

## LRPC Meeting Notes – FAQs and Subject Matter Expert Responses

June 17, 2019

### Open Space

#### **Q. Have open space stakeholders been surveyed regarding past experiences and strategic funding considerations?**

Shannon Carter: Yes. We collect feedback through a variety of processes. We send out surveys at the end of our competitive grant program asking what areas or improvements to the process or the types of projects they would like to program to focus on. As a result, we have had special grant rounds that focus on active recreation, or trail projects. Additionally, we host and facilitate four working groups made up of key stakeholders that meet to discuss strategic and regional projects that benefit the corridor.

#### **Q. Is there a certain ratio of open space to people that you're trying to maintain, such as a tenth of an acre per thousand residents or some other measurement?**

SC: We have explored different measures and matrixes that track parks, trails, and open space, but have not settled in on any particular measurement. We will be exploring industry standards as part of the Open Space Master Planning process and will explore the most useful/meaningful measurements for our program.

#### **Q. Is open space funding authorized for future maintenance and repair of existing assets?**

SC: Yes. For example, we've made a several improvements along the Cherry Creek corridor. We've added trails to existing parks and completed environmental projects that improved the health of several creeks and drainageways. The resolution allows jurisdictions to use up to 20% of the money they receive for operations and maintenance. However, the County's use of its maintenance funds is capped at 3.24% which is inadequate for the amount of property we're responsible for. As a way leveraging our use of available funds, we keep a portion of some of our Open Space property in agricultural production. We use the money we receive from our leases to maintain the property. Thus, we supplement the maintenance fund with additional revenue. s well.

#### **Q. Are water rights a revenue source?**

SC: With most of the property we own, we have agricultural water wells for providing water to grazing cattle. Our Richmil Ranch properties has two irrigation wells with pivot sprinklers which have the potential to generate additional revenue depending upon the type(s) of crop grown (we have not utilized field irrigation yet; the current lessee's have used to the property for grazing).

#### **Q. Is there a plan to set aside more revenue so projects in Aurora can be more self-sustaining?**

SC: Yes. We have some neighborhood partners.

#### **Q. So if we don't renew the tax on open space, how would we maintain the properties?**

SC: If the tax isn't renewed, we would face the challenge of finding replacement revenue to maintain current properties. This would be a discussion with the BOCC and others to identify new sources of revenue. Our municipal partners would have to have a similar conversation, the existing tax is a major funding source for parks, trails and open space for several municipal programs.

**Q. Explain the 3.24%**

SC: The Open Space Sales and Use tax resolution outlines how the County can use the revenue it receives. The current restriction states that no more than 3.24% (a little over \$900k) of the revenue can be used for the maintenance and operations of County owned parks, trails, and open space.

**Q. Are you included in this panel because you've been successful? It seems like you're the odd man out.**

SC: The Open Space Program has enjoyed a number of successes including reauthorization in 2011. Additionally, I sit on the Capital Improvement Committee, the Executive Budget Committee, and the Long-Range Budget Committee.

Janet Kennedy: We included open space sales tax in the discussion in order to share with everyone we can't just repurpose revenue streams like the open space tax to uses that weren't approved by the voters. We also wanted to explain the impact of any repurpose would have on our municipal partners.

**Q: Would it be the plan that greater than 3.24% be used for maintenance?**

SC: Yes. We would have that discussion around the time of the reauthorization

**Q. Has there been any discussion of changing the resolution to provide direct funding for special districts?**

SC: Yes, this has been discussed.

**Q. When will it go to the ballot?**

SC: Last time we went to the voters to reauthorize the tax, it was 2011, two years before it was set to expire. There are current discussions about following that same strategy.

**Q. Do municipalities call and ask if they can do more with their portion?**

SC: No. The municipalities are given much more flexibility in the resolution as to what they can do with their portion of the revenue than the County.

**Q. Why does the open space fund have large surpluses in the fund?**

SC: Although it may appear that the fund has a large surplus, this can be a bit misleading and requires some explanation. Because we distribute the share back portion of the Sales and Use Tax to the Municipalities once a year, some of the fund balance is allocated to them. Also, we distribute our grant and joint project funds as reimbursements, in other words, once they submit invoices, we pay them therefore, the money remains part of the fund balance. We also allocate money to the working groups for joint projects. Because we have money committed to various projects, and due to the timing of when the money is paid out, it may appear that the fund has

large surpluses. In reality, most of the fund balance is committed or allocated for specific projects or is allocated to the Cities and Towns.

