 days prior/200 ft. radius</td>
<td>Within mile of site, avoid city offices</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbine Valley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Group Homes: neighborhood notified of application, applicant may propose to meet with neighbors – can request town’s assistance</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Based on code review; Columbine Valley did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Suggested for all applications, especially: Rezoning, Final Plat, Preliminary Plans, Site Plans</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Varies/1-2 mile radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion; staff suggests HOAs and community spaces</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PC and BOCC have continued cases and urged applicants to hold mtg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rezoning, PUD, Major Subdivision, Conditional Use for Telecommunications Facility</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 days prior/1,000 ft. radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion; location accessible and convenient for the public</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Owner and tenant notified, not just owner; based on code review – Englewood did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Meeting Req. in Code</td>
<td>Case Types</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Staff Attendance</td>
<td>Noticing: Sign Posting</td>
<td>Noticing: Mailing</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Can Staff Req. Mtg. if Not Otherwise Required?</td>
<td>Unique Feature if Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Village</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Annexation, Rezoning (including PUD), Major PUD Modification, Special Use Permit, Major Special Use Permit Modification; Meetings encouraged for Site Development Plans (in conventional zone districts)</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15 days prior/2,000 ft. radius</td>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>No; Have Code section to waive mtg.</td>
<td>Special areas – Development Impact Zone – have different noticing requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rezoning, Special Use</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14 days prior/500 ft. or 1,320 ft. radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion; close to project, public buildings encouraged</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Different noticing guidelines depending on location – density varies across the jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Initial Zoning, Rezoning, Special Use Permit, or as Determined by Director</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14 days prior/300 ft. or 500 ft. radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion</td>
<td>Yes – at director’s discretion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Initial Zoning, Rezoning, PUD, Planned Development Overlay, Conditional Uses</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15 days prior/700 ft. radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion; City building offered, meeting in neighborhood encouraged</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Zoning, Rezoning</td>
<td>No specification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 days prior/ 300 ft. radius</td>
<td>Specific rec center or City Hall</td>
<td>No; General language to ask for additional materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Conceptual Site Plans, Rezoning, Annexation, Major Development Permits</td>
<td>After Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 days prior/1,500 ft. radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion; no formal guidelines</td>
<td>Yes – at director’s discretion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Stages of PUDs, PUD amendments</td>
<td>After Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14 days prior/300 ft. radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion but staff approves; request using a public building</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Ridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rezoning, Special Use Permit, Projects in Mixed Use &gt;10 ac.</td>
<td>Before Application</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10-14 days prior/600 ft. radius</td>
<td>Applicant’s discretion; most at City Hall or rec center</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Owner and tenant notified, not just owner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD SUMMARY REPORT

DATE: June 11, 2019
TO: Board of County Commissioners
THROUGH: Bryan D. Weimer, PWLF, Director
Public Works and Development
FROM: Peter Kozinski, Transportation Division Manager
Public Works and Development
SUBJECT: DISCUSSION ON INNOVATIVE / ADVANCED MOBILITY IN ARAPAHOE COUNTY

Direction/Information
The Public Works and Development Department (PWD) is seeking direction from the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) regarding Arapahoe County engaging in advanced mobility planning and deployment efforts. If the BoCC chooses to support advanced mobility engagements, it would be the first County, in Colorado, to do so (other than the City and County of Denver). Additionally, if the BoCC is supportive of engaging in advanced mobility discussion PWD would like to receive feedback on the kind of "data" that can be shared. If the BoCC deems it appropriate, data sharing authority could be address in a forthcoming consent agenda item.

Request and Recommendation
Staff seeks BoCC perspective and direction on engaging in advanced mobility efforts. Staff recommends exploring, to a limited extent, the benefits and partnerships that can be recognized by being open to and exploring advanced mobility solutions.

Background
As discussed with the BoCC in the March 15, 2019, Study Session pertaining to the County joining the Smart Cities Alliance; technology, mobility, big data and innovation are common threads in the discussions around smart cities & regions of the future. The 2040 Transportation Plan is being developed with the recognition that mobility in 2040 will look different than it does today and that “out-of-the-box” thinking is needed to keep the County from
lagging behind. Furthermore, it was discussed that Infrastructure Owner / Operators (IOOs), like Arapahoe County, should be open to P3s as a mechanism to leverage existing investments to improve the state of the infrastructure within the County. As such, the BoCC provided direction to join the Alliance and thus the purpose of this study session is to update the BoCC on a potential next step involving Innovative / Advanced Mobility.

Align Arapahoe
Two elements of Align Arapahoe (Service First, Quality of Life) would be consistent with this initiative and PWD’s involvement.

Service First
Being engaged with Advanced Mobility initiatives will afford the County the opportunity to be part of and access the various resources that our constituents will demand as mobility service and expectations evolve.

Quality of Life
Some of the largest challenges the County is experiencing is in the area of transportation and mobility for our citizens and businesses. Engaging in Advanced Mobility discussions will help us “future-proof” our investments while preparing for the future. These engagements have the potential to provide the County and its constituents new tools and solutions to address current and future transportation challenges and problems.

