



# Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study

---

## Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study Attachment A: Outreach

### Attachment A-3: Primary Stakeholders One-on-One Coordination Meetings





## Primary Stakeholders One-on-one Meetings

Agency	Date	Meeting Materials
Public Information Officers	March 14, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conference Call</li> </ul>
Presentations to City Councils and County Commissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Denver International Airport February 2, 2016</li> <li>City and County of Denver March 1, 2016</li> <li>Adams County April 5, 2016</li> <li>City of Brighton March 22, 2016</li> <li>City of Aurora Council Committee March 25, 2016</li> <li>City and County of Denver Committee March 29, 2016</li> <li>City of Commerce City April 11, 2016</li> <li>City of Aurora Council Study Session April 18, 2016</li> <li>Colorado Department of Transportation TBD</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation</li> </ul>
Public Information Officers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adams County</li> <li>Adams County Economic Development</li> <li>City of Aurora</li> <li>City of Brighton</li> <li>City and County of Denver</li> <li>City of Commerce City</li> <li>Colorado Department of Transportation</li> <li>Denver International Airport</li> </ul>	February 26, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> </ul>
Governance Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adams County</li> <li>City of Aurora</li> <li>City of Brighton</li> <li>City of Commerce City</li> <li>City and County of Denver</li> </ul>	January 6, January 8, January 15, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Memo: Aerotropolis Stakeholder Governance Discussions, January 19, 2016, Icenogle Seaver Pogue</li> </ul>
Public Information Officers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adams County</li> <li>Adams County Economic Development</li> <li>City of Aurora</li> <li>City of Brighton</li> <li>City and County of Denver</li> <li>City of Commerce City</li> <li>Colorado Department of Transportation</li> <li>Denver International Airport</li> </ul>	December 14, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
City of Commerce City	October 13, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>



# Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study

Agency	Date	Meeting Materials
City of Commerce City	September 30, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
Denver International Airport	September 28, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
City of Aurora	September 10, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
City and County of Denver	August 4, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
City and County of Denver	May 26, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
Denver International Airport	May 21, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
City and County of Denver	May 13, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> </ul>
City of Brighton	April 29, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
City and County of Denver	April 13, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
Denver International Airport	April 8, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
City of Commerce City	April 7, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
Adams County	April 6, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
City of Aurora	April 3, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>
Initial Agency Coordination: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adams County</li> <li>City of Aurora</li> <li>City of Commerce City</li> <li>City and County of Denver</li> <li>Denver International Airport</li> </ul>	February 6, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting Agenda</li> <li>Meeting Notes</li> </ul>



## Governance Meeting Agenda

Project: **Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study**

Subject: Coordination Meeting

Date: January 6, 2016 - City of Commerce City, City and County of Denver; January 8, 2016 - City of Aurora, Adams County; January 15, 2016 - City of Brighton

Location:

1. Introductions
2. Study Overview
3. Purpose of Meeting
4. Current Districts
5. Staff Discussion of Regional Governance Mechanism Options
6. Action Items

### Public Sector Regional Governance Mechanism Options

- a. Should the governance mechanism be responsible for funding of infrastructure (and to what degree), or should it be the recipient for revenues accumulated from primary stakeholder governments and others?
- b. For which aspects of infrastructure delivery should the governance mechanism have responsibility: Funding, design/construction or operation?
- c. What is the geographic scope of the governance mechanism and its infrastructure activities?
- d. For what types of infrastructure, in addition to transportation, should the governance mechanism undertake?
- e. Should the governance mechanism's authorizing and organizing "charter" specify infrastructure projects and/or sequence, or should it convene the primary stakeholders and provide the process by which projects are selected and sequenced?
- f. The governance mechanism's powers, authority, and limitations will be defined by statute, intergovernmental agreement, or a combination of the two. Are the Aerotropolis infrastructure goals best served by placing control (i) in the establishing documentation with substantive decisions to be made by the primary stakeholders' governing bodies or (ii) in the governing body of the governance mechanism?
- g. How can the governance mechanism best relate to (a) primary stakeholders and (b) other public entity stakeholders and the private sector?

Name	Agency	Position/Title	Email
Chris Pinnus	HDR	✓	✓
MAYE FALKENBERG	Brighton	Asst. C.M.	✓
Ed Tenege	ISP	attorney	ETenege@ISP-law.com
Anna Wool	ISP	Attorney	AWool@ISP-law.com



Name	Department	Title	Phone
Chris Peltus	HDR	Twp Planning	3 323 4838
Anna Wool	ISP	Attorney	303-867- 3013
Ed Trenchle	ISP	Attorney	303-867 3002
Abel Montoya	Adams County Office Long Range Strategic PLAN	DIR.	720 523 6990
Rachel Baron	AA CO Long Range Strategic Planning	Long Range Planning Strategist	720- 523-6992











## ICENOGL SEAVR POGUE

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Chris Primus, HDR, Inc.

FROM: Ed Icenogle and Anna Wool

DATE: January 19, 2016

RE: Aerotropolis Stakeholder Governance Discussions

---

### INTRODUCTION

Chris Primus of HDR, Inc. and Ed Icenogle and Anna Wool of Icenogle Seaver Pogue, P.C. held one-on-one meetings with senior staff (the “stakeholder representatives” or “stakeholders”) from the City and County of Denver and the City of Commerce City on January 6, 2016, the City of Aurora and Adams County on January 8, 2016, and the City of Brighton on January 15, 2016. The purpose of the meetings was to solicit from stakeholder representatives input regarding governance options and structures for the development of an “Aerotropolis” regional entity in the area of the Denver International Airport (“DIA”).

The 2015 Amendment to the 1988 Denver/Adams County agreements relating to the development of DIA specified, in Section V, that there will be negotiated an additional agreement between Denver and the Airport Coordinating Committee (“ACC”), by which a new regional entity will be formed for advancing the Aerotropolis concept. The ACC comprises Adams County, Aurora, Commerce City, Brighton, Thornton, and Federal Heights. The political subdivisions interviewed were selected as the “primary stakeholders” for the purpose of meetings to sample the sentiments of the Aerotropolis participants regarding this regional entity.

The 2015 Amendment’s description of the purposes of this new regional entity is, in total: “...to promote and market development opportunities on and around DIA and assist in coordinating land use and infrastructure planning efforts by the respective jurisdictions on and around DIA.” The 2015 Amendment also denies the new regional entity authority to regulate or otherwise control land use or development within any jurisdiction.

In pursuit of the new regional entity, the Study Review Committee polled Aerotropolis participants and identified a number of critical interests deemed most important for collaborative action in the near term. Among those critical interests, and of apparent especial relevance to the nature of the new regional entity, were: cross-jurisdictional planning, governance/financing structure, corroborative funding, marketing and infrastructure funding, form of governance/oversight, long-term roads funding stream, and regional water/wastewater.

Against this background, the one-on-one interview team guided the primary stakeholder representatives to eight topics and invited additional comments, as desired. This memorandum compiles the responses of the stakeholder representatives by topic and supplements with additional comments raised during the meetings.

This memorandum then concludes with a checklist of anticipated governance decision points, identification of some likely governance approaches, and recommended processes for determining the Aerotropolis new entity governance structure.

### **RESPONSE TO DISCUSSION ITEMS AND COMMENTS**

The eight discussion items (A through H) presented to representatives of the primary stakeholders (which are the City and County of Denver, the City of Commerce City, the City of Aurora, the City of Brighton, and Adams County), along with a summary of discussion comments, are presented in this section.

#### **A. Should the new governance entity be a funding mechanism and, if so, should it be a direct funding source or a collection point for revenues contributed by primary stakeholder governments and others?**

There was no consensus on whether the new entity should participate in funding of Aerotropolis infrastructure and promotion.

Some responses indicated a desire that the new entity provide funding for regional projects. If that is the case, some stakeholder representatives indicated a preference that the governance mechanism *not* be a direct taxing and funding entity, but rather serve as a recipient of revenues collected and contributed by the primary stakeholder governments. Pursuant to the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights or "TABOR," Section 20 of Article X of the Colorado Constitution, voter authorization would be required for a new entity to levy its own taxes directly. In contrast, if the governance entity were to serve as a recipient of funds from primary stakeholder governments, the new governance entity would be free from voter TABOR authorization, although the contributed revenues would be at the expense of the primary stakeholder governments' budgets.

Along these lines, we were cautioned of likely opposition to a new entity serving as an overlay property taxing district. At same time, we were cautioned that an arrangement by which revenues would flow from primary stakeholder governments to the new governance entity would detract from the image and reality of a cohesive Aerotropolis governance and brand. However, if revenues are to flow from primary stakeholder governments to a new governance entity, stakeholder sentiment favored a nexus between the primary stakeholder governments making contributions and the capital improvement projects undertaken with those contributions.

As an alternative to direct taxation or stakeholder flow-through of funds, the concept of a dedicated mill levy imposed through multiple special taxing/assessment districts was advanced for the new governance entity. In the case of development districts, the example continued, a

cross-jurisdictional mill levy for the Aerotropolis effort would increase as the developer districts' mill levies decreased with debt retirement and increased assessed value.

The concept of the entity establishing a revolving loan fund was also raised as a possible approach to either facilitate funding projects through the new entity or as a stand-alone mechanism for Aerotropolis projects.

Additionally, there was some interest in "project-specific" revenue raising, which would seek funds for a particular project on a proportional basis, involving proximity, benefit, and other criteria.

With regard to revenue raising and spending, several stakeholder representatives thought it likely that, regardless of the form of raising revenue, if the new governance entity is to serve a funding function, the primary stakeholder governments will want revenues from their respective jurisdictions to be spent in their respective jurisdictions. Other stakeholder representatives expressed the possibility that the revenue raising and spending functions of the governance entity might be used to address "disparities" of tax and fee burdens from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Virtually all interviewed agreed that, whatever the revenue raising and funding capabilities of the new governance entity, but especially if revenues from the primary stakeholder governments are to be pooled, it would be important to establish a process that builds trust between and among primary stakeholder governments and works to create a cohesive Aerotropolis.

Finally, other than funding for the new governance entity's own operation, some stakeholders expressed a substantial preference that the new governance entity *not* participate in infrastructure or promotional project funding at all, but rather serve a planning and coordination function. This is more fully discussed in Section B, below.

**B. What services and/or infrastructure should the new regional entity deliver: Planning, funding, design/construction, and/or operation?**

For this discussion, activity related to marketing and promotion (also referred to as branding), which appear expressly in the 2015 Amendment, is deferred for separate treatment in Section H, below.

One vision for the regional entity, consistent with the language of the 2015 Amendment, was that of a regional (sub-regional) planning council or authority, which would serve as a facilitator for the Aerotropolis participants. Possibly an IGA entity or a non-profit corporation, it would span jurisdictional boundaries and have the ability and responsibility to coordinate and plan infrastructure and to seek state and federal funding. The governance entity would serve as an initial step in Aerotropolis regional cooperation among the primary stakeholder governments and might evolve into a more traditional and empowered governance entity. Initially, the governance mechanism would act as a regional planning authority which prioritizes and phases projects, leverages funding, makes recommendations, and distributes funding to several layers of

governments. The example of DRCOG, a metropolitan planning organization, may illustrate the concept.

Of those stakeholder representatives who thought that, additionally, the governance mechanism *could* be responsible for funding infrastructure and marketing/branding, there was little support for new entity construction, ownership, or operation of infrastructure. Upon completion of infrastructure, the jurisdiction within which the infrastructure exists should own and maintain it.

A possible exception to avoiding an ongoing role for the new entity might be circulator transportation or similar activities.

**C. What is the geographic scope of the governance mechanism and its activities?**

While the entirety of what is to become Aerotropolis was expected to benefit from the new regional entity, many expect near- and even mid-term activity to occur largely to the west and south of DIA, those areas forming an “L” shape, which was believed to be the logical focal point for the initial phases of Aerotropolis development. Stakeholder representatives felt that the new governance mechanism should take a regional, long-term approach and acknowledged the cross-jurisdictional nature of many infrastructure projects that may be undertaken or coordinated by the new governance mechanism. Stakeholder representatives appeared to find some efficacy in the new entity undertaking infrastructure projects and development on a limited scale initially and adding more land – or jurisdictions – to the new governance mechanism’s efforts as needed and over time.

**D. For what types of infrastructure, in addition to transportation, if any, should the regional governance entity undertake?**

Stakeholder representatives variously identified roads, transit, water, sewer, and drainage as infrastructure needs potentially to be advanced by the new governance mechanism, although transportation was the area of consensus. None appeared to favor relinquishing land use and entitlement authority within the boundaries of their jurisdictions, in the contexts of both the public infrastructure projects and the private property developed in Aerotropolis. Some stakeholder representatives felt that infrastructure projects should be determined by the needs of each primary stakeholder government.

In addition to capital projects, some stakeholder representatives cited the value of shared or common services. Suggestions were made that the governance mechanism could potentially undertake traffic circulator services, as well as marketing and branding.

