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 Administrative Support Supervisor

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

Break

11:30 A.M.  *Lobbyist Lunch (WHR)
Board of County Commissioners
Ron Carl, County Attorney
Greg Romberg, Lobbyist

1:00 P.M.  Strategy And Performance Update (WHR)
Manisha Singh, Director, Department of Strategy and Performance

1:30 P.M.  *Discussion Of Adams County Area Aging Agency Request (WHR)
Discussion of a request from Adams County for support to open up the state process to consider creating additional planning and service areas consistent with the Older Americans Act

Request: Information/Direction

Michelle Halstead, Director, Communication and Administrative Services
Linda Haley, Community Development and Senior Resources Division Manager, Community Resources

Documents:

BSR_AAA_ADCO_REQUEST_20200113.DOC
LTR_ADCO_AAA_REQUEST_2019_12_13.PDF

2:00 P.M.  *Steering Committee Update (WHR)
Update from the Steering Committee

Request: Information/Direction

Michelle Halstead, Director, Communication and Administrative Services
Janet Kennedy, Director, Finance
Shannon Carter, Director, Opens Spaces
Ron Carl, County Attorney
Dick Hawes, Director, Facilities and Fleet Management
Don Klemme, Director, Community Resources
Bryan Weimer, Director, Public Works and Development
Todd Weaver, Budget Manager, Finance
John Christofferson, Deputy County Attorney

Documents:

BSR_STEERING_COMMITTEE_20200113.DOC
2019 COORDINATED ELECTION ANALYSIS.DOCX
2019 COORDINATED ELECTION MAPS.PDF

3:00 P.M.  *Creation Of K9 Training Area And Law Enforcement Memorial At Sheriff’s Office (WHR)
Discussion of a request from the Sheriff's Office for authorization for (1) Phase One - to create a memorial to deputies killed in the line of duty and (2) Phase Two - donation for K9 Training Area improvements on land to the east of the Sheriff's Office building on Broncos Parkway

Request: Information/Direction

Olga Fujaros, Sheriff's Finance Manager, Sheriff's Office
Kenneth McKlem, Special Operations Captain, Sheriff's Office
Tyler Brown, Sheriff
Keith Ashby, Purchasing Manager, Finance
Tiffanie Bleau, Senior Assistant County Attorney

Documents:

2019 DROP-IN BSR MEMORIAL AND K9 TRAINING AREA FINAL.DOCX

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

1. Dove Valley Annexation Update
Update on annexations in unincorporated Dove Valley. As part of an intergovernmental agreement for Dove Valley Regional Park improvements, the county agreed to annex the park into the City of Centennial, as well as an associated parcel adjacent to the Sheriff's Office for the Lone Tree Trail

Request: Information/Direction
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.
Board Summary Report

Date: January 2, 2020

To: Board of County Commissioners

From: Michelle Halstead, director of communication and administrative services and Linda Haley, community development and senior resources division manager

Subject: Adams County Request for Supporting Area Agency on Aging Review Process

Request and Recommendation
Adams County has requested support from other metro counties to open up the state process to consider creating additional planning and service areas consistent with the Older Americans Act. Given it has been 30 years since the last evaluation, staff is supportive of this request and recommends sending a letter.

Background
The Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) serves as the Area Agency on Aging (AAA) and Planning Service Area (PSA) for eight metro counties, including Adams, Arapahoe, Clear Creek, Douglas, Gilpin, Jefferson and the Cities and Counties of Broomfield and Denver.

The AAA is funded through the Older Americans Act, a half-century old federal program that allocates funds to states based on their 60-plus populations and Colorado General Funds distributed through the Older Coloradans Act. As the AAA, DRCOG administers authorized grant funding; creates and implements a four-year Area Plan on Aging to establish service priority areas; and provides the region's Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program.

Within the state of Colorado, 16 agencies are designated by the State Unit on Aging in accordance with the laws and regulations promulgated by the Administration for Community Living (ACL) and authorized under the Older Americans Act. Colorado AAAs are housed in: local councils of governments (10), county government offices (4) and non-profit organizations (2). Together, the 16 AAAs in Colorado form the Colorado Association of Area Agencies on Aging (c4a), which provides leadership, advocacy and a voice for the aging network in the state.