## Transportation

**Q. What capital projects such as Smoky Hill need to be addressed now due to congestion, etc. and how much funding is needed for those projects over the next five years.**

Bryan Weimer: In terms of funding, projects are broken into three categories: 1) Local Projects happen only in unincorporated Arapahoe County; 2) Joint Projects are those with shared jurisdictional boundaries where the County has some type of responsibility such as ½ a boundary roadway as an example; 3) Regionally Significant Projects are typically projects that may not be located within or adjacent to unincorporated Arapahoe and are larger projects that serve citizens within or traveling through Arapahoe County.

The questions we asked to determine the Regional category are: Is the project in unincorporated Arapahoe County? Is it large enough to warrant other partners? Is it within a municipal boundary? How many citizens/travelers does it serve? The Board of County Commissioners ultimately provide direction on Regionally Significant Project participation. Examples of Regional Significant projects are the widening improvements to Arapahoe Road east of Waco, Arapahoe/I-25 Interchange, Arapahoe/Parker Interchange, and the current 6<sup>th</sup> Ave/Hogan Parkway. Overall within entire Arapahoe County (unincorporated and incorporated), roughly one-third of all arterial roadways have a mobility grade of poor or very poor which is an indication of congestion and the needed improvements.

**Q. How do partner shares get determined?**

BW: Let's first start with federal funding. The process through DRCOG (Denver Regional Council of Governments) has changed. The current federal funding process involves a dual model in which there are regional funds (20% of total) available that DRCOG scores and ranks based on projects submitted from the Sub-Regions (Counties, three project each) and Sub-Regional allocation (80% of total) to each Sub-Region (Counties) for distributions to projects submitted by each eligible entity within the County and scored against criteria.

For this TIP cycle (FY2020-2023), Arapahoe County received an allocation of \$44 Million of federal funds, which funded \$80.5M of projects in the Arapahoe County Sub-Region. The minimum local match towards federal project is 80% federal/20% local. However, for the most part, a high percentage of local match funding is provided to increase project scoring. In the Arapahoe County Sub-Region, one evaluation criteria was leverage of funding and projects received more points for the higher the local match and the Sub-Region was interested in making its Federal funds go further (more projects) by incentivizing a larger local match. It's a balancing act between the local match and the ability to have a project selected based on the evaluation scoring, so match is always adjusted.

**Q. Does the federal government participate on regional projects?**

BW: Yes, it depends on the project and its eligibility for federal funds. The I-25 and Arapahoe interchange had six partners, which were federal, state (CDOT), Arapahoe County, Centennial,

Greenwood Village, and SPIMD (Southeast Public Improvement Metropolitan District). Federal funds can also fund the other categories, but again it is a function of project type and eligibility per DRCOG TIP criteria.

**Q. Do private partners get involved?**

BW: Yes. There are times when developers provide their pro-rata share depending on how their development impacts traffic and/or their responsibilities required per County land development regulations. We also have two impact fee areas in the County. A fee is collected from developers based on the land use type (residential, commercial, etc.) that the County matches funding to build eligible projects.

**Q. How much of the County's transportation budget is shared back with the municipalities.**

BW: Of the 13 mills for the County, 0.56 of that is collected countywide and goes to Road and Bridge, 50% of which is shared back to municipalities within the County. This is typically used for maintenance of infrastructure. The CEF fund is 0.449 mills of the 13 mills and for capital projects, which does not only include roadway infrastructure, but also large computer purchases, equipment, and buildings. The CEF funds is only used for capital improvements for roadway infrastructure and therefore not shared with municipalities.

**Q. Has there been a discussion of RTA's with the municipalities to address transportation needs? Colorado Springs has one of them and they work great.**

BW: We have not had this discussion yet, but all funding and financing options are on the table for consideration. It should be noted that the Metropolitan Mayors are investigating an RTA for the Denver Metro area.

**Q. Does the County remit the funds right away or do you wait until the money is there?**

BW. We wait until the money is there. Large projects in particular take a lot of coordination. With a \$4-\$5 million capital project budget annually, it is difficult to fund larger projects in one year and therefore the funding is banked over multiple years until the County's full share of funding is available to fund the project. As a frame of reference, intersection projects can cost between \$5-\$15 million; widening roadways (2-lanes to 4-lanes) is between \$4-\$5 million per lane-mile; and an interchange could be \$60-\$90 million.

**Q. Are you fully staffed?**

BW: We always have open positions. We haven't been fully staffed for years. Heavy equipment operators and road maintenance workers, for example, are very difficult to hire and retain. Especially in an economy like the one we have now, we are at the mercy of a very competitive job market. This regional job market effects everyone.