**E. Should the new regional governance entity’s organizing “charter” specify infrastructure projects and/or sequence, or should it convene the primary stakeholders and only provide the process by which projects are selected and sequenced?**

Stakeholder representatives agreed that the governance entity should retain flexibility to act, as well as the capability to develop agreement on and prioritization of projects, especially in light of changing market conditions and other considerations. Thus, stakeholder representatives were generally opposed to specifying projects in an organizational document. Rather, stakeholder representatives favored deciding upon projects as the need arises, possibly based on specific criteria. Stakeholder representatives cited DRCOG and regional and state transportation improvement plans as examples of project prioritization processes.

**F. The governance mechanism's powers, authority, and limitations will likely be defined by statute, intergovernmental agreement, or a combination of the two. Are the Aerotropolis infrastructure goals best served by placing decisional control in the primary stakeholders' governing bodies or in the governing body of the new regional governance entity?**

In response to this question, stakeholder representatives voiced a range of concerns and possibilities.

Most comments agreed that the new regional entity's decision-making (and its governing body) should be contained to the public sector, some favoring staff participation and some elected officials' participation.

Some stakeholder representatives argued that the entity must have the authority to act on its own and without the approval of the primary stakeholder government's governing body, while others felt strongly that decisions must be taken back to primary stakeholder governments for ratification. As a compromise, a new governance entity could be given the authority to act on its own with regard to a list of previously determined decisions, with some decisions reserved for approval or ratification by the primary stakeholder governments.

**G. How can the governance mechanism best relate to public entity stakeholders (other than the primary stakeholders) and the private sector?**

Primary stakeholder representatives approved of establishing advisory boards, committees, and commissions to participate in the governance mechanism. In general, stakeholder representatives did not want citizens or landowners to be directly involved in the policy and the day-to-day governance of Aerotropolis.

As described in Section H, below, the collective marketing and branding of the Aerotropolis was seen as a direct way to relate to other public entity stakeholders and the private sector on state, national, and international scales. Additionally, NATA and DRCOG were given as examples of ways in which a governance mechanism can identify, develop, and advocate with a collective voice for infrastructure identified by the new regional entity.

**H. Marketing and Branding.**

Stakeholder representatives by and large indicated that marketing and branding should be left to those with subject matter expertise (i.e., not the governance mechanism). As such,

marketing and branding may be best handled by a separate organization or entity, whether in existence now or to be formed, which would work closely with the new regional governance entity and perhaps receive partial or full funding from it. On more than one occasion, primary stakeholder representatives alluded to the economic development councils currently serving various primary stakeholder governments in the metropolitan area. Stakeholder representatives thought these economic development councils represent a good example of existing organizations that could potentially collaborate, both together and with the new regional entity.

Stakeholder representatives thought that marketing and branding would be most effective if tackled jointly, and some discussed the possibility of funding a joint economic development council to act in the collective interests of the primary stakeholder governments and Aerotropolis.

However, some stakeholder representatives thought that the primary stakeholder governments would want to also maintain their respective jurisdictional brands, while other stakeholder representatives hoped that branding and marketing of Aerotropolis could be used to improve and expand on a combined Aerotropolis brand.

#### **ANTICIPATED DECISION POINTS IN ARRIVING AT A NEW ENTITY**

A review of the discussion responses (summarized above) yields a conclusion that the following terms and arrangements need to be negotiated and agreed:

1. Shall the entity be constrained to the functions listed in the 2015 Amendment, to wit: promotion and marketing of development opportunities and coordination assistance in land use and infrastructure planning? The 2015 Amendment can be narrowly or broadly construed, and the jurisdictions can by agreement expand the functions not listed, if desired.
2. If the entity is to engage in funding, should it have direct taxes and/or fees, or should it rely upon stakeholder jurisdictions to remit taxes and/or fees over to the entity?
3. Should the entity engage only in planning and coordination of infrastructure or also provide funding, design/construction, and/or operation?
4. What area should the entity serve initially, mid-term, and ultimately?
5. What infrastructure should the entity address: Transportation, water, sewer, drainage, other?
6. Should the entity bond to accelerate projects and/or serve as a lending fund or revolving loan bank?
7. Should the entity's decisional control be in its governing body or reside with the stakeholders' governing bodies? Should there be a mixed approach, depending on subject matter?
8. Should the entity try to bring the private sector and other public entities into its decisional process or seek to involve them in advisory committee(s) and the like?
9. Should marketing and branding be within the ambit of the entity or accomplished through a separate entity or coalition with expertise? Should the entity help fund marketing and branding?



10. Should the entity's governing body be elected officials or staff or others chosen for subject matter interest and expertise?

### **RECOMMENDED PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A NEW ENTITY**

- Discuss and negotiate, insofar as possible, areas of consensus and likely agreement. Some are identified in this memorandum
- Consider use of a neutral facilitator and draftsman
- Seek agreement on the major issues
  - Scope of entity activity
  - Whether a funding entity
  - If a funding entity, direct or through stakeholders
  - Consider wisdom of phasing and scaling activity of entity
- Match major determinations to existing types of entities or collection of entities or consider customized entity through legislation or IGA
- Work through refinement of lesser issues

### **POSSIBLE ENTITY CANDIDATES AND WHY OR WHY NOT LIKELY OF USE**

- Regional Transportation Authority – Limited to transportation, requires organizational vote of people of member counties, municipalities – unlikely
- Title 32 Metropolitan District – Not well-suited to have governing body populated by counties, municipalities – unlikely
- Non-profit corporation – May qualify for some federal grants, but not a public entity – unlikely
- Association of existing and future Metropolitan Districts – Developer and resident control; not stakeholder governments – unlikely
- Intergovernmental Agreement entity – Can be imbued with powers common to local government stakeholders, although probably not some fundamental government powers, like taxes, exempt bonds, eminent domain; would include a regional transportation commission or a regional planning commission – likely candidate
- Regional planning commission (if entity is to be limited to planning), established pursuant to Section 30-28-105, C.R.S. – likely candidate
- New legislative entity – Can be customized, but requires action of General Assembly and Governor – likely candidate
- Combination of entities – Cobble together contribution and involvement of different types of public entities through a functional IGA, with or without creating a new entity – likely candidate
- Research other potential entities



# Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study

## Agenda

Project:	Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study
Subject:	PIO Meeting
Date:	December 14, 2015 12:00 - 1:30 p.m.
Location:	CDOT Headquarters

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Aerotropolis Overview
  - a. Current study
    - i. Study final deliverables
  - b. How it relates to 1A
  - c. Next steps (post-study)
3. Communications Goals and Objectives
  - a. Current Owner - CDOT
  - b. Future Owner - TBD
4. Interim Communications Plan (Immediate Post-study)
  - a. What are the minimal elements?

### COLORADO AEROTROPOLIS | Visioning Study

A word cloud centered around the word "Collaboration". Other words visible include: Globally, Efficient, Transportation, Opportunity, Sustainability, Hub, Partnership, Connected, Commercial, Airport, Growth, Region, Commercial, Agreement, Catalyzing, Surrounding, Finance, Competitiveness, Targeting, Goals, City/polls, Coordination, and the Colorado Department of Transportation logo.

Vision Statement:

A sustainable, efficient, well-connected, and globally recognized Aerotropolis that capitalizes on the economic opportunity surrounding the Denver International Airport through collaborative planning, development, and marketing.

## Meeting Notes

Project:	Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study
Subject:	Primary Stakeholders' Public Information Officers Meeting
Date:	December 14, 2015, 12:00 p.m.
Location:	CDOT Headquarters
Attendees:	See attached sign-in sheet
Distribution:	Attendees, File

### Meeting Summary

1. This is a meeting with CDOT's Communications Office and the public information officer from each of the project jurisdictions (Adams County, Aurora, Brighton, Commerce City, and Denver and DIA). The purpose of the meeting is to coordinate on how the study and the study conclusions get communicated as the study finishes and what are the next steps. After the study, CDOT will eventually disengage.
2. The study has garnered momentum. What happens after the study should try to leverage the forum amongst the jurisdictions that the study has provided.
3. The 1A Ballot Initiative has been a separate and successful event through the course of the study. They are moving on to define the regional entity as described in the IGA Amendment. They have until 2016 to negotiate among the jurisdictions to set something set up.
4. The group suggested that the Aerotropolis Visioning study remains separate and pure from the 1A Initiative activity of the Adams County Airport Coordinating Committee (ACC) and the negotiations with Denver to set up the regional entity.
5. The PIO suggested that the final study reports and products be thoroughly vetted. The draft report will be prepared by mid- to late-January 2016 and distributed to this group, as well as the study committees, by the first of February 2016.
6. The primary stakeholders of the study were identified to be all the study participants and the staff and elected officials, as well as planning agencies, such as RTD and DRCOG, among others. The general public is not a primary stakeholder; it was noted the study has a page on the CDOT website.
7. It was suggested that the "ownership" eventually needs to shift to the ACC. It was recognized that a neutral third party to be a coordinating body would be helpful in the interim period.
8. A video has been suggested as part of the final study product. After some discussion, it was agreed that a video product would sound too polished and lend too much of an air of finality. In contrast, there is actually quite a bit of work to do through 2016 among the jurisdictions to set up a regional entity. So this study can continue to provide a forum into early 2016 and provide an independent voice and perspective on the merits of an aerotropolis.
9. It was agreed that the study recommendations and description should be presented to city councils. After some discussion, it was identified that the March time frame is the best time to do this. Jay Hendrickson confirmed that the contract language has been extended through September 2016, so there is no problem in continuing the study through March.
10. The March time frame for presenting the study to the city councils will allow time for thorough review and vetting of the presentation and study final products.

11. The audience is largely confined to the staff and elected officials at jurisdictions. There will be no public release, so there is no need for public announcements or press reports announcing the completion of the study.
12. It was suggested that Jay Hendrickson and Rick Pilgrim should be the main presenters for the presentation to the city councils. The same presentation will be presented to each of the jurisdictions.
13. The public information officers should reconvene and discuss the final presentation and study recommendations, as well as review the final study products.
14. Each of the attendees agreed to identify dates for presentation to their respective city council.
15. Presentations to other interested groups, such as DRCOG and the Metro Denver Economic Development Corporation, will be held after the city council presentations.



Initial	Name	Organization	Title
✓	Beckstein, Erin	Adams County Economic Development	Director, Marketing and Communications
KC	Chernosky, Kristen	City of Brighton	Director of Public Information & Community Resources
MC	Crane, Mindy	DIA	Director of Communications
e.d.	Dreyer, Evan	Denver Office of the Mayor	Deputy Chief of Staff
✓	Ford, Amy	CDOT	Director, Office of Communications
✓	Gault, Kaitlin	City of Brighton	Communications Specialist
✓	Halstead, Michelle	City of Commerce City	Director of Communications
✓	Hendrickson, Jay	CDOT	Program Engineer/ Project Manager
AM	Miller, Amber	Denver Office of the Mayor	Director of Communications
	Montoya, Abel	Adams County	Planning & Development Director
✓	Morales, Abraham	City of Aurora	Sr. Public Information Officer
✓	Primus, Chris	HDR	Consultant Project Manager
✓	Siedlecki, Jim	Adams County	Director, Public Information Office
✓	White, Stephanie	HDR	Public Involvement Director

## FINAL Meeting Notes

Project:	Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study
Subject:	Coordination Meeting—Commerce City
Date:	October 13, 2015
Location:	Commerce City
Attendees:	Commerce City: Chris Cramer, Michelle Claymore, Steve Timms, and Jim Hayes HDR: Chris Primus Arland: Arlene Taniwaki
Distribution:	File

### Summary of Discussion

1. Jim Hayes gave a brief overview of the special districts in the area. They have two districts—one is commercial and one is residential. The commercial district raises about 30 mill; the residential raises about 27 mill. The districts don't have formal boundaries; however, there is a general area where in if a development occurs, then it will be tagged as either a commercial district or residential district.
2. Reunion has a GID. Total mill levy is about 120 mills. The schools in the city add up to about 90, and the 27 mill for residential special district bring the Reunion mill levy to about 120. On top of that a Title 32 District would add again to serve developer's own infrastructure needs. When they set this up, they set a very high limit of around \$2 billion with an 85-year absorption schedule.
3. Jim Hayes mentioned that there is a presentation from a landowner meeting they had in July that he would share with the Aerotropolis Study, that would further illustrate this situation with the districts.
4. Tower Road is a widening project that is proceeding over the next couple of years through construction with 100 percent funding from Commerce City municipal funds.
5. Some landowners who are prospective developers in the Commerce City area are complaining that the City's system for funding developments is unfair compared to Aurora and other cities around the metropolitan area. One of these landowners has recently commissioned a study to compare Commerce City system to the peers of Aurora, Denver, and others. They have not heard yet from this. They are to meet to get a preliminary view of the results of the study in a week or two.
6. Chris Primus mentioned that he had met briefly with the Crawley Development Group earlier in the summer and have received copies of their land holdings. **Chris will send PDFs of this information to Commerce City.**
7. Arlene and Chris described the need to get a good understanding of the developments that are imminent, as well as longer term prospects, that Commerce City knows about. The map that was provided to Commerce City was discussed. Arlene suggested Commerce City looked at the map, mark it up, and send back to Arlene. Chris will provide a zoomed-in PDF of this map to Commerce City that the City will use to mark up and send back.



