

**Jefferson Parkway Public Highway Authority**  
**Regular Board Meeting Agenda**  
**Thursday, October 18, 2018**  
**Arvada City Hall**  
**8101 Ralston Road, Arvada, CO 80002**



**Executive Session**  
**3:00 p.m.**  
**Council Conference Room, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor**

Executive session, pursuant to C.R.S., Section 24-6-402(4)(a), Section 24-6-402(4)(b) and Section 24-6-402(4)(e) for the purposes of discussing real property matters, receiving legal advice on specific legal questions and determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations and instructing negotiators related to FAA matters, right-of-way agreements, potential concession matters and professional services agreements.

**Regular Board Meeting immediately following Executive Session**  
**Council Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Approval of Minutes
  - A. September 20, 2018 Regular Board Meeting
- IV. Consent Items
- V. Report from Executive Director
  - A. Transmittal of Proposed 2019 JPPHA Budget
  - B. Motion to set public hearing on proposed 2019 JPPHA Budget: December 20, 2018
- VI. Report of the General Counsel
- VII. New Business
  - A. Resolution 18-02, A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Jefferson Parkway Public Highway Authority Approving Acquisition or Condemnation of Certain Property
- VIII. Report from the Board of Directors

- IX. Informational Items
  - A. JPAC September 20, 2018 Meeting Summary
- X. Public Comment
- XI. Adjournment

# Jefferson Parkway Public Highway Authority Regular Board Meeting Minutes



Thursday, September 20, 2018  
Arvada City Hall  
8101 Ralston Road, Arvada, CO 80002

## Executive Session 3:00 p.m. Council Conference Room, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Tamara Seaver requested matters for discussion that required an Executive Session, pursuant to C.R.S., Section 24-6-402(4)(a), Section 24-6-402(4)(b) and Section 24-6-402(4)(e) for the purposes of discussing real property matters, receiving legal advice on specific legal questions and determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations and instructing negotiators related to FAA matters, right-of-way agreements, potential concession matters and professional services agreements.

Director Williams made a motion to go into Executive Session for the purposes stated above. Director Beacom seconded the motion.

The following votes were cast on the Motion:  
Those voting Yes: Beacom, Szabo, Williams  
Absent: Ahrens, Jones

Chairman Jones joined the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

## Regular Board Meeting immediately following Executive Session Council Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

### Call to Order:

Chairman David Jones called the meeting of the Jefferson Parkway Public Highway Authority (JPPHA) to order at 3:35 p.m. Present were Director David Beacom, Vice-Chair Libby Szabo and Director Marc Williams. Also in attendance was Lorraine Anderson, RTD Representative; Bill Ray, Exec. Director; Tamara Seaver, JPPHA Counsel; Kevin Standbridge, Broomfield Deputy City and County Manager; Chris Daly, Arvada Counsel; and Steve Durian, Jeffco Transportation and Engineer Director

Jefferson Parkway Public Highway Authority  
Board Meeting Minutes  
September 20, 2018

Director Williams moved to excuse Director Randy Ahrens.

The following votes were cast on the Motion:

Those voting Yes: Beacom, Jones, Szabo, Williams

Absent: Ahrens

**Pledge of Allegiance**

**Approval of Minutes:**

Director Szabo made a motion to approve the August 16, 2018 board meeting minutes as presented. Director Williams seconded the motion.

The following votes were cast on the Motion:

Those voting Yes: Beacom, Jones, Szabo, Williams

Absent: Ahrens

**Consent Items – None**

**Report from Executive Director:**

- A. Status of Access Permits to SH 128, North Terminus of Parkway to be Relocated Outside the Airport RPZ
- B. Release of Request for Qualifications
- C. Budget Discussion – 2018 Estimated Year End and 2019 Calendar

Mr. Bill Ray reviewed the status of the SH128 Access Permit. He said he has met with CDOT and that all matters regarding the construction and cost sharing will be managed through the notice to proceed for the access permit.

Mr. Ray said that the Request for Qualifications was issued on September 7 and that responses are due back on December 6. He said responders submitted contact information for their team and that significantly more than one was received.