The Adams County Board of Commissioners directed staff to begin the process of developing its own locally controlled AAA and PSA. The state estimates the County could receive approximately $3 million in direct funding, which would provide local control over programs and services for their population (Adams County-specific data included for reference).

An early state of the process is requesting written support from metro counties to open a process with the Colorado State Unit on Aging (housed within the Colorado Department of Human
Services) to allow counties to apply to be a Planning and Service Area (PSA) and an Area Agency on Aging. Adams County must obtain support from 50 percent or more of the counties that are part of DRCOG’s AAA (or any AAA around the state). This request is not a guarantee that an application would be accepted by the state. If approved, this would be the first time the state has opened up the process to consider new planning and service areas since Boulder left the DRCOG AAA in 1990. Adams County has received initial indications of support from some metro counties.

Given it has been 30 years since the state opened this process, staff is recommending supporting Adams County’s request. Arapahoe County also has a large aging population that is only predicted to keep growing. All metro counties – including Arapahoe – could benefit from a robust discussion on how to best support Denver metro’s growing older adult population and provide critical services.

**Attachments**
- Adams County request letter and county-specific service data
- [Map of Colorado’s 16 Area Agencies on Aging](#)

**Reviewed By**
Don Klemme, Director of Community Resources
Todd Weaver, Budget Manager
John Christofferson, Deputy County Attorney
Arapahoe County Board of County Commissioners  
Arapahoe County Administration Building  
5334 S Prince Street  
Littleton, CO 80120

Dear Jeff Baker,  

Adams County is requesting written support from your county for it to become its own Area Agency on Aging (AAA) and Planning & Service Area (PSA).

Currently, the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) serves as the Area Agency on Aging (AAA) and Planning & Service Area (PSA) for 8 metro counties, including Adams. PSA is a term from the Older Americans Act of 1965 that means the service region. The counties in the Denver Metro PSA currently include Adams, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, Denver, Douglas, Gilpin, and Jefferson.

The Adams Board of County Commissioners has directed staff to begin the process of developing its own locally controlled AAA and PSA. An early stage in the process is for any county seeking to become its own AAA and PSA to obtain approval from other counties within the DRCOG region. Boulder is an example of a county that successfully established its own AAA and PSA years ago.

The Adams County Board of Commissioners is requesting your support for its request to the State Unit on Aging (Colorado Department of Human Services, Division of Aging & Adult Services) by signing the attached template.

Thanks for your consideration of our request. Please contact Sue Bozinovski, Deputy Director, Economic Security & Aging Services at 720-523-2151 or sbozinovski@adcogov.org if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Raymond H. Gonzales  
County Manager
Greg Smith, Acting Director
Division of Aging & Adult Services
Colorado Department of Human Services
1575 Sherman Street
Denver CO 80203

This letter is indicating that Arapahoe County Board of Commissioners supports Adams County’s request to the State Unit on Aging of the Colorado State Human Services Department to begin the process of becoming an Adams County Area Agency on Aging and Planning and Service Area.

__________________________  __________________________
Chair  Date
Board of County Commissioners
Adams County

Service provided by the DRCOG Ombudsman Program

Approximately 2,392 people served

Nursing Homes
- The county has 13 Nursing Homes (13% of our regions 96 homes)
- 2 ombudsmen are assigned to nursing homes
- 111 complaints were investigated
- 181 ombudsman visits
- 577 consultations (residents/family/providers/other)
- 15 trainings were provided to nursing home staff
- 10 nursing home resident council meetings were attended by the assigned ombudsman
- Assigned ombudsmen participated in 11 CDPHE surveys (annual or complaint)

Assisted Livings
- 35 Assisted Livings (9% of our regions 400 homes)
- 6 ombudsmen are assigned to the assisted living homes
- 53 complaints were investigated
- 166 ombudsman visits
- 314 consultations (residents/family/providers/other)
- 6 Training was provided to assisted living staff
- 2 Resident council/house meetings were attended by the assigned ombudsman
- Assigned ombudsmen participated in 10 CDPHE surveys (annual or complaint)