Project:	Computed:	Date:
Subject:	Checked:	Date:
Task:	Page:	of:
Job #:	No:	

Sign-In  
Aerotropolis Coordination Meeting  
Commerce City October 13, 2015

---

Chris Primus HDR

CHRIS CRAMER Commerce City

Michelle Claymore Commerce City

Steve Thomas CCC

JAMES HAYES COMM. CITY

Aileen Tamwahi Arland Land Use Economics





Project:	Computed:	Date:
Subject:	Checked:	Date:
Task:	Page:	of:
Job #:	No:	

Sign-In  
Aerotropolis Coordination Meeting  
Commerce City October 13, 2015

---

Chris Primus HDR

CHRIS CRAMER Commerce City

Michelle Claymore Commerce City

Steve Thomas CCC

JAMES HAYES COMM. CITY

Aileen Tamwahi Arland Land Use Economics





## FINAL Meeting Notes

Project:	Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study
Subject:	Coordination Meeting—Commerce City
Date:	September 30, 2015
Location:	Commerce City
Attendees:	Steve Timms, Michelle Claymore, Chris Cramer, Maria D’Andrea (Commerce City); Arlene Taniwaki (Arland); Chris Primus (HDR)
Distribution:	File

### Summary of Discussion

1. Chris Primus provided a brief review of the alternative scenarios that the Aerotropolis Study would be analyzing. The projections of growth for each one would be the baseline using the 2040 DRCOG forecasts. The Aerotropolis scenario would have additional employment over and above the 2040 projections.
2. There was some discussion of the IGA amendment and the fact that it opens up acres in the clear zones. There was a question about what and where this meant. Chris will follow-up with Dan Poremba to get more information.
3. Michelle Claymore mentioned that the scenario analysis was very similar to an analysis that was conducted for the completion of the beltway by the Northwest Parkway team. An economist had been hired and did a similar scenario analysis looking at the employment that would be attracted when the beltway is completed. The Jefferson County EDC might have a copy of this study.
4. Chris Cramer voiced a concern about the use of the data after the Aerotropolis Study concludes. The allocation of Aerotropolis employment is quite contentious among the jurisdictions. If there is data in this report, it could be used to contend for infrastructure investments—in one jurisdiction vs. another.
5. Maria D’Andrea described the planned improvements on Tower Road. For the most part this will be completed within about 2 years. They are currently at 90% plans. In general, they are widening from two to four lanes from 104th down south to their border. They are adding the missing ramp from Tower Road to southbound Pena Boulevard. They are widening Tower Road through the Pena Boulevard interchange to the eastbound ramps. She noted this is actually City and County of Denver territory, but it was part of the agreement they worked out with CCD.
6. The DRCOG projections for Commerce City were discussed. The information that the study team pulled together for the area in Commerce City directly west of DIA showed very little growth from 2015 through 2040. Commerce City confirmed that this was not a reasonable growth projection, and that there must have been a miscommunication with DRCOG when DRCOG was seeking input from local governments during development of the 2040 data set.
7. It was noted that Piccadilly, Tower Road, and E-470 are all planned to be six lanes each in the future. This was a result of an earlier plan. Commerce City plans to update the transportation plan next year and would consider having a focus area for a subarea of this area to the west of DIA.
8. Chris Primus asked about special districts within the city. All of Commerce City’s developers have at least one or more metro districts. Some of the developers have not yet formed a metro district yet. There are two or three GIDs in the corridor. Commerce City suggested that the study team speak with the director of the South Adams Water and Sanitation District, Jim Jones. DOLA has a list of all metro districts.

9. Commerce City has several planned developments at various stages. It was agreed that a subsequent meeting is needed to go through those developments so the study team can get a good understanding of the developments that Commerce City knows about and the stages of each.

Canonville City

Name	Agency	Position/Title	Email
Chris Primms	HDR	✓	✓
Stacy Timms	CCC	Planning Mgr	stacms@c3gov.com
Michelle Claymore	CCC	Ed Director	Mclaymore@c3gov.com
Ciris Cason	ccc	CD Director	ccason@c3gov.com
Maria D'Andrea	CCC	Director of Public Works	m.dandrea@c3gov.com

Project:	Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study
Subject:	Coordination Meeting—DIA
Date:	September 28, 2015
Location:	
Attendees:	Dan Poremba (DIA); Arlene Taniwaki (Arland); Rick Pilgrim, Chris Primus (HDR)
Distribution:	File

### Summary of Discussion

1. Dan Poremba mentioned that the developments that are closest to occurring include Porteos. It is very well positioned. It does need infrastructure. Another one is Nob Hill. He also mentioned the two TOD projects—one at 61st and Pena Station, the other one at 40th and Airport Boulevard.
2. In discussing the ratio of off-airport Aerotropolis employees to on-airport Aerotropolis employees, Dan reiterated that particularly in the early years, there would be much more off-airport Aerotropolis activity than on-airport. Only as the land fills up will there be a need or much cause for companies to locate on airport property because of additional costs and bureaucratic hurdles.
3. Regarding the estimate of 12,000 employees as a result of a successful IGA amendment, Dan said that he would look for the process that was used to estimate the number of employees.
4. Regarding the IGA and clear zones, Dan mentioned that the 1,500 acres are really the net leasable number of acres. The IGA also allows use of the clear zone acreage which amount to about 8,500 acres. This is owned by Denver but located in Adams County.
5. Dan suggested (and the study team agreed) that the pilot lexicon should be used when referring to the 1,500 acres of commercial development per the IGA amendment.
6. Regarding the ratio of off-airport employees to on-airport employees in association with an Aerotropolis, John Kasarda might have some information. Dan will contact Dan Kasarda. Another resource who would be useful could be Chris Letournier (sp?) with MXD, who has had a contract in the past with DIA.
7. Dan mentioned his support for having Ed Icenogle on our study team to contribute toward identifying reasonable governance structures that are options to move forward on.
8. The value of involving EDCs in this study was discussed. The study team has met with Tom Clark. Vicky Leah is the appointed representative from EDC to attend study team meetings. It was agreed that perhaps a panel of EDC speakers could inform this study at a future Study Review Committee meeting.

## FINAL Meeting Notes

Project:	Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study
Subject:	Coordination Meeting—City of Aurora
Date:	September 10, 2015
Location:	City of Aurora
Attendees:	Bob Watkins (Aurora), Mac Callison (Aurora), Vinessa Irvin (Aurora), Rick Pilgrim, (HDR) Chris Primus (HDR)
Distribution:	File

### Summary of Discussion

1. Introductions were made.
2. Regarding the development opportunities out in the DIA area, they have been working with property owners and developers who have identified infrastructure needs. Financing is the real issue. The developers have stated their interest in shared possibilities for the financing. Vinessa mentioned that they have a variety of tools for partnership, one of which is the Titled 32 Metro District. They have lots of those throughout the city of Aurora. Another one of these tools is ARI (Aurora Regional Infrastructure) Mill Levy). It is primarily for the built-out areas. The first 10 years is a 1 mill levy, the second 10 years is 5 mill levy, up to about 20 years and it steps up further. As the built-out area's debts get paid off, the ARI Mill Levy ramps up to provide money for new capital improvements. However, without the existing infrastructure, this tool is probably not the best for the area in north Aurora south of DIA. GIDs would be better initially.
3. Vinessa stated two authorities have been formed out of a conglomeration of special metro districts. The structure of these authorities is very similar to SPIMD (Southeast Public Improvement Metropolitan District), which is in the southeast area.
4. Vinessa also mentioned that for the built environment, the bulk of the funding for infill or redevelopment opportunities comes through the adjacency procedure—that is, if the property is adjacent to the roadways, the property owner is responsible for improvements in that area. This structure does not work for undeveloped areas (such as that south of DIA), because the improvement needed may not necessarily be for the area adjacent to the property. Instead there may be a need for improvements in the vicinity of the property, such as addressing gaps in roadways or other roadway improvements to access the property from some distance away.
5. For the northern area, GIDs would be a better structure at this point. The metro districts are developer-controlled. Rick Pilgrim suggested potential use of the funds would be the provision of a ring road. Aurora's position is that a good arterial network is superior to building more freeways. If the ring road is to be a freeway, they would disagree with that concept in favor of a good structure of arterials. This could be controlled access with limited signals.
6. Rick inquired about the population and employment estimates as tabulated in the recent FHU study for northern Aurora south of DIA.
7. There was some discussion about Aurora's urban growth area. There is 3.2 miles of urban area designated in the south of DIA area. There is also about 5 square miles that is unspecified location-wise but is a part of their allotment for urban growth in the Aurora area. As needed,

they can mix and match their urban growth allotment as long as they don't go over their total of about 21 square miles.

8. Urban centers are an important part of the metro vision process, in that approximately 75 percent of future growth within the metropolitan area is to take place within designated urban centers. Aurora has several urban centers already designated, including one at 64th and E-470, 56th and E-470, and others.
9. It was mentioned that in the HDR's review of the 2040 socioeconomic data, the Aurora area immediately south of DIA seemed to have very low projections of employment through 2040. Bob Watkins said that they have recently met with DRCOG to provide them further information. DRCOG is still processing the 2040 data. A new 2040 data set will be produced next year.
10. Mac mentioned that the City of Aurora has its own land use allocation model that uses a Delphi technique based on a variety of input that takes into account capacity constraints for their own scenario planning assumptions.
11. It was agreed that the DRCOG estimates for the south of DIA area represent a low end at this point. The FHU numbers represent a higher end. And the real development pattern probably is somewhere in between for the year 2040 level of development.
12. The City Council asked for the FHU study to be completed for the area south of DIA to jump start and spur infrastructure that would attract development. The Council would prefer to see this development happen much sooner than the study's horizon year of 2035.
13. The study team needs to have a meeting with Aurora Water. Sarah Young might be a good contact for this need.
14. Aurora regularly has contacts with developers. The study team would like to contact the major landowners. The following contacts were provided by the City to the study team:
  - a. Bruce Row (Oakwood)
  - b. Bill Wichterman (Porteos; 602-595-6121)
  - c. Ed Sabrowski (HighPoint)
15. Other developers to consider contacting include:
  - a. Starwood
  - b. Painted Prairie
  - c. Front Range
  - d. Transport



Project:	Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study
Subject:	Coordination Meeting—Peter Bartlein, City and County of Denver
Date:	August 4, 2015
Location:	Denver Offices
Attendees:	Peter Bartlein (Denver), Rick Pilgrim, (HDR) Chris Primus (HDR)
Distribution:	File

### Summary of Discussion

1. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the special districts that are established in the City and County of Denver near DIA.
2. Peter Bartlein mentioned that SPIMD (Southeast Public Improvement Metropolitan District) is a good model to consider for the Aerotropolis area to develop.
3. He said that the special districts in the DIA area (within Denver) were established in 1990 for the Gateway Area Development to pay its own way. This involved impact fees to pay for the entire development needs, including parks, trail, drainage, fire, etc. After some point in time (approximately in the year 2000), Fulenwider needed the 56th and Tower area developed for the hotels that are currently there now. This led to the establishment of a Gateway Regional Metro District (GRMD). This provided a different fee structure to provide for regional infrastructure. It was a hierarchical fee structure that varied depending on the distance from Tower or 56th per square foot of development. The Gateway Regional Metro District provides revenue to the City and County of Denver (CCD) for the initial development. CCD acted as a bank which now gets paid back as time goes on.
4. In 2006 High Point wanted out of the GRMD and formed its own. This is set up as a local but collected for regional projects.
5. More recently the GRMD has been updated and put forth an obligation for Peña Boulevard and 64th Interchange which would serve the region. This would provide their share for those improvements.
6. The GRMD was established pre the Tabor amendment to the constitution. They have established a 20-year voter obligation, and in the year 2017 it goes back to a vote.
7. The improvements funded by the GRMD fund the initial establishment of a road. And the outlying lanes are provided by private developers as demand increases in the future.
8. Peter also mentioned that Metro Waste Water has developed a northern treatment plant which is opening in 2016. The intention is to relieve the Hite Plant, which is approximately at I-270 and 72nd. This has identified an opportunity to haul wastewater from Aurora and send north to the Northern Treatment Plant instead of the Hite Plant. But it is at local government's discretion and this diversion from Aurora is not confirmed yet. Metro Wastewater has hired a consultant to work on the technical merits of such a diversion.
9. The wastewater follows the trunk model; such as on the transportation side, there are main regional facilities and interchanges.