**Q. Is the share based on linear feet and which portion is inside the municipality and which portion is in unincorporated Arapahoe County?**

BW: Yes. Where we typically start is frontage foot within each jurisdiction. However, other considerations such as where contributing traffic comes from, project eligibility for different types of funding, number of partners, etc. are also factors depending on the project.

**Q. Are there categories that are top priority?**

BW: Yes we do have a capital plan, but priorities change due to fiscal restraint, partnerships, being able to leverage other funding sources, etc.

**Q. What percentage of your needs are the top priority projects?**

BW. We have about \$15-\$20 million of needs annually for capital projects with an annual budget of between \$4-\$5 million annually historically.

**Q. Who does the work?**

BW: For the most part we only use contractors for capital projects. For maintenance Road and Bridge we use a mixture of in-house crews and contractors depending on the maintenance task. Governmental maintenance staffing in Colorado is typically based on snow removal needs and level of service for such. Currently we have a mixture of in-house and contracted services. Paving is handled in-house, but slurry seals and concrete maintenance is contracted. If we would receive additional funding for maintenance we would evaluate how best to put the funding to work, but most likely additional paving would be contracted out since we only have one paver and a crew to run it, but sign and striping would be handled internally. If we were directed to increase the level of snow removal services, then additional staffing/equipment would be necessary - which means we could handle more services in-house..

**Q. During your presentation, you talked about mobility grades. What's our roadway condition?**

BW: Pavement Condition Index is a 67 on a 0 to 100 scale. The County's target for roadway overall network condition is set at 70. As this is an overall network condition, we have some roadways that are below and some above, but 67 is the average. From our pavement management modeling and the current funding we are losing two points per year. Currently, we have 28% of our roadway in a poor or very poor condition with a goal of no more than 25%. As the roadways deteriorate, they cost 10 to 15 times more to maintain them in an excellent, good or fair condition.

**Q. How much does deferred maintenance effect that score?**

BW: In the presentation, I discussed the concept of lane-mile years. Using that concept we have shown that we are losing about 300-plus lane-mile years per year with current funding (approx. 26% of network lane-mile years). In four years that would equate to our overall lane mile network size and in 10 years this backlog would be double our lane-mile years. We have calculated that to keep the existing condition and reduce this backlog over a 10-year period, we would need approximately and additional \$2.1 to \$2.5 million more per year, making our paving budget \$6.5 million annually.

## ACJC

**Q. Will the new facility be built so it lasts more than 30 years? What's the projection on the new facility's life span? Will the new design permit the facility to expand one type of prison population over another without mixing prisoners?**

Vince Line: Yes, the facility will be designed to last at least 40 years, with all utilities designed for future expansion. The new design includes housing that can accommodate higher populations based on projected needs, allow for separate housing for all inmate classifications.

**Q. Can any of the current building be used as part of the new building?**

VL: It may be possible, but likely not feasible. Remodeling will probably expand the project timeline significantly, and the remodeled space will not have the longevity that a new facility would have. Nor is it anticipated that re-using parts of the existing space will result in significant savings. If we remodel instead of rebuilding there will be significant operation inefficiencies, projected ongoing operations and maintenance cost will increase, and would likely require relocation of inmates during construction.

**Q. Will the Tucson property be exclusively utilized for future planning, expansion and construction?**

VL: The Tucson property right now is planned for only phases 1 and 2.

**Q. Are courts and support services included in the ACJC planning process?**

VL: Yes. The complete master plan does include courts and support services. The campus includes the jail and the courthouse, and both are included in the master plan.

**Q. Have the results from the previous National Institute of Corrections (NIC) organizational/facility assessment a consideration?**

VL: In 2010 or 2011 the NIC completed an assessment. All of that material was reviewed and contemplated as part of the master planning process.

**Q. Have recommendations from the Arapahoe County Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee been applied and considered?**

VL: The ACJCC did not make specific recommendations for this project other than recommend that the Ehlers team continue to collect feedback.

**Q. What criminal justice reforms and modifications related to population management, incarceration and re-entry protocols have you made?**

VL: Several efforts have been made to limit jail population. One of these programs is referred to as the Court Date Notification Program. The program began as a recommendation from the ACJCC and is aimed at notifying folks of pending court dates to decrease the frequency of failures to appear in court. Today we accomplish this through a texting program, which has proven to be as effective as the previous voice calls being made.

We have also increased the amount of mental health training for staff across the agency, such as Crisis Intervention Training and Mental Health First Aid training. This training helps staff

recognize when someone is in crisis, and potentially helps reduce the possibility of additional charges or arrests.