Services provided by the Aging and Disability Resource Center

1,347 clients
- 1,248 Information & assistance calls
- 198 Options counseling clients- units of service (hour)
# Services Provided by Contracted Service Providers in Adams County

Clients served by contracted providers 2,581

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Units of Service</th>
<th>Service Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Day Care</td>
<td>8,189.00</td>
<td>Broomfield, LFS, Senior Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Transportation</td>
<td>20,169.00</td>
<td>Assisted Trans/ Escort, SRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>1,085.00</td>
<td>DRCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Giver Access Assistance</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>Senior Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Counseling</td>
<td>631.00</td>
<td>Lutheran Family Serv. (LFS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Training</td>
<td>336.00</td>
<td>Alzheimer’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Ind. Counseling</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>Catholic Charities, LFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Support groups</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Respite</td>
<td>4,189.25</td>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Adult Day care</td>
<td>1,314.00</td>
<td>Senior Resource Center(SRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Respite Monitoring</td>
<td>163.00</td>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chore Service</td>
<td>1,474.00</td>
<td>Arapahoe County, SRC, VOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregate Meals</td>
<td>13,215.00</td>
<td>VOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>203.00</td>
<td>American of the Blind, Asian Pacific Center, CO. Center for the Blind, Senior Support, Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Prevention Training</td>
<td>699.00</td>
<td>Tri County Health, VOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>951.00</td>
<td>American Council of the Blind, Asian Pacific Center, Audio information Network, Colorado Center for the Blind, Senior Support, Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Delivered Meals</td>
<td>100,410.00</td>
<td>Volunteers of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker Service</td>
<td>2,395.35</td>
<td>Colorado VNA, Dominican Home Health, JFS, SRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Assistance</td>
<td>278.00</td>
<td>HealthSET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Aid – Audiology</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>CO. Gerontology Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Aide – Optometry</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>Senior Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition education</td>
<td>6,308.00</td>
<td>Volunteers of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td>384.76</td>
<td>Visiting Nurses Association, Dominican Home Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>944.00</td>
<td>Asian Pacific Development Center, Dominican Home Health, HealthSET, Senior Support Services, Southwest Improvement Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind and Visually Impaired Education</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>American Council of the Blind, Colorado Center for the Blind, seniors Resource Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the AAA services, we have secured additional funds and have contracts with the Veterans Administration, Colorado Health Care Policy and Finance and State Health Insurance Program, the Colorado Refugee Services program and the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services. The following lists how Adams county residents are served by these programs.

**Veteran Directed Care Program – Adams County**

- 13 veteran participants
- 25 paid caregivers
- That equals almost $40,000 a month in funds that are paid to these 25 caregivers many of which are family members. If not for the VDC program caregivers would go unpaid for providing care at home and several veterans who be forced into assisted living or nursing homes.
- 11 of these veterans are at the high end of allowable budget = high risk for nursing home placement

**Transitions Services, Options Counseling – Adams County**

- 111 individuals assessed
  - 66 of these referrals were sent on to work with a Transition Coordination Agency

**State Health Insurance Program (SHIP) – Adams County**

DRCOG is not the designated SHIP office for Adams county but, we have been directed by the state to serve anyone that calls into the office.
DRCOG staff provided:
- 89 clients served
- 125.50 units of service (estimated)

**Elder Refugee Program – Adams County**

Served 29 people in Adams County in the past year providing exercise activities, wellness education, and community navigation services.
- 600 units of service at community recreation centers.
- 190 community navigation and education services
- 422 rides/ bus tickets
This program screens individuals in clinical settings for needs in transportation, housing, nutrition, domestic violence, and energy assistance and works with community service to provide the services needed.