## Meeting Agenda

---

Project: Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study

---

Subject: Coordination Meeting—Denver

---

Date: May 26, 2015

---

Location: Denver City and County Building

1. Purpose of Meeting
2. Study Review Committee
  - a. Visioning Workshop
    - i. Name, Vision, Area
    - b. Next SRC meeting May 27 - Briefings
3. Steering Committee
  - a. Representatives
  - b. 8:30 - 10:30 June 4, 2015 RMANWR
4. Other
5. Next Steps and Action Items

## FINAL Meeting Notes

---

Project: Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study

---

Subject: Study Coordination Meeting—City and County of Denver

---

Date: May 26, 2015

---

Location: CCD Offices

---

Attendees: Evan Dreyer (CCD), Chris Primus (HDR), Rick Pilgrim (HDR), Jay Hendrickson (CDOT)

1. Evan Dreyer attended the visioning workshop on May 7 and thought it went very well and was positive in his perception of the response from the attendees. He thought that everyone had good contributions and were excited for the study to move forward.
2. He inquired about the second Study Review Committee (SRC) meeting scheduled for May 27. This will be a briefing session for the different agencies to introduce themselves and present their plans for the future near DIA.
3. Chris inquired who was going to speak for Denver. It was mentioned that 2 or 3 people will be speaking for DIA. Evan was not sure would be speaking for Denver. He was not sure if a presentation has been prepared. He suggested we contact Leslie Thomas, Jose Cornejos, and Crissy Fanganello since Peter Baertlein is on vacation.
4. Jay described the media protocol that is planned by CDOT. Evan thought that it was a good plan and agreed that social media needs to be allowed as people desire. He suggested that if there are elements of discord that the agencies involved work out and communicate this prior to engaging the media.
5. Chris said he drafted a study fact sheet for the support of the Public Information Office of CDOT. Evan confirmed he could review the draft statement that was prepared for the fact sheet regarding how the Aerotropolis study interacts with the Peña Boulevard study, and also the relationship of the Aerotropolis study with the confidential mediation underway. **Chris will send the draft fact sheet to Evan for his review.**
6. Jay inquired about the history of the grant, as it has not been known by the study team. Evan responded while Mayor Hancock was campaigning about 4 years ago, the Aerotropolis was an initiative that he campaigned upon and educated himself with the concept with John Kasarda's book and other materials.
7. Upon Mayor Hancock's election, the aerotropolis concept became one of the priorities of his administration. Someone in the Public Works department heard about or knew of an opportunity for a grant to study this concept through FHWA.
8. In 2011 the City sought the grant with support from DIA contributing \$125,000. In 2012 the Global Airport Cities Conference was held in Denver and the MXD Study, which had been underway for 2 or 3 years, was announced by the mayor at the conference. This airport city concept proved politically controversial. And those within the City and DIA realized they cannot successfully administer the FHWA grant.

9. Kim Day's idea of turning to a third party to administer the grant led to the identification of CDOT as the third-party. The grant was transferred to CDOT and CDOT hired HDR to facilitate the study.
10. There was discussion about the representation at the Steering Committee. The first committee meeting is June 4, and the major stakeholders have an interest in having equitable representation. Jay suggested that since DIA and Denver both wanted representation, that DIA make the case to the other stakeholders why they should have a seat at the table. It was clarified that a seat at the table does not translate into a vote, because committee recommendations would not be made by voting.
11. Evans said that either CDOT or DIA could make the case at the first meeting. Jay suggested that it might be best for DIA/Dan Poremba to make the case. This was fine with Evan and he could support Dan on this topic.
12. Evan mentioned that the IGA originally signed by the major stakeholders in 1988, in advance of the annexation of the land for DIA into Denver, makes the prospect of an aerotropolis unique. That is a structure and an agreement between neighboring jurisdictions around an airport unlike any other prospective aerotropolis development.
13. There was discussion about stakeholders that should be involved in the study. One mentioned was the Metro Denver Economic Development Corporation run by Tom Clark. Evan suggested Pam Reichert would be a good representative from this group because she has worked on DIA in the past.
14. Evan agreed it would not be appropriate to include the FAA as a stakeholder.
15. Evan suggested large private landowners should also be engaged. Rick and Jay confirmed the intention is to engage large private landowners once the study has made some progress and we can frame out the plan to these private landowners. Evan has a list that could be useful in identifying the major private landowners.



## Meeting Agenda

---

Project: **Aerotropolis Visioning Study**

---

Subject: **Coordination Meeting—DIA**

---

Date: **May 21, 2015**

---

Location: **DIA**

1. Purpose of Meeting
  2. DIA Perspectives
    - a. Global Marketplace
    - b. FAA Regulations and Restrictions
    - c. Non-Airline Revenue
  3. Access
  4. Area-wide Benefits
  5. DIA Master Plan
    - a. DEN Real Estate
  6. Economic Profile
  7. Other
  8. Next SRC meeting May 27 - Briefings
  9. Next Steps and Action Items
-

Draft Schedule

Tasks	2015											
	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D			
Project Management												
Steering Committee												
Study Review Committee												
Concept Development and Visioning												
Initial Scenarios Economic Analysis												
Refined Scenarios Economic Analysis												
Findings & Next Steps												
Final Document												

## FINAL Meeting Notes

---

Project: Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study

---

Subject: Study Coordination Meeting—City and County of Denver

---

Date: May 21, 2015

---

Location: DIA Offices

---

Attendees: Tom Reed (DIA), Brandon Howes (DIA), Bill Poole (DIA), Chris Primus (HDR), Rick Pilgrim (HDR), Jay Hendrickson (CDOT)

1. The DIA planners are part of the Infrastructure Group within the DIA organization. They are tasked with maintaining and updating the DIA Master Plan, as well as other duties. The Master Plan is closely coordinated with the DEN Real Estate Group within the DIA organization.
2. The planning and needs of an airport focus more and more on sources of non-airline revenue. They see that the potential aerotropolis helps them achieve the goal of increasing non-airline revenue. They see the airport as a catalyst to drive this economic engine.
3. The DIA planners are currently working with the DEN Real Estate Group to produce a mini update of the Master Plan. This mini update will incorporate the DEN Real Estate Airport City Plan. The airport has 34,000 acres in total; the DEN Real Estate Group has identified that 9,000 of this is potential for development for non-airline revenue endeavors. Less than 10 percent of the 9,000 acres is currently used.
4. The DIA planners confirmed that the airport master plan focuses on airport property. It does not go beyond the airport borders. They are looking toward this aerotropolis study to help inform their planning for additional accesses, for example. The plan now identifies Piccadilly as a new corridor through the airport property. Piccadilly is currently a partial road within Aurora. This improvement would build the corridor through DIA and improve it into Commerce City and farther in Aurora.
5. A good example of the planning process leading to a new access into the airport is the Jackson Gap extension. It will be open in June. It has taken 4 to 5 years working with the developer to get to this point where a new access will be open. There are numerous bureaucratic steps that need to be followed when an access opens into an airport property.
6. DIA has an IGA with the developer to help pay for maintenance of the roadway. Aurora will pay for the roadway and its maintenance needs south of airport property within Aurora. The airport will provide snowplow services, but the IGA with the developer stipulates that the developer will pay for maintenance funds, including future potential capacity additions on airport property.
7. The developer is owned by A.N.C Properties, the same developer for the Porteos Development located immediately south of DIA along Jackson Gap.
8. The steps necessary for developing new roads onto airport property are largely controlled by the requirements that the FAA places on airport operators. There are a variety of airport compliance regulations that they must follow and follow grant assurances that define how use

of funds that are generated on an airport can be used. The grant assurances stipulate that revenues generated on airport property are used for aviation purposes.

9. The process for Jackson Gap was a lengthy one but it was also the first one for a brand new access onto DIA (besides Peña Boulevard). Future new accesses might be a quicker process now that Jackson Gap has set the precedent.
10. At a future SRC meeting, it would be worthwhile to present and discuss the process for gaining access to airport property.
11. A new initiative at DIA is to place DIA on the world map. One goal is to increase the share of international passengers. Currently, about 3.7% of passengers have international destinations. DIA's goal is to increase it by 5% to 6% in 5 years. They work closely with the International Trade Group of the Governor's office for development purposes. Panasonic, for example, is a development that has occurred through collaboration between DIA and the Governor's Economic Development Group Office.
12. There is a need for an airport to increase its share of non-airline revenue. To be competitive globally it is important that the costs to run an airport are paid not only by airlines but non-airline sources as well. Increasing non-airline revenue reduces the amount an airport needs to charge an airline for operating. With reduced costs to operate an airport airlines are more likely to locate in an airport and increase the number of flights that they operate. In turn, this increases connectivity to the nations in the world and increases the attractiveness of airport to corporations and companies and they are more likely to locate in and near the airport with increased connectivity. The presence of more companies as to the development around the airport, there is a balance between the amount of on-airport development and off-airport development.
13. There is a need to be sure development opportunities are off airport, as well as opportunities on airport. This provides a good mix of price points for companies to locate near the airport.
14. The cities need to have a share of development, not residential so much as that costs the cities, but also commercial development. Otherwise, the surrounding cities are impacted without benefits.
15. The DIA's opportunities for on- and off-airport development are very great. DIA currently has six runways and this provides them plenty of capacity. The ultimate buildout for the airport can accommodate 12 runways. Current forecast suggests that the 7th runway will not be needed until 2030. This is partially because of the increased technology that NextGen provides, which is a GPS-based airplane tracking as opposed to radar-based airplane tracking for air traffic control.
16. Laura Jackson is the person who could make a presentation about DIA marketing. She has good material about DIA and its statistics and how it ranks against domestic airports, as well as international airport. It was suggested she could be a potential presenter at an SRC meeting.

17. There was discussion about the upcoming SRC meeting scheduled for May 27. It was agreed that there is not enough time for Laura Jackson to present at that time. The airport city concept will be presented in principle for what is driving the need, but it is recognized that no detail would be discussed. And that it needs to be developed in balance with off-airport development opportunities.
18. There was also discussion about DEN vs. DIA. The airport is attempting to rebrand itself as DEN, because that is the recognition that people have internationally for the Denver airport. It is also recognized that the airport will always be known as DIA to the locals. The DIA planners are comfortable with using both terms interchangeably for the aerotropolis study.





## Meeting Agenda

---

Project: **Aerotropolis Visioning Study**

---

Subject: **Coordination Meeting—Evan Dreyer**

---

Date: **May 13, 2015**

---

Location: **City and County of Denver**

1. **Introductions**
2. **Visioning Workshop Observations**
  - a. **Study Name**
  - b. **Continuing Participation**
3. **Study Committee Structure**
  - a. **Steering Committee**
  - b. **Study Review Committee (SRC)**
4. **Study Course and Outcomes**
5. **Background of Grant**
6. **Next Steps and Action Items**

Draft Schedule

Tasks	2015											
	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D			
Project Management												
Steering Committee												
Study Review Committee												
Concept Development and Visioning												
Initial Scenarios Economic Analysis												
Refined Scenarios Economic Analysis												
Findings & Next Steps												
Final Document												



**COLORADO**

Department of  
Transportation

## Meeting Agenda

---

Project: **Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study**

---

Subject: **One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—City of Brighton**

---

Date: **4:00 April 29, 2015**

---

Location: **City of Brighton  
Brighton, CO 80603  
City Hall - 6th Floor Meadowlark Conference Room**

- 1. Introductions**
  - 2. Study Background / Grant**
    - a. Collaboratively develop an overall vision for the infrastructure and development surrounding DIA to generate long-term economic growth
  - 3. Purpose of Meeting**
    - a. On an individual agency basis, the study team desires to listen and understand your agency perspectives and needs before the kick-off of the study
  - 4. Study Schedule**
  - 5. Proposed Committee Structure**
    - a. Main stakeholders: Adams County, Aurora, Brighton, Commerce City, Denver
    - b. Small Steering committee composed of one representative each, either appointed or elected, from the main stakeholders
    - c. Larger Study Review Committee composed of main stakeholders and coordinating organizations
  - 6. Suggested Coordinating Organizations**
    - a. Economic Development Corporations
    - b. RTD
    - c. DRCOG
    - d. Major landowners
    - e. DIA
    - f. Others?
-

7. Consideration of:
  - a. Study Name Study Area
  - b. Study Vision Statement
  - c. Study Goals
  - d. Charter Agreement
8. Perspectives and Visions
  - a. What are your top three priorities regarding the northeast quadrant?
9. Draft Agenda Kick-off Visioning Workshop
  - a. Date:
10. Confirmation of Local Plans and Studies
11. Available GIS and other data
12. Roundtable
13. Next Steps and Action Items
  - a. Scenario Development Collaboration



## FINAL Meeting Notes

---

Project:	Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study
Subject:	One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—Brighton
Date:	April 29, 2015
Location:	City of Brighton Offices
Attendees:	Marv Falconburg (Brighton), Chontel Trujillo (Brighton), Jay Hendrickson (CDOT), Chris Primus (HDR)

---

1. Introductions were made.
2. Jay Hendrickson described the background of the upcoming study and CDOT's role to lead the study as a neutral party. He said the purpose of today's meeting was to listen to the perspectives and visions of the City regarding this upcoming study. He further mentioned that due to terms of the grant, the study needs to be concluded by end of the calendar year.
3. It was agreed the proposed committee structure of a Steering Committee and a larger Study Review Committee (SRC) was appropriate.
4. Brighton is interested in productive talks for the planning of the Aerotropolis Area. Brighton noted that they are geographically not as close to DIA as some of the other local partners. But they support improved access and joint marketing of the Aerotropolis area for the benefit of all. Brighton views that there is a lot to gain for regional cooperation and will be a willing partner in the Aerotropolis Study.
5. It is realized that more connections via roads into the DIA area would be beneficial.
6. It was questioned if revenue sharing will be an outcome of the study. In discussions with other local partners at the One-on-One sessions, it has been mentioned that the study could be a first step towards some kind of inter-jurisdictional structure for revenue sharing.
7. Marv confirmed that he has invitations for the Study Review Committee Envisioning Workshop on May 7<sup>th</sup> as well as the 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop on May 27<sup>th</sup>. Chris will make sure Chontel is also invited. The attendees at the committee meetings might differ among agencies. Brighton would appreciate knowing the number and type of staff being sent by local partners so that they can make sure they send the appropriate staff at these committee meetings.
8. Brighton is looking forward to productive discussions among staff for moving forward with regional collaboration. They have seen political gamesmanship between some of these other partners regarding airport redevelopment in the past and do not wish to participate in those battles.
9. Brighton looks forward to the possibilities of joint marketing efforts for economic development and believe the model set by the MDEDC is productive in which they attract developments from elsewhere in the nation and world and then give the local

partners a chance to compete for those developments. A positive example of this which was a success story for Brighton was the Vestas Wind Turbine Facility in Brighton. This came about by working with the MDEDC and eventually resulted in the location of this plant in Brighton.