Mr. Ray referred to a spreadsheet showing expenditures year to date for 2018 and estimated year end expenses, showing a positive balance. He reminded the Board that both a preliminary

Jefferson Parkway Public Highway Authority  
Board Meeting Minutes  
September 20, 2018

budget and budget message are required to be submitted to the governing body by October 15 and that he will give the Board an update at their October meeting. Mr. Ray said budget adoption will be scheduled for the December 20 Board meeting.

**Report from the General Counsel**

- A. Amendment to Reimbursement Agreements

Tamara Seaver said she will be making amendments to the reimbursement agreements dealing with payment for right of way and that these will come before the Board for consideration.

**New Business - None**

**Report from the Board of Directors - None**

**Public Comment - None**

**Informational Items:**

- A. JPAC July 19, 2018 Meeting Summary
- B. JPAC August 16, 2018 Meeting Summary and Recommendations

Mr. Ray said the advisory committee will be making their recommendations to the Board, along with ideas as to how they can be involved as we move forward.

**Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

---

David Jones, Chair

---

Christine Koch  
Recording Secretary

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE JEFFERSON PARKWAY  
PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY APPROVING ACQUISITION OR  
CONDEMNATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY**

**Resolution 18-02**

**WHEREAS**, the Jefferson Parkway Public Highway Authority (“Authority”) was created pursuant to the Public Highway Authority Law, Sections 43-4-501, *et seq.*, C.R.S., to finance, construct, operate, and maintain the Jefferson Parkway Public Highway; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Directors of the Authority is empowered to acquire real and personal property pursuant to Section 43-4-506(1)(g), C.R.S., including through the exercise of eminent domain pursuant to Section 43-4-506(1)(h), C.R.S., and to authorize its designees to act on its behalf, and is specifically empowered to undertake the acquisition of the real property hereinafter described; and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with Section 43-4-506(1)(f), C.R.S., the Authority was created to finance, construct, operate and maintain the Jefferson Parkway and all related improvements and appurtenances; and

**WHEREAS**, acquiring the real property hereinafter described is necessary to allow the Authority to construct, operate and maintain the Jefferson Parkway which is of significant public benefit to the Denver Metropolitan Region; and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority, by and through its Board of Directors, has determined there is a public use and purpose for the acquisition of a fee simple interest in the real property described in **Exhibit A**, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference (the interest sought by the Authority shall be referred to as the “Property”); and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority, by and through its Board of Directors, or its designee, shall have the authority to amend (enlarge, decrease or change) the legal description of the Property and the nature of the interest to be acquired, as it deems necessary in the best interest of the public purposes; and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority, by and through its Board of Directors, has determined that negotiation services on behalf of the Authority may be necessary in conducting good faith negotiations for the acquisition of the Property; and

**WHEREAS**, the Authority, by and through its Board of Directors, has determined that if the Property cannot be otherwise acquired in a timely manner, the exercise of the Authority’s powers of eminent domain to obtain immediate possession of and to acquire title to the Property is necessary and required for the public health, safety, and welfare of the Denver Metropolitan region.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE JEFFERSON PARKWAY PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Authority, by and through its Board of Directors, has determined that it is necessary to acquire the Property as described in **Exhibit A**, by negotiation if possible, or using the power of eminent domain if necessary, and to seek immediate possession of the Property if necessary.

Section 2. The Authority, by and through its Board of Directors, finds, determines and affirms there is a public need and necessity to acquire the Property for the construction, financing, operation and maintenance of the Jefferson Parkway and all related improvements and appurtenances, all of which constitute, and are in furtherance of, a public use of the Property by the Authority.

Section 3. The Authority's staff, consultants, or other agents are authorized to take necessary and appropriate action to acquire fee simple title to the Property, including, without limitation, conducting good faith negotiations or securing negotiation services for or on behalf of the Authority, for the acquisition and, if necessary, condemnation of the Property.

Section 4. The Authority's staff is authorized to employ all necessary persons for this purpose, including legal counsel, special condemnation counsel, if necessary, and appraisers, surveyors, engineers, and other experts.

Section 5. The Authority's legal counsel is authorized and directed to take all necessary legal measures, including retaining special condemnation counsel, to acquire the Property. The Authority's legal counsel and/or special condemnation counsel is specifically authorized to request immediate possession of the Property.