- 2212 screened in Adams County

- 122 provided with navigation services (individuals must meet CMS requirements and have 2 ER visits in a year)
**Board Summary Report**

**Date:** January 7, 2020

**To:** Board of County Commissioners

**From:**
Director of Finance Janet Kennedy, Director of Intergovernmental Relations & Open Spaces Shannon Carter, County Attorney Ron Carl, Director of Fleet & Facilities Dick Hawes, Director of Community Resources Don Klemme, Director of Public Works & Development Bryan Weimer, Bureau Chief Vince Line, Director of Communication & Administrative Services Michelle Halstead, Budget Manager Todd Weaver, Deputy County Attorney John Christofferson, Criminal Justice Planners Todd Spanier and Kally Enright

**Subject:** Steering Committee Update

---

**Request and Recommendation**

The steering committee is providing an update on research activities and timelines associated with direction by the Board of County Commissioner during the November 25, 2019, meeting. The county’s criminal justice planners will present the analysis of election data results (attached), followed by a discussion for additional consultant support in 2020. Staff will also review the proposed timeline and seek additional input/information needs in preparation for the 2020 Leadership Workshop.

**Background**

Arapahoe County is one of Colorado’s fastest growing counties with more than 650,000 residents. By 2030, 800,000 are likely to live here making us the most populous county in the metro area and surpassing the City and County of Denver. Arapahoe County has a reputation for being an efficiently-run, fiscally responsible government. With some of the lowest property taxes in the state and a .25% dedicated open spaces sales tax, the County faces unique fiscal challenges. And as the population grows, so does the need for County services. And much of the County infrastructure – roads, bridges, jail, courthouse – is aging. How do we keep up with the demands of growth and maintain our current facilities?

Since 2016, County leadership and residents have been working to better understand the long-term public safety, transportation, and general government needs of the county so they can develop a path forward. The County has been exploring and evaluating how to meet these critical needs, including options that require voter approval.

The Steering Committee is an interdisciplinary internal team that was tasked by the Board to coordinate, plan and manage activities associated with addressing county’s fiscal realities following the 2019 Leadership Workshop.
The Commissioners actively engaged residents and businesses in these discussions, culminating in a recommendation last year from a community advisory committee to replace the aging county jail. While the Board of County Commissioners’ unanimous referral of a property tax ballot measure failed to secure voter support, it has created more opportunities for deeper conversations and increased education regarding the future and direction of Arapahoe County.

During the November 25, 2019 steering committee update, the Board affirmed the work of the interdisciplinary team, requesting additional research be conducted on election results, focus groups and grassroots surveying. The committee has been meeting regularly over the last six weeks to complete this work based on the following schedule shared with the board:

December 2019
- Analyze Election Data
- Conduct Focus Groups
- Steering Committee formulates specific options for board consideration/vetting

January 2020
- Present initial findings to committee, BOCC
- Consider retaining consultant support for coalitions, grassroots outreach strategy
- Steering Committee formulates specific options for board consideration/vetting
- Communications team (sheriff’s office/communications services) create communication strategy, including messages, audience, tools, timelines, etc. for consideration

February 2020
- Re-engage LRPC
- Steering Committee formulates specific options for board consideration/vetting
- Communications strategy reviewed and presented for approval
- Leadership Workshop Discussion
  - Present options and concepts for consideration, discussion
  - Prioritization
  - Consequences

March 2020 – onward
- Select conceptual approach
- Implement strategy/plan
2019 Coordinated Election Analysis
Todd Spanier and Kally Enright

Summary

An exhaustive analysis was conducted on the demographics, party affiliation, and past voter performance on the 2019 electorate. Also, precinct level and individual cast vote record statistical analysis was conducted on the 2019 voters.

The findings show that the average 2019 voter is older than a 2018 voter (although younger than 2017 voters), more likely to be female (although less so than the prior two elections), and likely to be registered Democratic or Green by a small margin.

1A ballot success is explained by Democratic Party registration by precinct, average voter age by precinct (younger and older voters favored, while middle-aged voters opposed 1A), and female proportion of registration by precinct.