10. Another example of the strength of aviation related development and the proximity to an airport is shown by a new hospital complex in the Prairie Center development area. The hospital has some state of the art medical machinery. The proximity to the airport is favorable. People from Japan have been flown in to see the equipment in operation.
11. After consideration of the area appropriate for the Aerotropolis study, Brighton suggests that the northern boundary be the county line. On the west, the 76 and 85 corridors would be appropriate for the Aerotropolis study.
12. Regarding potential study names, the term Aerotropolis is appropriate from their perspective. Regarding their visions and priorities for the area surrounding DIA, Marv and Chontel will brainstorm with colleagues regarding Brighton's visions and priorities. It was confirmed that not just future roads but transit and utilities such as water, sewer, should also be considered when they are envisioning future possibilities. They will send bullets or a marked up map back by Tuesday, May 5, 2015.
13. Brighton has some GIS mapping that will be useful. One of these is the IGA and Growth Areas Map. Other city plan documents will also be provided.





**COLORADO**

Department of  
Transportation

## Meeting Agenda

---

**Project:** Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study

---

**Subject:** One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—City and County of Denver

---

**Date:** 8:30 Monday, April 13, 2015

---

**Location:** City and County of Denver  
Webb Bldg  
201 W Colfax Ave, 6th Floor  
Conf Rm 6.H.17

1. Introductions
  2. Study Background / Grant
    - a. Collaboratively develop an overall vision for the infrastructure and development surrounding DIA to generate long-term economic growth
  3. Purpose of Meeting
    - a. On an individual agency basis, the study team desires to listen and understand your agency perspectives and needs before the kick-off of the study
  4. Study Schedule
  5. Proposed Committee Structure
    - a. Main stakeholders: Adams County, Aurora, Brighton, Commerce City, Denver
    - b. Small Steering committee composed of one representative each, either appointed or elected, from the main stakeholders
    - c. Larger Study Review Committee composed of main stakeholders and coordinating organizations
  6. Suggested Coordinating Organizations
    - a. Economic Development Corporations
    - b. RTD
    - c. DRCOG
    - d. Major landowners
    - e. DIA
    - f. Others?
-



7. Consideration of:
  - a. Study Name Study Area
  - b. Study Vision Statement
  - c. Study Goals
  - d. Charter Agreement
8. Perspectives and Visions
  - a. What are your top three priorities regarding the northeast quadrant?
9. Draft Agenda Kick-off Visioning Workshop
  - a. Date:
10. Confirmation of Local Plans and Studies
11. Available GIS and other data
12. Roundtable
13. Next Steps and Action Items
  - a. Scenario Development Collaboration

## FINAL Meeting Notes

Project: Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study

Subject: One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—City and County of Denver

Date: 8:30 Monday, April 13, 2015

Location: City and County of Denver  
Webb Building  
201 W Colfax Ave, 6th Floor  
Conf Rm 6.H.17

Attendees: Jose Cornejo (CCD); Lesley Thomas (CCD/PW); Peter Baertlein (CCD/PW); Crissy Fanganello (CCD/PW); Brian Pinkerton (CCD/PW); Tykus Holloway (CCD/PW); George Delaney (CCD/PW); Jay Hendrickson (CDOT); Chris Primus (HDR); Rick Pilgrim (HDR); and Kip Cheroutes (LXC)

1. Introductions were made.
2. Jay Hendrickson described the background of the upcoming study and CDOT's role to lead the study as a neutral party. He said the purpose of today's meeting was to listen to the perspectives and visions of the County regarding this upcoming study. He further mentioned that due to terms of the grant, the study needs to be concluded by end of the calendar year.
3. CCD recognizes that this is a great opportunity for the region and for the state. They are excited about the study and the visionary opportunities that it brings.
4. It was agreed the proposed committee structure of a Steering Committee and a larger Study Review Committee (SRC) was appropriate.
  - a. A suggestion was to include the State of Colorado Economic Development Office.
  - b. DIA can be a separate coordinating organization for the study. It was noted that DIA is different than some of the other coordinating organization because DIA functions as an enterprise economic development corporation, a landowner, and airport operations functions.
  - c. Would CDOT would be a participant as a sitting member of the study? Besides Jay Hendrickson, CDOT will be represented by HPTE for long term planning and connectivity possibilities.
  - d. It was recognized that key agencies are utility organizations, such as Denver Water, Metro Districts, etc. After some discussion, as the study progresses, special districts will be contacted and coordinated with at a later date.
  - e. It was noted that the major landowners typically have districts that represent them. CCD has a map or a list of the districts, there are many in the area. Peter

- Baertlein will provide the list. There are multiple ones but there are two or three ones that may be sufficient in representing this study.
- f. Should Arapahoe County be an cooperative agency? After discussion, it was determined it was too far south, and in turn if you go further south, you need to go further north and engage communities such as Ft. Lupton, Thornton, Weld County and that would be too many players at this point in time.
  - g. DRCOG's role on the study. We are looking forward to keeping them informed and including coordinating with the sustainability initiatives.
  - h. RTD. Aerotropolis needs to keep transit as part of the infrastructure surrounding and serving the airport. At the beginning stages it might look like circulators, and could evolve into BRT and other services.
  - i. This Aerotropolis effort among the neighboring jurisdictions could be akin with the US-36 Coalition. This is a partnership among agencies along the US-36 corridor that promotes transportation and infrastructure in investments.
5. The study should have a perspective of developing from the concept of Aerotropolis. In contrast, the various needs of the northeast area would be developed in an individual sense.
  6. No agency has a proper perspective or full understanding of the regional economic potential of DIA. Hopefully this study will provide some of that perspective.
  7. Denver as well as its neighboring partners have had development and infrastructure plans for the area going multiple years back. But this study takes a different look at the Aerotropolis concept; the idea is to grow beyond and outside of individual such plans. Also, to be more thoughtful and provide the type of infrastructure that is needed by various aviation oriented industries that Aerotropolis concept can support. For example, there may be certain infrastructure needs of transportation, power, etc. that are tailored to an agriculture / aviation area of development. All individual plans will be challenged to amend and revise to correspond to the larger Aerotropolis concept.
  8. It was questioned if there was a level of agreement among the local partners of what an Aerotropolis study would accomplish. Does the grant chart a specific course of action? It was agreed that this study will provide an opportunity to get us to an Aerotropolis in a collaborative manner with neighboring jurisdictions. In fact, this study in its entirety will function as a chartering process amongst the jurisdictions.
  9. Regarding the name Aerotropolis, the term's concept is established and has academic basis based on Dr. John Kasarda and his contributions. Use of this term is important for branding purposes. The term Aerotropolis, for this area, will be important to define the airports role in the region and economic potential. The 'aerotropolis' term will convey to the world that this area is coordinated and therefore will be attractive for development.
  10. Amongst peer airports that have gone through an Aerotropolis type of development, DIA's development as an Airport was perhaps not typical. Are there peers that have had the issue of multiple competing government jurisdictions in the process of developing an Aerotropolis? DFW and Chicago are a couple of examples that might be

good examples. When there are multiple jurisdictions involved, how do differing view points get handled?

11. At the staff level, there are good relations with other neighboring jurisdictions. People are eager to talk and work on this issue. As the study proceeds there will be some things that will be found to be in alignment; and others that collaboratively that can be tackled and worked on amongst the partners.
12. The biggest challenge of this study effort will be to demonstrate the economic benefits and determining the costs of an Aerotropolis type development. How will costs be shared? There will need to be a willingness amongst the partners to share the costs and therefore the shared economic benefits can be realized in the long term. The current development plans need to be re-considered by each jurisdiction, including the City and County of Denver, in light of the potential greater economic benefit under a collaborative plan. The costs are both direct and indirect. As infrastructure is provided and activities at the airport grow due to early Aerotropolis developments, there will be more impacts on the surrounding roadway networks for example and impacting the other jurisdictions.
13. It was suggested that there may be the need to establish a governance to move forward after the study. The study will have to answer why we want to move forward but some sort of government structure might be appropriate amongst the jurisdictions to proceed with Aerotropolis plans.
14. The geographic area for the study was suggested to be a hard one to pin down. DIA serves metro area as a whole, serves Colorado and even beyond the state borders. The other extreme is that Aerotropolis geographic area could be defined as a mile or two on either side of Pena Blvd corridor.
15. A governing structure will eventually need a defined area for the district for costs and revenues. It was suggested that the absorption rates of economic development and their horizon years will naturally lead to a description a geographic area for part of the Aerotropolis area and study.
16. It was recognized that the cost of infrastructure is going to be quite large because of the area and the expansive land to cover with new infrastructure. It might be better to group together and define a closer in area to start with. This is reasonable because the Aerotropolis will take decades, 50-60-100 years to fully develop. Better to start close in where the costs are surmountable. For this reason, it might be best to identify some early small areas off airport property that might be available as practice opportunities with our jurisdictional partners.
17. It was asked on what is the best way to engage DIA to make new connections into the airport. It was mentioned that airport revenues cannot be used to build these roads. Denver's policy is that development pays its own way, but in contrast, many of the jurisdictions offer incentives for financial developments. This difference between Denver and the neighboring jurisdictions is another part of the puzzle that needs to be worked out.
18. The study could help with prioritizing early developments, identifying those, and potentially a government structure for the early opportunities.

19. Funding as always is critical. It was noted that DIA actually has money but has limitations on what it can be used for. It has revenue for parking and revenues for oil and gas. It therefore has revenues to build infrastructure on airport property. This is often resented by surrounding jurisdictions that don't have funding streams. It was noted in contrast that Pena Blvd. was initially constructed with airport revenue. If that's the case, with that model, can the airport build more Pena's so to speak, connecting to the surrounding areas? If not, at least these roads could be built within airport boundaries and other revenues will need to be identified to continue the roads around the airport property. The financial aspects will be important to address.
20. The overall concept is to attract global investments and the whole study will actually act as a charter amongst the partnering jurisdictions. One of the important aspects of the study is to address funding and revenue sharing.



Name	Agency / Dept	Email	Phone
Chris Primus	HDR	christopher.primus@hdrinc.com	3 323 1838
Joe Gomez	CCI		
Lesley Thomas	CCD / PW	lesley.thomas@denvergov.org	702 865 8719
Sally Puckey	CDOT	Sally.Puckey@state.co.us	712-5991
Rice Puckey	KTR	rice.puckey@hdrinc.com	720 302 9466
Peter Baerlein	CCD / PW	peter.baerlein@denvergov.org	720-865-3013
Crissey Fongmello	CCD / PW	crissey.fongmello@denvergov.org	7.865.3026
Brian Pinkerton	CCD / PW	brian.pinkerton@denvergov.org	720-865-2524
KIP CERUTOS	LXC STRATEGIES	LXC@AOL.COM	303.204.0479
Tykus Holloway	CCD / PW	tykus.holloway@denvergov.org	720-913-8912
George Delaney	CCD / PW	george.delaney@denvergov.org	720.913.1776



**COLORADO**

Department of  
Transportation

## Meeting Agenda

---

Project: **Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study**

---

Subject: **One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—DEN**

---

Date: **9:00 Wednesday, April 8, 2015**

---

Location: **Denver City and County Building, Conference Room #353**

1. **Introductions**
  2. **Study Background / Grant**
    - a. **Collaboratively develop an overall vision for the infrastructure and development surrounding DIA to generate long-term economic growth**
  3. **Purpose of Meeting**
    - a. **On an individual agency basis, the study team desires to listen and understand your agency perspectives and needs before the kick-off of the study**
  4. **Study Schedule**
  5. **Proposed Committee Structure**
    - a. **Main stakeholders: Adams County, Aurora, Brighton, Commerce City, Denver**
    - b. **Small Steering committee composed of one representative each, either appointed or elected, from the main stakeholders**
    - c. **Larger Study Review Committee composed of main stakeholders and coordinating organizations**
  6. **Suggested Coordinating Organizations**
    - a. **Economic Development Corporations**
    - b. **RTD**
    - c. **DRCOG**
    - d. **Major landowners**
    - e. **DIA**
    - f. **Others?**
-

7. Consideration of:
  - a. Study Name and Study Area
  - b. Study Vision Statement
  - c. Study Goals
  - d. Charter Agreement
8. Perspectives and Visions
  - a. What are your top three priorities regarding the northeast quadrant?
9. Draft Agenda Kick-off Visioning Workshop
  - a. Date:
10. Confirmation of Local Plans and Studies
11. Available GIS and other data
12. Roundtable
13. Next Steps and Action Items
  - a. Scenario Development Collaboration



## FINAL Meeting Notes

Project:	Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study
Subject:	One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—DEN
Date:	9:00 Wednesday, April 8, 2015
Location:	Denver City and County Building, Conference Room #353
Attendees:	Dan Poremba (DEN); Bill Poole (DEN); Mark Schaefer (AECOM); Jay Hendrickson (CDOT); Chris Primus (HDR); Rick Pilgrim (HDR); and Kip Cheroutes (LXC).