Section 6. The Authority's executive director and/or the Authority's engineer are hereby authorized to amend (enlarge, decrease, change) or clarify the legal descriptions of the Property to be acquired or the nature of the interests to be acquired, as deemed necessary, and any such amendments or clarifications shall be included in the definition of Property contained herein.

Section 7. Any contract for acquisition of the Property which results from negotiations shall be separately presented to and approved by the Board of Directors.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

ADOPTED AND APPROVED THIS \_\_\_\_ DAY OF OCTOBER 2018.

**JEFFERSON PARKWAY  
PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY**

\_\_\_\_\_  
By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Its: \_\_\_\_\_

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Its: \_\_\_\_\_



**EXHIBIT "A"**

Lot 1A, Rocky Flats Industrial District Filing No. 1 Adjustment 1

Reconfiguration of Lot 1 and a Portion of Lot 2 of Rocky Flats Industrial District Filing No. 1, Located in the South Half of Section 23, T2S, R70W of the 6<sup>th</sup> P.M., County Of Jefferson, State of Colorado, Comprising 2.48 Acres more or less.

Reception No.: 2017074330

Date: 07-19-2017

**Jefferson Parkway Advisory Committee (JPAC)**  
**September 20, 2018**  
**Apex Field House**  
**Meeting Summary – FINAL**

**ATTENDANCE**

*Participants:* Bini Abbott, Rebecca Kallio, Vera Ladtkow, Britta Nelson, Ian Owens, Bill Ray, Brent Smith, Jill-Ellyn Straus, Jerry Taylor, Brett Vernon

*Facilitation:* Heather Bergman and Sam Haas

**ACTION ITEMS**

<b>Peak Facilitation Group</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Send the link to the request for qualifications.</li> <li>• Send Judge Brimmer’s decision.</li> <li>• Send a Doodle for the October meeting.</li> </ul>
<b>Anyone who wrote a recommendation</b>	Consider whether they want to leave their recommendation as-is, rewrite it, or withdraw it.

**UPDATE ON THE JEFFERSON PARKWAY PUBLIC HIGHWAY AUTHORITY (JPPHA) BOARD MEETING**

Bill Ray provided an update on the JPPHA Board meeting.

- The request for proposals (RFQ) to design, build, finance, operate, and maintain the Jefferson Parkway project was released to the public on September 7. That document is available on the website in the “procurement” tab. September 18 was the deadline for the contractors planning to submit a proposal to identify a single point of contact. The JPPHA Board has received a number of submissions.
- If JPPHA received enough qualified respondents to the RFQ, the Board would shortlist no more than three respondents. That selection process will take place between December 6, 2018 (when responses are due) and December 20, 2018. Then a request for proposals (RFP) will be released. Each respondent may spend \$5 million developing their response. It will take approximately eight months for the JPPHA to evaluate those submissions. If there is a clear winner, JPPHA will negotiate a concession agreement that will close approximately a year from today and will reach financial close by the end of 2019.
- Working with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has been challenging, so the JPPHA Board has suggested that a different alternative that serves the purpose should be explored. Bill Ray has approached the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and discussed shifting the north end of the Parkway from where it was going to be (across from Interlocken) half a mile to the west. CDOT has agreed to this realignment. JPPHA will modify their access permits to allow for this change. It would be possible to add lanes onto State Highway 128 to accommodate traffic, and CDOT has agreed with that approach.

## Clarifying Questions

Participants asked clarifying questions about the update on the JPPHA Board meeting. Questions are indicated in italics, followed by the response.

*Is the current Simms Street going to be closed?*

Simms Street will be relocated, and the current location of Simms Street will become a cul-de-sac to serve the airport.

*Is Broomfield still going to build an extension through Interlocken to Highway 128?*

That is the decision of the Northwest Parkway and the concessionaire. There was a conceptual design for an extension six years ago, and it was going to cost \$150 million to extend the road by two miles.