At the individual ballot level, 1A success is explained by voters who favored Initiative CC, and to a lesser extent, those Aurora voters who also supported mayoral candidate Montgomery. Although it lost in Arapahoe County by 6 points, CC outperformed 1A by 13.4%. Those who voted for Montgomery were much more likely to support CC (69.6%) than 1A (39.4%). Montgomery voters supported 1A considerably more than Coffman voters (20.6%). Among those who voted yes on CC, 51% of them also voted yes on 1A, compared with 16.2% who opposed CC. However, there is also some evidence that shows there are voters who lean Republican (as indicated by having voted for Coffman) and who favor tax increases (as indicated by having also voted for CC), and among these voters, 40.1% supported 1A.

If a similar initiative is added to the ballot in 2020, it will likely have more success due to more favorable age and party registration of the expected 2020 electorate versus the 2019 electorate. If such an initiative is undertaken, outreach efforts should focus on heavy Democratic-registered precincts. Moreover, more effort should be made to communicate the necessity of the initiative to groups that, based on 2019, do not seem to favor the idea, such as: voters who are middle-aged, men and Republicans.

Demographics

Average age of a registered voter in the county: 47

Average age of electorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Voter</th>
<th>Non-Voter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender: 52% of registered voters are female

Female proportion of electorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Voter</th>
<th>Non-Voter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Party identification

Proportion of registered electorate by party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEM+G</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>UAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of voting electorate by party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>DEM+G</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>UAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion of non-voting electorate by party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>DEM+G</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>UAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent registration

3,602 persons registered within 30 days before the 2019 election, 22.3% of those cast a ballot.
### 2019 Turnout by Commissioner District and Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner District</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>UAF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2019 1A Results by Commissioner District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner District</th>
<th>Yes1A Average</th>
<th>Yes on 1A votes</th>
<th>Total Ballots Cast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14,058</td>
<td>39,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14,167</td>
<td>38,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10,099</td>
<td>38,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9,613</td>
<td>28,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5,216</td>
<td>17,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>53,153</td>
<td>162,785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cast vote record analysis**

This table shows the support for 1A by support for Aurora Mayor and support for CC. The figures in the cells are the proportion voting yes on 1A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coffman Voters</th>
<th>Montgomery Voters</th>
<th>Countywide Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes CC</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CC</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Voters</strong></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is instructive because it shows that support for CC is the strongest predictor of support for 1A, more so than the Aurora mayoral choice. In other words, if only
CC supporters voted, 1A would have won, but if only Montgomery supporters voted, 1A would have lost.

**Precinct Level Statistical Analysis**

- Democratic turnout by precinct has a weak and positive correlation to 1A. A 1% increase in Democratic turnout results in a .05% increase in 1A support in a given precinct.
  - Yes on CC correlates negatively with Democratic turnout: a 1% increase in Democratic turnout results in a .13% decrease in CC support in a given precinct.

- Republican turnout by precinct has a weak and negative correlation to 1A. A 1% increase in Republican turnout results in a .08% decrease in 1A support in a given precinct.
  - Yes on CC correlates negatively with Republican turnout: a 1% increase in Republican turnout results in a .25% decrease in CC support in a given precinct.

- Party registration DEM or REP does not correlate with 1A, but UAF registration does correlate positively.

- Democratic turnout by precinct has a negative correlation to those voting yes on CC and No on 1A. A 1% increase in Democratic turnout results in a .15% decrease in support for 1A among those who voted yes on CC.

- Republican turnout by precinct has a weak and negative correlation to those voting Yes on CC and No on 1A. A 1% increase in Republican turnout results in a .13% decrease in support for 1A among those who voted yes on CC.

- Average voter age by precinct has an overall positive correlation to the proportion voting yes on 1A. A 1-year increase in average precinct age results in a .04% increase in support for 1A; however, the relationship between these two variables is bimodal—youth and old age correlate positively, middle age correlates negatively with support for 1A.

- Female proportion of the registered electorate by precinct has a positive correlation to the proportion voting yes on 1A. A 1% increase in female registration results in a .15% increase in support for 1A.

- Total turnout (among all registered voters) does not correlate with 1A at the precinct level.