Discussion
Historically transportation could easily be divided between infrastructure (i.e. roads, signals, signage) and vehicles (i.e. cars, trucks, busses) but over the past decade these historic lines have started to blur. Now, more than ever, vehicles are utilizing sensors and other devices to read and communicate with infrastructure and other vehicles around them to improve safety and efficiency. This symbiotic relationship between infrastructure and vehicles is changing how traditional IOOs manage and use their assets.

This new mindset is being driven by the assertions of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA); that upwards of eighty percent (80%) of current roadway accidents could be reduced or avoided, and the capacity of our existing roadway could be increased by up to four hundred percent (400%) by integrating new and emerging technologies in our infrastructure and vehicles.

Add to this the proliferation of ride-share companies and the declaration of many of the major vehicle manufactures to build more Electric Vehicles (EVs), and it’s hard to ignore the changes that have occurred in the transportation industry over the last 10-years. These changes are indicative of Moore’s Law, and if history is any indication of the future we can expect to see a very dramatic increase in advanced mobility activities in the next 5 to 10 years and the time is now to get Arapahoe County prepared.

PWD Staff is not suggesting that the County should dramatically deviate from its current investment strategies but is suggesting that as we make investments in traditional infrastructure, that have a life expectancy of 10 to 75 years, we take into consideration the new paradigm in innovative / advanced mobility. As well as show a willingness, on a limited basis, to openly engage with those that are looking to increase the safety, efficiency and reliability of our transportation network with Advanced Mobility solutions.

As an example, PWD has been in communications with an organization called Traffic Technology Services (TTS) that would like to receive a Signal, Phase and Timing (SPaT) data feed from Arapahoe County that they could make available to vehicles equipped to receive this kind of information. Vehicles that are equipped to receive this information can alert and notify the operator of the vehicle that a light is about to change color and what the recommended speed is if said operator wants to make the green cycle of the light(s) ahead of the vehicle. These features make our roadway system more efficient. Similar opportunities exist with school zone information, ramp meters, curve warnings and slippery roads to name a few.
From PWD’s perspective “Data is the new asphalt in the transportation business”.

**Alternatives**
The BoCC can choose to encourage staff to engage or not engage in Advanced Mobility efforts. If the BoCC chooses to encourage engagement, staff would recommend that the already established Smart Cities Alliance working group be tasked with Advanced Mobility exploration and partnerships also.

This groups’ first task would be to introduce a consent agenda item outlining under what conditions County transportation & traffic data can and should be shared and who is authorized to enter into such agreements.

**Fiscal Impact**
There is no financial impact to explore Innovative / Advanced Mobility options within the County.

**Concurrence**
The Public Works and Development Department has reviewed this Board Summary Report and concurs that it would be beneficial for Arapahoe County to encourage staff to be more engaged and open to and exploring Advanced Mobility solutions.

cc: Bryan D. Weimer, Director – Public Works and Development  
Peter Kozinski, Transportation Division Manager - PWD  
David Bessen, Director – IT Department  
Karl Packer, Traffic Operations Manager - PWD  
Robert Hill, Assistant County - Attorney Department  
Keith Ashby, Purchasing Manager – Finance Department  
Todd Weaver, Budget Manager – Finance Department  
Leanna Quint, Budget Analyst – Finance Department  
Kim Lynch, PWD  
File (Advanced Mobility)
Board Summary Report

Date: June 5, 2019
To: Board of County Commissioners
Through: Don Klemme, Director, Community Resources
From: Liana Escott, Community Development Administrator, Housing and Community Development Services (HCDS).
Subject: HOME allocation Habitat for Humanity for $70,000 revocation.

Request and Recommendation:

The Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) approved the funding for the construction of a duplex at 2002 West Hillside Avenue, Englewood Colorado for the amount of $70,000. The construction for this project commenced prior to Arapahoe County receiving the Environmental Clearance for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), a legal requirement. It is HCDS staff’s recommendation that the funding be withheld from this project.

Background

Habitat for Humanity Duplex:

Habitat for Humanity has started construction on an affordable duplex project located at 2002 West Hillside Avenue in Englewood. The construction started prior to Arapahoe County having the notice to proceed from HUD. Arapahoe County did not give Habitat a notice to proceed, which is required when federal HUD funds are invested into a project.

Therefore, HCDS staff is recommending to remove the awarded $70,000 grant from this project, to avoid any potential future compliance/audit concerns.

Links to Align Arapahoe

1. Enhance Quality of Life. Citizens’ lives may be enhanced by utilizing federal HOME funds for housing activities that will benefit lower income families.
2. Service First. Using HOME funds to help residents of Arapahoe County obtain stable housing will reduce the number of homeless persons and persons with inadequate housing.

Alternatives

Staff are unable to identify viable accommodations while remaining in compliance with HUD requirements. The funds will be eligible for a future HOME project.
Fiscal Impact

HOME funds are allocated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. No County funds are affected.

Attorney Comments

Reviewed By:

Liana Escott, Community Development Administrator
Linda Haley, Housing and Community Development Division Manager
Don Klemme, Community Resources Department Director
Janet Kennedy, Finance Department Director
Tiffanie Bleau, Assistant County Attorney