## DOTTING PRIORITIZATION EXERCISE

JPAC members used colored dots to prioritize their recommendations. The dotting exercise is intended to provide data and help the JPAC decide how to proceed with their discussions; the dots do not indicate a decision. JPAC members were provided red, yellow, and green dots and placed one colored dot on each recommendation to indicate their level of support. Green dots signified full support, yellow dots signified questions or concerns, and red dots signified no support. Bill Ray offered to provide recommendation-specific feedback, and the group agreed to listen to Bill's input after they completed the dotting exercise.

Recommendation	Number of Green Dots	Number of Yellow Dots	Number of Red Dots
#1: Adopt the mitigation measures from the 2008 Northwest Corridor Transportation Study Environmental Impact Analysis.	11	0	0
#2: State in the RFP that all NEPA-like standards be followed for the environmental review process.	8	3	
#3: Install air monitoring equipment down-wind of construction to monitor airborne contamination. Accompany this with a public comment period.	7	4	0
#4: Require independent testing for plutonium and other contaminants before surface-disturbing activities on Indiana Corridor and require public posting of results. If contaminant levels exceed CDPHE's standards, pause construction and follow mitigation measures, then resample.	7	2	2
#5: Sponsor independent review of all past studies of soil contamination and public health impacts.	3	2	6
#6: Require dust control and mitigation during construction and follow the Clean Air Act air pollution	11	0	0

control measures required under Colorado's State Implementation Plan.			
#7: JPPHA should seek to open the records of the Special Grand Jury 89-2.	2	0	9
#8: Include bike/walk paths in the design to allow pedestrian use across the Parkway, and eventually like these paths to other trails.	8	3	0
#9: Create multi-modal options along proposed access road by Leyden Rock during phase one of construction that connects to all trailheads.	7	4	0
#10: Offer a subscription for bike access to the new bike route.	1	3	7
#11: Carefully consider the site and design of the Greenway Trail.	9	2	0
#12: Take mitigation measures to insulate Leyden Rock from negative impacts of construction and prevent the highway from dividing the community and keep residents safe.	9	1	0
#13: Do not build sound walls near Leyden Rock.	3	7	0
#14: Build wide, clear pedestrian walkways that connect one end of Leyden Rock to the other.	9	2	0
#15: Integrate forested areas in empty spaces into the design to improve safety, create green space, and increase community connectivity.	7	3	0
#16: Reach out to Leyden Rock Metro District and/or Candelas Metro District to determine if/how they could contribute.	5	5	0
#17: Include an access road onto the Parkway from Highway 72 to facilitate Leyden Rock access and provide additional egress options.	4	6	1
#18: Require incorporation of design features that help achieve objectives from Arvada's community plans.	7	2	1
#19: Carefully consider light/sound mitigation measures, especially close to homes. Sound mitigation options other than walls should be considered to account for views.	9	2	0
#20: Take steps to promote utilization of the Parkway (minimize/eliminate tolls or offer other funding mechanism and solicit state/federal funding.	1	6	3
#21: Utilize Indiana Street as the northbound lanes of the Parkway and construct the new Southbound lanes in the Rocky Flats right-of-way (from west 96 <sup>th</sup> Ave north to 128).	1	3	6
#22: Change the alignment to go up Highway 93 instead of Indiana Street to avoid concerns about Rocky Flats.	2	0	8

#23: Provide clarity for the public on how the Parkway helps achieve current Front Range transportation objectives and why JPPHA chose Indiana Street alignment.	6	1	4
#24: Consult with Colorado Parks and Wildlife about options for wildlife crossings.	9	2	0
#25: Change the Parkway alignment to "joint use" of current highway 128 from its intersection with Northwest Parkway to where the Parkway turns south at Indiana Street (to mitigate Federal Aviation Administration).	3	5	3
#27: JPAC should continue to meet during the RFP process and the construction of the Parkway.	9	2	0
#28: Consider innovative approaches to pursuing all recommendations.	9	2	0
#29: Send all presentation materials from JPAC's May meeting to the JPPHA Board to consider and review.	7	1	3

### GROUP DISCUSSION

The group focused their discussion on the recommendations that received either all green dots or had only a few yellow dots. Participants who were unsure or had questions about the recommendation shared their thoughts, and Bill Ray provided his input on these recommendations.

**Recommendation #1:** Adopt the mitigation measures from the 2008 Northwest Corridor Transportation Study Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

- Bill stated that this recommendation is a recitation of standard CDOT policies and expressed support for moving forward with the recommendation.