1. Introductions were made. The other active people on their staff that will potentially contribute to the study are Tom Reed and Kenneth Howell.
2. Jay Hendrickson described CDOT's role to lead the study as a neutral party. He said the purpose of today's meeting was to listen to the perspectives and visions of DIA regarding this upcoming study.
3. It was agreed the proposed committee structure of a Steering Committee and a larger Study Review Committee (SRC) was appropriate. After some discussion, they recognize that it is appropriate that DIA be a stakeholder or a participant in the study. Denver staff would sit on the small steering group and represent Denver and DIA. DIA has requirements of running an airport and these may need to be discussed and understood by the study participants. The bottom line is that the airport is a large 26 billion dollar enterprise and benefits the entire region. The goal for the study is to better determine how to leverage DIA and its benefits with the Aerotropolis concept for the surrounding area.
4. The Denver Finance Department should participate in the study. That would be Kerry Kennedy and her staff.
5. DIA feels the study will be a means to educate others about activities at DIA regarding the level of planning and how the Airport City planning can integrate with other plans surrounding the airport.
6. Regarding the Airport City versus Aerotropolis, it was confirmed the Airport City by definition ends at the boundary of DIA. Dan Poremba mentioned that they have a new brochure for Real Estate on DIA property and he would provide the study team that brochure. Another aspect is the clear zones. There are 8,000 acres of clear zones and these are owned by the city but are in other jurisdictions.
7. Of ten (10) companies that are involved in development activity at DIA, nine (9) are outside the boundary. An example is the collaboration with an edge project is Nob Hill and Porteos.
8. They recognize that there are important transportation needs. It is needed to connect DIA better to the region with transportation infrastructure. The status of Pena Boulevard needs to be defined and worked out on a regional basis. For transportation

connections on the west Commerce City's cooperation is needed: nothing can happen without coordination. On the north, CSU has been in discussion about developing an agricultural hub. This would be on the North side of DIA. And on the south of DIA, the transportation needs are focused on new roads.

9. Mark Schaeffer said the Pena study has a focus on both the 2,000 foot wide Pena corridor as well as some broader alternatives for capacity improvements. The study has not really started developing alternatives yet, but it will be doing so soon. They will also be examining funding opportunities.
10. As a broader discussion for the Aerotropolis study would be a recognition that there a lot of activities and studies going on that will need to be understood and summarized. After some discussion, it was suggested that a workshop of the study review committee be focused on a series of briefings by these other endeavors. This would include the Den Real Estate "Airport City Activities", Pena Boulevard Study, The CSU Agricultural work, The Panasonic Development, The Wildlife Refuge, The Aurora Street Study, and others.
11. There are a variety of metro districts that are active in the area surrounding DIA. Landowners should be reached out to after some progress is made on the study.
12. It was confirmed that the outcome of the study would not be a plan but recommendations or a frame work or framework for potential recommendations. This study has limited funding and time but are looking forward to it being a forum for regional conversation and hopefully it would lead to a series of recommendations for future cooperation.
13. Regarding potential names for the study, they suggested that one of the alternatives for the Airport Envisioning Study was not good. They asked about the Colorado Aerotropolis study. They mentioned it had been used in the past. They are not opposed to that and recognize it would be good for global marketing purposes. In the past, Colorado had been used by Tom Clark for an earlier DIA effort.
14. Regarding the boundary for the study, they suggested something on the order 10-25 miles away from the DIA boundary. A square or rectangle shape is appropriate. I-70 makes sense on the south. I-76 and US-85 makes sense on the west, etc. They did quite a bit of prior work for a variety of reasons regarding the area of influence around the airport, which of course leads to infrastructure concerns and needs. Bill Pool will send a summary of this area of influence.
15. The Front Range Airport is an area of opportunity. In the long term, it is good for real estate opportunities. Regarding space port, they have concerns that the operational impacts to DIA could be significant. However, the specific technology used for space operations might offer an ability to offer a space port there that does not impact DIA operations.
16. Dan said that he can request from John Kasarda permission to use a video for purposes of launching this Aerotropolis visioning workshop. He also suggested that Chris LeTourneur from MXD could also be a speaker and is very inspiring. But after some discussion, it might make sense to bring him in later on as the study progresses. Another person that came up as a potential speaker is Jeff Fagan from DFW. It was agreed that he would be a very good speaker.

17. DIA recognizes they are at the end of a “cul-de-sac” and this needs to change. They are looking forward to the east line. They see that as a game changer for passengers as well as real estate developments.
18. They also noted that there is a need to discuss and educate others about the change in operations of an airport regarding airline-based revenue. In the last few decades, there has been a move towards increasing non-airline revenue for competitive operation of an airport.
19. It was asked why Denver sought the grant and Dan Poremba didn't know but speculated it was to foster regional collaboration and to improve the development infrastructure around DIA.
20. DIA has needs for infrastructure including water and sewer is very important. They notice DIA is 20 years old and is needed to spend more and more money as this infrastructure ages, so that is a new aspect for DIA.
21. They are looking forward to the envisioning workshop, which will occur in early first week of May. It was recognized that there is a need to increase connectivity in the surrounding areas with this type of infrastructure. They recognize some projects will be catalysts and will help everyone work together to get these infrastructure needs met.





**COLORADO**

Department of  
Transportation

## Meeting Agenda

---

Project:	Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study
Subject:	One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—City of Commerce City
Date:	1:30 Tuesday, April 7, 2015
Location:	Commerce City Civic Center

---

1. Introductions
  2. Study Background / Grant
    - a. Collaboratively develop an overall vision for the infrastructure and development surrounding DIA to generate long-term economic growth
  3. Purpose of Meeting
    - a. On an individual agency basis, the study team desires to listen and understand your agency perspectives and needs before the kick-off of the study
  4. Study Schedule
  5. Proposed Committee Structure
    - a. Main stakeholders: Adams County, Aurora, Brighton, Commerce City, Denver
    - b. Small Steering committee composed of one representative each, either appointed or elected, from the main stakeholders
    - c. Larger Study Review Committee composed of main stakeholders and coordinating organizations
  6. Suggested Coordinating Organizations
    - a. Economic Development Corporations
    - b. RTD
    - c. DRCOG
    - d. Major landowners
    - e. DIA
    - f. Others?
-

7. Consideration of:
  - a. Study Name and Study Area
  - b. Study Vision Statement
  - c. Study Goals
  - d. Charter Agreement
8. Perspectives and Visions
  - a. What are your top three priorities regarding the northeast quadrant?
9. Draft Agenda Kick-off Visioning Workshop
  - a. Date:
10. Confirmation of Local Plans and Studies
11. Available GIS and other data
12. Roundtable
13. Next Steps and Action Items
  - a. Scenario Development Collaboration

## FINAL Meeting Notes

---

Project:	Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study
Subject:	One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—City of Commerce City
Date:	1:30 Tuesday, April 7, 2015
Location:	Commerce City Civic Center
Attendees:	Maria D’Andrea (CC); James Hayes (CC); Chris Cramer (CC); Steve Timms (CC); and Jay Hendrickson (CDOT); Chris Primus (HDR); Rick Pilgrim (HDR); Kip Cheroutes (LXC).

---

1. Introductions were made.
2. Jay Hendrickson described the background of the upcoming study and CDOT’s role to lead the study as a neutral party. He said the purpose of today’s meeting was to listen to the perspectives and visions of the County regarding this upcoming study. He further mentioned that due to terms of the grant, the study needs to be concluded by end of the calendar year.
3. It was agreed the proposed committee structure of a Steering Committee and a larger Study Review Committee (SRC) was appropriate.
  - a. Will the representatives on the Steering Committee be elected officials or senior staff? They could be either; it was suggested senior staff would allow the study to proceed efficiently.
  - b. Considering the list of major stakeholders, how will Denver and DIA be treated? At this point, it is expected they will be considered as separate entities, with Denver providing the representative to the Steering Committee.
4. It was agreed that the main stakeholders as identified on the agenda are appropriate. There was discussion of Bennett and how it relates with its growth boundary but was suggested agreed to be too far away. Watkins is unincorporated. It was agreed that the main stakeholders are appropriate.
5. CCC suggested that the small steering group should be composed of senior staff officials, as opposed to elected officials in the interest of time to move forward given the schedule. They suggested we reach out to each of the main stakeholders to suggest the staff level of representation (as opposed to elected official) and to ask each agency to identify their delegate.
6. Cooperating organizations:
  - a. The EDC is important and Chris Cramer will reach out to Commerce City’s Economic Development Corporation.
  - b. E-470 Authority
  - c. Fish & Wildlife Organizations.
  - d. Commerce City water and sanitation district. They mentioned that there is a meeting upcoming on April 22<sup>nd</sup> where this study could be mentioned.

- e. Denver Water.
  - f. Railroads either BN or UP but after some discussion, it was suggested that those are too far away.
7. Boundaries
- a. On the west: the refuge on the south and SH-2 for the western border further north.
  - b. Barr Lake and 136<sup>th</sup> as a northern boundary.
8. Name of study
- a. CCC embraces the term Aerotropolis
  - b. Recognize that Airport City is on-airport and this term is not favored.
  - c. Suggested that 'Northeast' as too closely aligned with the stock show and activities of northeast Denver itself, not the northeast metro area.
  - d. Corridor of Opportunity
9. CCC is looking forward to the economic analysis aspect of the study to demonstrate the benefits of further cooperation between communities to improve connections to the airport to improve the grid and further infrastructure improvements.
10. CCC suggested that we need to consider managed lanes. For example managed lanes are a potential on I-270 coming from US-36 down to I-70 and also E-470 itself. They suggested that the potential managed lane system be considered as part of the study.
- a. Has tolling hindered economic development? E-470 as an example, it's not clear whether that has fostered or hindered development because of the toll aspect of that highway. They suggested that would be a question for the study to investigate the impact of tolls on development.
11. A key transportation element is the Peña study that is being conducted by URS. That study needs to dovetail very closely with this study.
12. CDOT, as leader of this study, can help review the larger regional benefit of Peña. They suggested that the study help coordinate and summarize all ongoing studies.
13. DFW sets an example, but the study can start everyone thinking to aspire to be better than DFW and to accomplish more in the long run.
14. A recommendation from the study might include a regional authority perhaps with a funding ability. If there is a regional authority with funding ability, an area would need to be defined at that point in time.
15. Commerce City has a land use plan with various distributions of development types. The facts of an economic analysis of a cooperative development plan that demonstrates the absorption rates will be beneficial. Land use plans can be changed as necessary.
16. They have a concern that Commerce City will be stuck with "back of house" uses. CCC already has many parking lots, distribution warehouses, storage tanks, etc as opposed to a healthier mix of some of the higher end development such as hotels and convention centers. They noted that the Airport City development pods closest to



Commerce City were more warehouse uses as opposed to some of the higher end development.

17. Commerce City has a desire to help shape its image and this includes airport related development as a key way for them to help craft a new image for themselves as higher end developments occur in Commerce City. They realize that from a planning perspective, like-uses develop near each other, so Commerce City would like input on where these pods are placed.
18. It was noted that there is open space to the north of the airport that is owned by DIA and in Adams County. It is a corridor 3 miles long but because of its open space needs, there is no normal way for development along there to help pay for extending the infrastructure of roads and water and sewer and power. That is a natural inhibition to the development north of DIA.
19. As far as corridors go, Piccadilly Roadway and its water and sewer is a very important corridor. They identified that as important for regional collaboration. They know Aurora has also tagged Piccadilly as an important corridor. They have needs up at 75<sup>th</sup>. Another important corridor is 120<sup>th</sup> east and west.
20. CCC is looking forward to the study supporting collaboration. They noted that CCC does not have as much water and sewer as Denver or Aurora. CCC does not want to be a bedroom community but they would like a full mix of use types. They have Reunion which is primarily residential but now they need a mix of more jobs. As part of an overall Aerotropolis development, they would like a reasonable jobs and housing balance.
21. Commerce City will have the planning districts for water and sewer send data.