**Individual-Level Statistical Analysis**

- Voting Yes on CC correlates positively and strongly with voting yes on 1A. Yes on CC voters had 30% greater odds of voting yes on 1A compared to no on CC voters.
For Aurora residents, voting for Coffman correlates negatively (weakly) with yes on 1A. Coffman voters had 13% lower odds of voting yes on 1A compared with non-Coffman voters (4% lower odds when controlling for votes on CC and DD).

For Aurora residents, voting for Montgomery correlates positively and strongly with yes on 1A. Montgomery voters had 16% greater odds of voting yes on 1A compared to non-Montgomery voters (5% higher odds when controlling for votes on CC and DD). Montgomery voters had 35% better odds than non-Montgomery voters in supporting CC.
Yes on 1A Votes by Precinct

Precinct Results: Yes1A

- 0.11 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 0.30
- 0.31 - 0.37
- 0.38 - 0.45
- 0.46 - 0.57
Montgomery for Mayor Voters who Voted Yes on 1A by Precinct
Coffman for Mayor Voters who Voted Yes on 1A by Precinct

Proportion of pro-Coffman Ballots Voting Yes 1A

- 0.00
- 0.01 - 0.04
- 0.05 - 0.06
- 0.07 - 0.08
- 0.09 - 0.10
- 0.11 - 0.16
Yes on CC Voters who Voted No on 1A by Precinct

Proportion of 'Yes on CC' Ballots Voting No on 1A

- 0.00 - 0.15
- 0.16 - 0.20
- 0.21 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 0.30
- 0.31 - 0.35
Drop-in Board Summary Report

Date: January 13, 2020
To: Board of County Commissioners
Through: Tyler Brown, Sheriff
From: Ken McKlem, Patrol Special Operations Captain
Subject: Creation of K9 Training Area and Law Enforcement Memorial at Sheriff’s Office

Request and Recommendation
The Sheriff’s Office seeks to inform the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) and request their authorization for (1) Phase One - the Sheriff’s Office to create a memorial to deputies killed in the line of duty and (2) Phase Two - donation for K9 Training Area Improvements on land to the east of the SO building on Broncos Pkwy.

The Sheriff’s Office requests approval for the creation of Fixed Assets for both projects to allow County to plan and implement the projects. It is anticipated that both projects will be fully funded through donations or other partnership contributions. The County will be the contracting authority for all services and products and will manage the implementation.

Background

Phase One – Memorial - In the spring of 2018, the Sheriff’s Office formed a memorial committee charged with assessing the feasibility of erecting a memorial on the Sheriff’s Office property to deputies who died in the line of duty. This came about after the incident in Douglas County where a deputy was shot and killed and three others wounded on December 31, 2017. The committee’s work resulted in a recommendation for a relatively simple yet tasteful memorial that can be expanded upon in future years as necessary. It is the intent of the committee to implement this project in time for dedication on National Peace Officers Memorial Day 2020 on May 15, 2020. Phase Two – Donation for K9 Training Area Improvements - A citizen group called “Back the Blue K9 Force” has been making donations to support our K9 Unit. They have paid (reimbursement) for dog armor, purchased new dogs and other equipment for the SO K9 Unit. They were recently contacted by a donor, Ms. Beverly Hashmeister, who asked what else she could do to help. A proposal is being drafted to convert an area that is a dirt field with weeds and some obstacle course equipment into a proper K9 training course. The existing surface is hard on the dog’s paws and has caused injuries in the past.

Links to Align Arapahoe

Service First and Fiscal Responsibility. Service First (Workforce Excellence/Employee Well Being) - The memorial will honor and preserve the legacy of those ACSO deputies who have given their lives in the line of duty. Fiscal Responsibility (Responsible Spending) – Both proposed projects will utilize community partnerships by accepting a donation to create the K9
Training Area and by using non-general fund money and Fraternal Order of Police donations of money and volunteer hours to create the memorial.