**Recommendation #2:** The RFP should state that all NEPA-like standards be followed for the environmental review process even though no federal funds are used.

- Group members who used yellow dots shared that their hesitation with this recommendation is associated with the federal NEPA process. They indicated that any specific NEPA-like standards that the group wants to call out could be included in the RFP but embarking on a NEPA-like process without specific goals that differ from other required environmental analyses could create unintended procedural bureaucracy without adding an additional layer of value.
- Bill clarified that the original reason the JPPHA Board decided not to pursue federal funds is that there were no funds to be allocated. The decision was not an attempt to avoid federal standards or regulations.
- Bill stated that there will be no further environmental review processes because they have all been completed. JPPHA is in the construction drawing and building phase. There will be some site-specific reviews for the 404 permit, which is required when crossing a wetland.

**Recommendation #3:** If the current parkway alignment up Indiana Street remains the same, the JPPHA Board should install adequate air monitoring equipment downwind of the construction to monitor for airborne contamination caused by construction activity. Monitoring should be accompanied by a public comment period on the design of the air monitoring equipment and on the consequences of exceedances of specified airborne contamination thresholds (and what those thresholds should be).

- Group members who used yellow dots shared that any air monitoring must be done pre-construction to establish a baseline because there are homes nearby. nearby homes. Some expressed concern that air is difficult to monitor because it is constantly moving. The RFQ also states that permits will be acquired to conduct air monitoring.
- Bill's thoughts on recommendation #3 also related to recommendations #4, #5, and #6. JPPHA will willingly submit to any permitting requirements of any jurisdiction. There are local requirements specific to Broomfield, Arvada, etc., that overlay state requirements. For each of these questions, Bill would like to know the clear purpose of conducting the additional analyses.

**Recommendation #5:** JPPHA should sponsor an independent review of all the past studies of both soil contamination and public health impact by a qualified national institution that is independent of the Department of Energy (e.g., the National Academy of Sciences). The independent reviewer should assess risks and conclusions surrounding public health impact, and review sampling techniques.

- Bill's question about the purpose of additional review also applied to this recommendation. In response, some participants indicated that the added value was in the independent reviewer.
- Some people who did not indicate support for recommendation #5 shared that recommendation #5 would not be necessary if recommendation #4 were pursued. These participants indicated support for recommendation #4 because the two perspectives on the issue of plutonium are so far apart and an independent review could settle some questions. However, there has historically been some challenges when determining what "objective" or "independent" really means. Also, depending on who hires and pays the independent reviewer, members of the public or the JPPHA Board may view the reviewer's independence as compromised.
- There are also questions about implementation thresholds (e.g., is the reviewer going to study groundwater or surface water; are they going to study to a two-inch or two-foot depth, etc.). People have differing degrees of comfort with risk and differing perceptions of risk.
- The JPAC asked to revisit recommendation #4 and #5 after members review the decision by Judge Brimmer.

**Recommendation #8:** Bike/walk pathways should be included in the design to allow pedestrian use across the parkway and eventually link up to trails at the north and south ends.

- Some participants were unconvinced that the private partner would agree to implement this recommendation.

- Bill supported advancing this recommendation to the JPPHA Board.

**Recommendation #9:** There should be multimodal options along the proposed access road by the Leyden Rock community. The pathway should connect to all the trailheads (the Greenway Trail, etc.). Development of the multimodal options should be included in phase 1 of construction.

- Bill's questions about this recommendation were about timing; it may not be able to be implemented during phase 1 of construction. Bill has discussed closely-related concepts with the landscape designer for Arvada.

**Recommendation #11:** JPPHA should carefully consider the site and design of the Greenway Trail.

- The Jefferson Parkway has nothing to do with the Greenway Trail. The Greenway will propose their design, and the JPPHA Board will review it.
- A federal grant is being used to pay for the Greenway Trail.

**Recommendation #12:** Mitigation measures should be taken to insulate the neighborhood of Leyden Rock from the negative impacts of the Jefferson Parkway construction, prevent the highway from dividing the community, and keep the residents safe.