**COLORADO**

Department of  
Transportation

## Meeting Agenda

---

Project: **Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study**

---

Subject: **One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—Adams County**

---

Date: **9:00 Monday, April 6, 2015**

---

Location: **Adams County  
4430 S Adams County Parkway  
Brighton, CO 80603  
5th Floor Study Session Conference Room**

- 1. Introductions**
  - 2. Study Background / Grant**
    - a. Collaboratively develop an overall vision for the infrastructure and development surrounding DIA to generate long-term economic growth
  - 3. Purpose of Meeting**
    - a. On an individual agency basis, the study team desires to listen and understand your agency perspectives and needs before the kick-off of the study
  - 4. Study Schedule**
  - 5. Proposed Committee Structure**
    - a. Main stakeholders: Adams County, Aurora, Brighton, Commerce City, Denver
    - b. Small Steering committee composed of one representative each, either appointed or elected, from the main stakeholders
    - c. Larger Study Review Committee composed of main stakeholders and coordinating organizations
  - 6. Suggested Coordinating Organizations**
    - a. Economic Development Corporations
    - b. RTD
    - c. DRCOG
    - d. Major landowners
    - e. DIA
    - f. Others?
-

7. Consideration of:
  - a. Study Name Study Area
  - b. Study Vision Statement
  - c. Study Goals
  - d. Charter Agreement
8. Perspectives and Visions
  - a. What are your top three priorities regarding the northeast quadrant?
9. Draft Agenda Kick-off Visioning Workshop
  - a. Date:
10. Confirmation of Local Plans and Studies
11. Available GIS and other data
12. Roundtable
13. Next Steps and Action Items
  - a. Scenario Development Collaboration

## FINAL Meeting Notes

Project: Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study

Subject: One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—Adams County

Date: 9:00 Monday, April 6, 2015

Location: Adams County  
4430 S Adams County Parkway  
Brighton, CO 80603  
5th Floor Study Session Conference Room

Attendees: Kristin Sullivan (Adams Cnty); Jeff Maxwell (Adams Cnty); Todd Leopold (Adams Cnty); Ray Gonzales (Adams Cnty); Chris Primus (HDR); Rick Pilgrim (HDR); Jay Hendrickson (CDOT); Kip Cheroutes (LXC2).

1. Introductions were made.
2. Jay Hendrickson described the background of the upcoming study and CDOT's role to lead the study as a neutral party. He said the purpose of today's meeting was to listen to the perspectives and visions of the County regarding this upcoming study. He further mentioned that due to terms of the grant, the study needs to be concluded by end of the calendar year.
3. It was agreed the proposed committee structure of a Steering Committee and a larger Study Review Committee (SRC) was appropriate.
  - a. Will the representatives on the Steering Committee be elected officials or senior staff? They could be either; it was suggested senior staff would allow the study to proceed efficiently.
  - b. Considering the list of major stakeholders, how will Denver and DIA be treated? At this point, it is expected they will be considered as separate entities, with Denver providing the representative to the Steering Committee.
4. For the study review committee, other participants should include:
  - a. The Front Range Airport (FRA). Dave Ruppel is the contact. FRA is an enterprise authority as part of the county.
  - b. ACED Adams County Economic Development led by Barry Gore.
5. Regarding the title of the study, it should convey that its focus is beyond the airport borders somehow. Colorado would be acceptable as part of the title name. The title could include 'Northeast Corridor', as a suggestion. Chris Primus asked for them to give further thought and respond with comments if they have any more.
6. Regarding the geographic scope of the study, first thoughts were that I-76 on the west; east of the Front Range Airport; and I-70 on the south. It was suggested that Bennett was too far away so the study area should not go that far.

7. Kristin Sullivan said that there were many studies that have occurred regarding DIA since the 1980's. The most prominent one was the Airport Environs. She will send an Adams County presentation that summarized and listed many of these studies. This presentation was developed in 2013. Adams County has several of these past studies, but not all. They will send the ones that they have to the study team.
8. Their perspective of the Front Range Airport is that it is not a competing facility but a complementary facility to DIA. They noted that it has its own wastewater treatment plant that has additional capacity and that might be an advantage for the infrastructure needs until the long term growth of the municipal utilities takes place.
9. Adams County, looking back at the past studies, has been concerned that DIA was myopic regarding its impacts to the surrounding area. Adams County is looking forward to the more regional approach of this study. The study should be multimodal including future rail consideration.
10. Kristin is really interested in the economic analysis aspect of the scope of our study. She inquired about our specific plans; we will be developing a variety of broad scale scenarios to compare and contrast. An economic model would be developed to demonstrate the coverage and absorption rates and to see if it would be reasonable to attract more development than the current DRCOG regional control totals.
11. There was a question about the planning horizon and it was suggested that 5-10 years to plan for capital improvement projects would be appropriate. They realized that the development on the south will occur first, then areas near Commerce City, and then development east of DIA will occur later.
12. The spaceport concept should be assumed as a potential development in the future. They are continuing their spaceport application process with the federal government. They don't expect to have a license by the calendar year end, but they do expect some milestones to be achieved regarding their submittal to the FAA. Adams County sees it as revenue diversification and an important complementary facility to the support the continued growth of the robust aerospace industry throughout Colorado: the metro area has all kinds of aerospace activity as it is and this would further the aerospace opportunities. They suggested the area near the Front Range Airport could eventually become a new DTC or Interlocken type high end development with a focus on research, development, testing, and training.
13. The Front Range Airport is underutilized which is one reason that the County pursued a spaceport license. Spaceport is a real long term 50-60 years out visioning investment. There are potential space technologies that could use the Front Range Airport facility and not interfere with plane operations at DIA. If indeed this space technology is successful, then a city such as Tokyo could be 2.5 hours away from the Colorado Front Range. The County has multiple studies regarding spaceport: business plan, environmental assessment, conceptual layout and they will share those studies with the study team.
14. It was asked if the study would address development and infrastructure within DIA; the answer was yes but the focus was on outside the boundary of DIA. It was asked if any additional entrances to DIA would be considered and studied in this process. The Adams County staff suggested that several cities might want new accesses, realizing that that will drive economic development. The Jackson Gap entrance into the

Porteos development on the south of DIA is already underway. Additional entrances on north and east side of DIA might be considered.

15. Among issues and concerns, the ongoing concern has been that agreements have not been honored in the past by all the parties. The economic activity surrounding DIA has not yet been realized to its full potential. However, they are interested in focusing on good planning to prepare for the growth that will come to this part of the region.
16. When DIA was developed, it was purposely developed with a lot of land, as an extreme case opposite than Stapleton, to remove any noise conflicts with residential areas. As time has gone on DIA has realized that there is so much property on the airport itself that is available for development. This has caused a significant disconnect from the original IGA with Adams County when the DIA land was annexed by Denver. However, they also realize that the economics of the airline industry has changed and that sources of non-airline revenue are extremely important now for airport operations.
17. Adams County and its residents remain concerned about planes and the noise impacts approaching DIA. They realized that there is a long history including litigation related to noise impacts. They feel that there is more awareness now and that plans and development can move on with noise treated properly.
18. Reunion, Highpoint, and Green Valley have long term potential for commercial, industrial and office activity. They have had concerns in the past where Denver moves to capture new opportunities. The original IGA is very specific regarding its language on hotel development. There is a specified ratio of hotel rooms. The County has expected more hotels surrounding the airport but it hasn't happened yet.
19. The infrastructure is an important part. Water and sewer infrastructure takes a long time to develop. It is coming to the south, but both north and south need additional infrastructure.
20. Peña Boulevard has aviation and non-aviation uses. There have been lots of discussions and studies on this issue. Denver has taken a position that other surrounding cities should pay portion of maintenance and capital costs for Peña in order for DIA to stay in compliance with the FAA. However, there is aviation traffic on Adams County, Aurora, and Commerce City roads surrounding the airport and no similar model for compensation.
21. The morning of May 6<sup>th</sup> would be a good date for the Visioning Workshop but this is pending discussion with other stakeholders. They said they had a lot of GIS data including noise, comp plans, transportation plans, spaceport plans, and potentially including some of the municipal data and that their GIS staff should directly communicate with our team's GIS staff.
22. The IGA mediation talks have been going on about 2 years. Despite this, they have good relations with staff at other agencies. They see this study as a great opportunity to do something jointly. A collaborative process will be a positive visioning approach. Adams County has grown 60% since the 1980's and are projected to continue to grow. They support the regional economic development approach of Tom Clark at the MDEDC where we market the metro region first and share opportunities that come to the front range as a whole.





## Meeting Agenda

---

Project: Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study

---

Subject: One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—City of Aurora

---

Date: Friday, April 3, 2015

---

Location: Mt. Bierstadt Conference Room, City Manager's Office (5th floor):  
City of Aurora  
15151 E. Alameda Parkway  
Aurora, CO 80012

1. Introductions
2. Study Background / Grant
  - a. Collaboratively develop an overall vision for the infrastructure and development surrounding DIA to generate long-term economic growth
3. Purpose of Meeting
  - a. On an individual agency basis, the study team desires to listen and understand your agency perspectives and needs before the kick-off of the study
4. Study Schedule
5. Proposed Committee Structure
  - a. Main stakeholders: Adams County, Aurora, Brighton, Commerce City, Denver
  - b. Small Steering committee composed of one representative each, either appointed or elected, from the main stakeholders
  - c. Larger Study Review Committee composed of main stakeholders and coordinating organizations
6. Suggested Coordinating Organizations
  - a. Economic Development Corporations
  - b. RTD
  - c. DRCOG
  - d. Major landowners
  - e. DIA
7. Others?
8. Consideration of:
  - a. Study Name Study Area
  - b. Study Vision Statement
  - c. Study Goals

- d. Charter Agreement
- 9. Perspectives and Visions
  - a. What are your top three priorities regarding the northeast quadrant?
- 10. Draft Agenda Kick-off Visioning Workshop
  - a. Date:
- 11. Confirmation of Local Plans and Studies
- 12. Available GIS and other data
- 13. Roundtable
- 14. Next Steps and Action Items
  - a. Scenario Development Collaboration

## FINAL Meeting Notes

---

Project:	Northeast Quadrant Visioning Aerotropolis Study
Subject:	One-on-One Agency Coordination Meeting—City of Aurora
Date:	Friday, April 3, 2015
Location:	Mt. Bierstadt Conference Room, City Manager's Office (5th floor): City of Aurora 15151 E. Alameda Parkway Aurora, CO 80012
Attendees:	Skip Noe (Aurora); Bob Watkins (Aurora); Jim Sayre (Aurora); Jay Hendrickson (CDOT); Chris Primus (HDR); Rick Pilgrim (HDR); and Kip Cheroutes (LXC)

---

1. Introductions were made.
2. Jay Hendrickson described the background of the upcoming study and CDOT's role to lead the study as a neutral party. He said the purpose of today's meeting was to listen to the perspectives and visions of the County regarding this upcoming study. He further mentioned that due to terms of the grant, the study needs to be concluded by end of the calendar year.
3. It was agreed the proposed committee structure of a Steering Committee and a larger Study Review Committee (SRC) was appropriate.
  - a. For the steering committee, they requested that a staff person be an option instead of necessarily an elected official.
  - b. For the SRC,
    - i. The E-470 Authority should be a coordinating agency
    - ii. EDCs are important participants and noted that EDCs focus on the primary industries.
    - iii. North Metro Chamber would be an appropriate participating agency as well.
    - iv. Homebuilders Association is also a possibility
    - v. Aurora Economic Development Corporation
    - vi. In addition, Aurora suggested that we talk to the FAA.
4. Regarding the title of the study, the "airport development study" is too innocuous. The term "Aerotropolis" has been identified too much with Mayor Hancock of the City and County of Denver. "Airport Area" would be a good term. The "Northeast Area" would be ok. The term "Development" in the title would be appropriate.
5. Aurora has made a tremendous amount of effort in planning and serving the airport, but it has been a challenge. Development around the airport in practical terms has not

occurred. The Airport City initiative represented a step backward. There are people that have strong memories of when the Adams County land was annexed into Denver. Aurora is ready and willing to move on but people must be cognizant of these past memories.