Over the last several years the Work Release and Weekender programs have expanded substantially as an alternative to general population, which reduces jail bed days and allows for eligible participants to continue to contribute to society and their families in a positive way by maintaining employment.

In 2015 we started a program in conjunction with Human Services to assist all eligible inmates in accessing benefits once they are released from custody.

In 2016 we started training identified inmates on the use Narcan. We then issue them a dose upon release to be used in the event of a relapse.

In 2018 we started a prescription drug program, which provides released inmates 30 days' worth of medications, which allows them a window to seek out-of-custody medications and treatment.

Also in 2018 we began a medication assisted therapy (MAT) program to continue treatment medication for those suffering from opioid addiction and are participating in a treatment program.

Judicial Services also offers a pre-trial supervision program and a navigator program, which assists with connecting offenders to resources in the community.

The Sheriff's Office also works closely with the judicial district to operate specialty courts, which offer treatment-based alternatives for appropriate offenders.

In 2017, the Chief Judge issued a new set of bonding guidelines with a goal of decreasing bond amounts for low level crimes.

**Q. Can you provide information on who is in the jail? Pre-sentence vs. sentenced and misdemeanor vs. felony?**

VL: The population is 43% sentenced and 57% pretrial. It's also 44% felony and 56% misdemeanor offenders.

**Q. Do current bonding schedules present challenges to population, effective release and length of stay?**

VL: The bonding schedule does have an impact on jail population. Every \$1,000 of increased bond represents another .4 days in jail. Sentencing habits of the judges, the severity of crimes, changes to statute, and case processing times, in addition to other factors, all have an impact on jail population and length of stay. Efforts of the ACJCC related to this issue are continuing.

**Q. How were the proposed costs associated with Phase 1 and 2 determined?**

VL: The proposed costs are preliminary at this point and were determined by the architectural services vendor. The Phase 1 cost is projected at \$195 million and the Phase 2 cost is projected at \$267 million (\$462 million total). Efforts to refine this cost are continuing.

**Q. What are the Phase 1 and Phase 2 timelines?**

VL: The total projected timeline is approximately 8 years, but it could be finished sooner. It is important to note that as the project progresses and changes are made to design, etc., the timelines could change.

**Q. Will it be phased in?**

VL: Yes. As soon as the doors of the Phase 1 project open, we move to Phase 2.

**Q. What can you tell us about cost sharing with the state?**

VL: The Detentions Facility is the county's responsibility, therefore there is no cost sharing with the state, however there are functions of the operation of the courthouse that are shared.

**Q. On planning for beds and inmates, is there a steady increase or not?**

VL: There has been a steady trend line upwards since a low point a couple years ago.

**Q. What percentage of the costs are due to technical requirements?**

VL: I'm not positive, but if you look at previous efforts, the cost for technology has gone up substantially. I'm not sure what it is today, but I believe there was a period of time when construction related costs went up about 10% per year. We're struggling to get fixed what needs fixed.

**Q. What about efficiency of the JAC? Is that factored in?**

VL: The JAC is no longer housed at the facility anymore. The JAC moved to space outside of Sheriff Office facilities in January 2019.

**Q. Do you have a budget for re-entry training? What happens to inmates when they get let go?**

VL: Every inmate who leaves the Detention Facility should get some form of re-entry training or services to help guide them. 90% of the inmates in our custody will be returned to the community, so access to re-entry services is important to assist in reducing recidivism. Right now, we can only offer re-entry services to about 60 inmates, which is far too small. Together with the Navigator program, offered through Judicial Services, the number is a little higher than 60, but it's still inadequate.

**Q. Given height restrictions, can we move the campus elsewhere?**

VL: The zoning on the land right now imposes a 50-foot height restriction. At the Tucson property adjacent to the current jail, the height restriction is 100 feet.

**Q. Can we house inmates outside the county?**

VL: There have been no formal discussions with other jurisdictions on housing inmates. The daily cost per inmate right now at our facility is approximately \$90 per day. If we house them elsewhere, it could cost considerably higher.

**Q. Architects tend to create more ambiance than functionality. Please encourage them to do the reverse with the jail design.**

VL: Thank you. Functionality has been prioritized since the beginning of the project and will continue to be.

**Q. Of the 56% misdemeanor offenders, how many are pre-trial?**

VL: I don't have the exact percentage in front of me, however it's about half of that number.

**Q. I commend the work to bring this important issue to the forefront. I don't expect an answer on this question from you, however if we go to the ballot with a jail question, elected officials are going to have to answer what took us so long to be addressing these issues. The needs have grown worse over time and the costs have gone up.**

VL: Thank you.