- Bill's question about the purpose of the mitigation measures also applied to this recommendation. Many people would likely have differing opinions about how much mitigation would be enough. It will be important to come to a common understanding with Leyden Rock residents about expectations for the mitigation measures.
- The RFP could potentially provide bonus points to bidders who show the most creative, innovative ideas for mitigating the impact to Leyden Rock.

**Recommendation #13:** There should not be any sound walls to mitigate noise near Leyden Rock.

- Participants who used yellow dots expressed hesitation about the speed with which trees and other vegetation grows, and therefore its effectiveness as a barrier.
- Those who were uncertain were also uncomfortable with the uncompromising nature of the statement "no sound walls," as there could be some cases where a sound wall is desirable.

**Recommendation #14:** There should be wide, clear pedestrian walkways that connect one end of the Leyden Rock community to the other.

- The pedestrian walkway would go across the Parkway connecting the two sides of the Leyden Rock community.
- This recommendation relates to recommendation #15 and #16 in terms of the potential partnerships.
- CDOT conducted a study about the impact of construction on the floodplain, and this should be considered when building the pathways.

**Recommendation #16:** Reach out to Leyden Rock Metro District and/or Candelas Metro District to determine if and how they could contribute.

- The purpose of this recommendation would be to expand options and provide an opportunity for the communities to be part of the solution.

**Recommendation #17:** The design should include an access road onto the highway from Highway 72 to the Jefferson Parkway to facilitate Leyden Rock access to the Parkway and provide additional egress options.

- The suggestion is for there to be a slathed road that would allow community members to access one of the roads onto the Parkway. This would pull traffic off Indiana Street.
- Bill responded that this would be a multi-million-dollar change in design.

**Recommendation #18:** JPPHA should require the incorporation of design features into the Jefferson Parkway that help to achieve objectives from Arvada's community plans, including the Arvada Arts and Culture Master Plan, the Arvada's Bicycle Master Plan, and the Parks Plan. These objectives include expanding the arts and culture throughout Arvada and improving bicycle and pedestrian access (i.e., reducing barriers to access).

- Some participants had questions about how much the community plans influence specific actions. Bill shared that master plans translate to strategic results. If a community plan says there should be "safer spaces," practical actions emerge from that direction.
- Participants were also interested in including the community plans from the other involved jurisdictions (not just Arvada). They recommended changing the recommendation to "all applicable master plans."

**Recommendation #23:** JPPHA should provide clarity for the public on how the Jefferson Parkway helps achieve current Front Range transportation objectives and why the JPPHA chose the Indiana Street alignment over other alternative alignments (e.g., Highway 93).

- A one-page description of how JPPHA came to the alignment decision would be helpful for many community members. Bill agreed that this was a great idea.

**Recommendation #26:** The public (residents, city, county, etc.) should not be financially responsible for the Jefferson Parkway. The RFP should require the private investment firm to cover the shortfall if the revenue does not cover operations costs.

- There were questions about who would be financially responsible if the concessionaire goes "belly-up." Bill clarified that the debt would be resold to a different company.
- The JPPHA Board is hoping to receive a proposal that does not seek a subsidy for the initial year of operations.

**Recommendation #27:** The JPAC should continue meeting during the RFP process and construction of the Jefferson Parkway.

- Some people had questions about the purpose of continuing to meet. Others emphasized that there will be ongoing changes and that it will be important for the



community to have an opportunity to interface with the Board. The group should be able to consult on the RFP responses and design proposals.

**Recommendation #29:** JPAC should send the following material from the May JPAC meeting to the JPPHA Board to consider and should specify what they would like the JPPHA Board to do with this information:

- Randy Stafford's position paper
- Jon Lipsky's presentation (PowerPoint and the meeting summary)
- The videotape recording and transcript of Kristen Iversen's talk; the presentation material from Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
- Some participants did not think this recommendation was necessary because the meeting summary (which included the presentations and transcript)

#### **NEXT STEPS**

- Anyone who wrote a recommendation should consider whether they want to leave their recommendation as-is, rewrite it, or withdraw it.
- At the next meeting, there will be a shorter list of recommendations, and the group will go through each one. Those in support of the recommendation will share their reasoning, and those in opposition to the recommendation will share their reasoning. The report will list these reasons for support or opposition.