Discussion

Phase One - As envisioned, the memorial includes a main wall for those that died in the line of duty, with additional space for those that died while employees of ACSO and a K9 memorial for our dogs who have passed away. The Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) Lodge 31 has agreed to partner with the SO to create this memorial through both financial donation and volunteer hours for the labor involved in building it. As envisioned, the maximum cost, including a contingency percentage, is $175,000 with the potential for a good portion of that cost to be reduced through donated labor. The FOP will fundraise to support construction as much as possible and the SO can support any remaining costs through the forfeiture fund and/or employee fund, ensuring no general fund money is utilized. The design of the memorial garden anticipates little to no increase in site irrigation and minimal increase in site maintenance.

Phase Two - Ms. Hashmeister has considerable resources (her late husband owned JBL Contractors) and Back the Blue discussed with her the need for a better K9 training area. Ms. Hashmeister and current JBL Contractor staff toured the site and are offering to donate materials and labor to create this K9 training area in the empty field next to the SO building. The area will largely consist of landscaping improvements to include artificial turf on the ground and will be completed within the requirements of the appropriate Authorities Having Jurisdiction (after a study) to ensure compliance with ground/storm water requirements. The County’s long range plan for that site calls for potential expansion of the existing facility, and that site plan will be preserved through the land use modification process. If approved, we will work with County Attorney’s office to execute an agreement for the donation that clearly outlines the donation and the County’s right to disturb that training area at a later time should it wish to implement the approved site plan.

Both projects have been designed and planned with the support of Public Works Department, in coordination with Lisa VanderHeyden from County FFM Project Management Office.

Alternatives

Taking no action will prevent the memorial from being built and the K9 training area will remain a dirt and weed covered open space.

Fiscal Impact

No direct measurable impact.

Concurrence

Public Works and Finance have been consulted about all aspects and have provided guidance on how to proceed as planned by accepting the donation of and using non-general fund money to complete this project. On approval and completion of construction drawings, an Administrative Amendment to the Location & Extent plan filed with the County will be processed.

Reviewed By

Ken McKlem, Patrol Special Operations Captain
Olga Fujaros, Finance Manager
Glenn Thompson, Public Safety Bureau Chief
Tyler S. Brown, Sheriff
Board Summary Report

Date: January 8, 2020
To: Board of County Commissioners
From: Michelle Halstead, director of communication and administrative services, Shannon Carter, director of intergovernmental relations and open spaces, and Bryan Weimer, director of public works and development,
Subject: Annexation Update

Request and Recommendation
Staff will provide a brief update on annexations in unincorporated Dove Valley.

Background
Arapahoe County’s 2018 Comprehensive Plan encourages growth to locate within well-defined growth and urban reserve areas, allowing development to occur in a sustainable manner that supports the urban pattern of the western portion of the County. As part of an intergovernmental agreement for Dove Valley Regional Park improvements, the county agreed to annex the park into the City of Centennial, as well as an associated parcel adjacent to the sheriff’s office for the Lone Tree Trail.

The City of Centennial and Arapahoe County have met numerous times to discuss the City’s desire to annex enclaves and other properties. To date, the county’s approach to the city’s annexation inquiries is to provide a single point of contact that then facilitates an interdisciplinary team of subject matter experts (open spaces, legal, public works & development) for specific issue follow-up and resolution to ensure a consistent county voice and message.

In the past year, conversations have focused on the Dove Valley area, especially as the City has been finalizing its vision plan for the area. Based on Board direction in early 2019, the County agreed to accelerate annexation of the park prior to implementing construction improvements, with the City taking a leadership role. In late summer 2019, the City received requests from the school district, SEMSWA, and other private property owners to annex, which increased the potential annexation area, to include non-voluntary properties. Staff brought this proposal to the Board in September, communicating to the city the board’s willingness to proceed, with a request to communicate with potential non-voluntary property owners. County and City staff were scheduled to meet and review the city’s proposal and timeline in early fall 2019; that meeting was canceled by the city given their staffing constraints and progress to date.
In late December 2019, the city reached out to provide an update on their timeline for Dove Valley annexations and desired updates to the scope of the proposal to return to voluntary-only participants. The city stated they would be in touch early 2020 to schedule a meeting to provide an update, including schedule milestones.

Reviewed By
John Christofferson, Deputy County Attorney