6. There was no regional collaboration that identified a need for a new study. This Aerotropolis study came to them out of the blue.
7. Aurora has just recently conducted a study that has identified priorities. Among those are Harvest, Piccadilly, 48<sup>th</sup>, and 64<sup>th</sup>. The cost of interchanges is a big challenge but they are a necessary link to DIA and are a high priority for Aurora. If this study could help identify progress for additional interchanges in I-70 that would be very helpful.
8. Aurora doesn't have a way to pay for interchanges at this point in time. Fees or GIDs are needed but development is south of I-70 but the needs are focused on the north side of I-70. Also, oil & gas can potentially help with revenue. The study had BBC (the financial firm) and identified funding options. Those are largely tried and true methods. But these and other funding issues need to be addressed.
9. A really important need is a second route into DIA. This would be through the Harvest Road / Jackson Gap Road. They noted though that this corridor needs an I-70 interchange.
10. Utilities are a big issue. Aurora City Water should have input to this study. Well and septic flows will eventually be converted to sewer systems. Now it is pumped south. Water and well plans will need to be developed and this would be a good basis for cooperation. Cliff Stevens is the contact at the Aurora Department of Water. They also suggested that Xcel be contacted. The power needs are challenging because of the distance that needs to be traversed.
11. How Front Range Airport gets connected is an important topic for the study to address. Aurora City boundaries will eventually surround the Front Range Airport.
12. Aurora and none of the other neighboring jurisdictions will give up their land use authority, but recognize that this study will have a larger umbrella than specific land use plans. Coordinating for infrastructure improvements is sensible and hope that this study can further that.
13. The study could define a better structure for how DIA works with its neighbors. DIA has more of a focus on development and infrastructure within its borders in contrast to a focus on outside of the DIA boundary.
14. There are potential gateways on the south. The Porteras developer has tried to obtain an airport gateway. But the process for gaining permissions to access the airport takes years. There is always a new hurdle or hoop to jump through including the FAA, DIA, the TSA, and others. This results in a very unclear process and developers need to have expectations upfront. It would be very helpful if DIA could chart out a clear path on how a gateway is established. This would be an inter-jurisdictional process. To conclude, DIA should promote this process and it will foster development and cooperation.
15. They noted there is a large development occurring south of Watkins that has been approved recently by Arapahoe County. It is called Prospect. They noted that the City

of Aurora opposed this development but Arapahoe County Commissioners have approved it.

16. It was recognized that we can learn lessons from DFW and other airports and development around them. However, DFW was jointly owned between the two major cities and is governed by a board, unlike DIA.
17. Aurora is glad to help and will provide any data that they have that is relevant for our study. They will facilitate coordination with their water department and of course participate in and attend all meetings. If this study could further the ability to advance funding capabilities for infrastructure improvements, then participation in this study is worth Aurora's time. This study might produce a new ethos of cooperation for getting some of these infrastructure improvements accomplished.
18. Aurora is a city of 350,000 population. Most people in the region don't appreciate its size. It would be a really positive outcome of the study to articulate the benefits of cooperation.
19. Jim will send the final update for 2016 to the Comprehensive Plan. The Infrastructure Phasing Plan is available. Land Use planning is done and that is available. Aurora will provide a contact for their GIS group. They will be very involved with providing any readily available data as needed.





---

**Subject:** Northeast Quadrant Aerotropolis Meeting  
Initial Agency Coordination

---

**Meeting Date:** February 6, 2015  
1:30 PM

---

**Meeting Location:** CDOT Metro Conference Room  
2000 S. Holly Street  
Conference Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831  
Passcode: 406221#  
POC Breena Alderete 720.865.9015

---

1. Introductions
2. Purpose of Meeting
3. Intention of Grant
4. CDOT's Role
  - a. HDR Introduction
5. Multi-jurisdictional Steering Committee with Equal Representation
  - a. Role of Agencies in the study
6. Public Discussion of Study Given Confidential IGA Negotiations
7. Land Use Planning Outside of Denver's Boundaries
8. Roundtable Discussion - possible discussion questions:
  - a. What is the purpose of the grant?
  - b. How will the grant be discussed publicly, if at all, particularly while confidential IGA negotiations are underway?
  - c. Is this just an effort by Denver to engage in land-use planning outside of its boundaries?
  - d. Could we establish a multi-jurisdictional steering committee to provide direction to CDOT and the consultant?
9. Schedule
10. Input on HDR's Scope
11. Next Steps



# FINAL Meeting Notes

Project: **CCD Aerotropolis Study**

Subject: Initial Agency Coordination Meeting

Date: February 6, 2015

Location:

Attendees:

Distribution Attendees, File

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

### 1. Introductions.

- Self-introductions were made.
- Jay Hendrickson welcomed everyone and introduced Evan Dreyer from the City and County of Denver (CCD).

### 2. Purpose of Meeting

- Evan Dreyer stated that this meeting was a follow-up to phone conversations that he has held with elected officials from each of the jurisdictions invited to this meeting today. He stated that this meeting was a preliminary conversation about the upcoming FHWA grant study. CCD received the grant for an aerotropolis study a couple of years ago, and its funds need to be expended soon. For a variety of reasons, the initiation of the study has been delayed, but now is a good time for launching the study. CCD recognized that it would be appropriate if a third neutral party would run the grant study, and CDOT has agreed to that role.
- Jay reiterated that CDOT is looking forward to move forward with the study, and will be reaching out to all the jurisdictions in an equitable manner through the course of the study. The grant has been amended to have CDOT as its executor.

### 3. Intention of Grant

- Dan Poremba from DIA briefly described the intention of the grant. The object is to perform a comprehensive land use and transportation aerotropolis study, as a regional effort engaging all the jurisdictions around DIA. This grant is intended to build a jurisdictional collaboration process to understand the range of advantages and requirements for developing the area around DIA to everyone's benefit. DIA has no pre-conceived notions on the dialogue regarding the forthcoming planning effort.

### 4. CDOT's Role

- Tony DeVito stated the timing of this comes at an exciting period. After conclusion of the recent 4-P planning process with the jurisdictional partners, it is clear that this is a quadrant of the metro area that is poised for high growth potential. CDOT is excited to be proactive in work with all the jurisdictions to define the transportation infrastructure in this area. CDOT is here to listen and collaborate with all of the local jurisdictions.



- Mike Cheroutes said that HPTE is focused on the key concept of a regional managed lane network. This provides improved reliability for the system as a whole. I-70 East is planned now to have a managed lane to I-225; and its expansion to the east could be part of the regional managed lane network. For this study, he welcomes the opportunity to consider potential projects and priorities.
- Jay stated that CDOT's role was to administer the grant in a fair, impartial, and transparent manner as a neutral third party. He is looking to receive input from all parties and return the best value for the grant and to develop a regional vision beneficial to all.
- Jay introduced Rick Pilgrim and Chris Primus of HDR, the consultant that CDOT will be retaining to conduct the study.

#### 5. Multi-Jurisdictional Steering Committee

- Evan said that during his conversations with the jurisdictions, it was suggested that a stakeholder steering committee be established that is structured so that all parties have an equal voice.
  - Steve Hogan suggested that a smaller committee is better than a larger committee. Tony agreed, given past experience on other corridors, streamlining the committee size is better. Sometimes having members and associate members can make the committee large and cumbersome.
  - Jose Cornejo asked how technical information would be efficiently provided to the committee for decision-making. It was suggested that at periodic milestones, relevant technical information would be conveyed to the steering committee.
  - Dan asked if each jurisdiction would have two, or three people assigned. This will be determined after others provide input on the committee structure.
  - It was suggested that an alternate representative be designated and empowered to enable the study to progress on a reasonable schedule.
  - Jim Hayes asked if the steering committee would be composed of elected or technical representatives.
  - Steve Hogan replied that his understanding of this grant study would not result in a specific plan that needed elected officials to provide decisions, but rather a process that would identify what is needed in the area, with potential timeframes of improvements under a recommended set of planning assumptions. So the committee needed to be technical staff representatives as opposed to decision-making elected officials.
  - It was noted that the surrounding jurisdictions already have prepared plans for their respective areas (the area within CCD might be the sole exception to this), and have done so in coordination with Adams County and so as a result major conflicts are already minimized. There is no desire of these local jurisdictions to change their plans. If CCD has thoughts on major impacts to these existing plans, this should be settled under some other process – not this study. Jay said that this study will focus on

major concepts, and will identify on what might be needed. Outreach will be a key part to understand the jurisdictional visions, and move forward accordingly.

- Dan Poremba submitted that the reality for this effort is the need to identify where infrastructure and community plans work together, and where they don't work together. This actually should be a key focus of this study: to gather and analyze background-planning information from all of the jurisdictions; knit these together, and develop findings and recommendations. This type of effort is pragmatic, given the time and resources available.
- For these reasons, it was suggested the steering committee be technical rather than composed of elected officials. It was suggested that perhaps a two-tiered structure might be appropriate, with a periodic meetings to inform elected officials of project milestones; and more regular meetings of technical staff. The elected officials could provide parameters and guidance for the study at the outset of the meeting.

#### 6. Public Discussion of Study Given IGA Negotiations

- Jay noted that there is an important mediation effort underway among many of the jurisdictions regarding the IGA. Evan said that from his perspective, the mediation is relevant but can be disconnected from the study. The area will continue to develop and grow, the infrastructure needs will not go away. This study will be beneficial for the jurisdictions regardless of the specific outcomes of the mediation. Steve Hogan agreed.
- Regarding public discussion of this study, Evan suggested that all media conversations be directed through CDOT; that individual jurisdictions not engage the media on this study as a topic. Steve Hogan agreed. Steve also suggested that at the initial kick-off meeting of this study, that all the jurisdictional PR persons be invited, so that they can understand the nuances of the sensitivity of this topic.

#### 7. Schedule

- Chris Primus stated that the grant funds need to be expended by the end of the calendar year, with a possible two-month extension.

#### 8. Input to HDR's Scope

- Jay asked for input to the HDR scope, by end of next week February 13, 2015.
  - Chris Primus reminded the group that the scope is a draft, pending input from this group. As mentioned earlier, the scope envisions extensive coordination and collaboration with the jurisdictions; the technical work will be conceptual at the '30,000'-foot level. The draft scope has identified potential stakeholders that should be reviewed by the participants today. The draft scope also outlines a potential committee structure, that after today's discussion and further input will need to be modified.
  - Dan Poremba suggested that per earlier discussion today, the scope be repositioned from resulting in an end product of 'plan', to more a summary of the collaborative findings and recommendations with an identification of next steps.
  - Tony suggested that step 15 of the scope could be the logical end-point of the study.

- Leslie said the focus should be more on the needed transportation infrastructure, rather than the land use planning. The development will follow naturally as these infrastructure investments are made.
- Jim Hayes supported the importance of the study including an identification of potential implementation funding strategies.
- Dan Poremba suggested a prioritization of regional infrastructure needs could be a beneficial and useful outcome of the study.

## 9. Roundtable Discussion

- Leslie Thomas asked about the ongoing Pena Boulevard Study. Dan Poremba stated that it is in the stage of identifying alternatives, and no detailed comparative analysis has begun yet. He suggested that the Pena study be well coordinated with this study, as this study will be more regional in nature than the corridor study, and it would be good to add the regional perspective to the Pena Boulevard study.
- Jose emphasized the importance of the analysis of existing jurisdictional plans and the coordination challenges and opportunities, rather than only a compilation of studies. Steve Hogan agreed that the evaluation needs to assemble and assess the multi-jurisdictional plans, and recommend strategic planning accordingly. It was agreed that the scope language needs to be strengthened to clarify the task.

## 10. Next Steps

- Jay said the focus is to finalize the HDR scope to get a task order processed for HDR.
  - He asked for input on the HDR scope by February 13, 2015 – one week from today's meeting.
  - Lesley Thomas recognized that the steering committee structure is an important and early decision, and would this group get back together? Steve Hogan suggested that the group respond to a proposal, rather than an open-ended discussion. CDOT and HDR will prepare a proposal for the steering committee structure, after input and careful consideration. Jay suggested this group might be reconvened via conference call to discuss and finalize the committee proposal structure.
  - Leslie asked if a high level conceptual schedule was available, to indicate the projected flow of the study associated with the draft scope. Chris Primus affirmed that a draft schedule has been prepared, and Jay stated that he would send it to the meeting participants.
  - Steve Hogan identified the need to determine the appropriate set of jurisdictions that will form the steering committee.
  - Jay also asked each jurisdiction to identify the appropriate technical people who should be appointed to participate in this study.
  - Tony recommended that this group and the elected officials meet collectively with the new CDOT executive director, to apprise him of the direction and intent of the study. All participants supported this proposal.

Sigh in

NE Quadrant Aerotropolis Meeting

February 6, 2015

Name	Agency	Phone	Email
Jay Henderson	CDOT	3/512-5991	DUANE.HENDERSON@STATE.CO.US
JOSE CORNEJO	CCD	720.865.8712	Jose.Cornejo@denvergov.org
Lesley Thomas	CCDPW	720.865.8719	lesley.thomas@denvergov.org
Patrick Houlahan	CDOT	720 839 6465	Patrick.houlahan@state.co.us
JAMES HAYES	CITY OF COMM. CITY	303-289-3619	JHAYES@C3GOV.COM
Tom Bickensader	DIA	(303)342-2402	Tom.Bickensader@flydenver.com

Name	Agency	Phone	Email
Tony DeVito	CDOT RI	303-757-9459	anthony.devito@state.co.us
EVAN DREYER	Denver Mayor's office	720-350-8370	Evan.dreyer@denvergov.org
Chris Pilatus	HDR	303 323 9838	christopher.pilatus@hdrinc.com
Dan Poremba	DIA	303.621.5524	dan.poremba@flydenver.com
BILL POOLE	DIA	303.942.4518	bill.poole@flydenver.com

On Phone:

Steve Hagan	A-rora
Mike Cherantes	HPTE
Rick Pilgrim	HDR
Kim Day	DIA
Tykus Hallaway	CCD
Todd Leopold	Adams Co