

AGENDA
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, February 24, 2014
1:30 p.m.
1290 Broadway
Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, west side

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. January 27, 2014 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)

ACTION ITEM

4. **Motion to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the process and criteria for determining 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP) roadway capacity projects.**
(Attachment B)
Steve Cook

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

5. Discuss funding levels for the Financial Plan of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP).
(Attachment C)
Steve Cook

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

6. Member Comment/Other Matters
7. Next Meeting - March 24, 2014
8. Adjournment

Disabled attendees are asked to notify DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of the need for auxiliary aids or services

We make life better!



ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE Monday, January 27, 2014

MEMBERS (OR VOTING ALTERNATES) PRESENT:

Daren Sterling	Adams County-Commerce City
Gene Putman	Adams County-City of Thornton
Dave Chambers	Arapahoe County-City of Aurora
Aaron Heumann	Arapahoe County-City of Greenwood Village
Tom Reed (Alternate)	Aviation Interests
George Gerstle	Boulder County
Heather Balsler	Boulder County-City of Louisville
Debra Baskett (Chair)	Broomfield, City and County
Steve Klausing	Business/Economic Development Interests
Danny Herrmann (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation, Reg. 1
Dave Gaspers (Alternate)	City and County of Denver
Doug Rex	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Art Griffith	Douglas County-City of Lone Tree
Greg Fischer	Freight Interests
Bob Manwaring	Jefferson County-City of Arvada
Kevin French	Jefferson County
Bert Weaver	Non MPO
Lenna Kottke	Non RTD Transit
Kate Cooke (Alternate)	Regional Air Quality Council
Bill Sirois (Alternate)	Regional Transportation District
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motor

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve (Alternate)	Adams County
Bryan Weimer (Alternate)	Arapahoe County
Mac Callison (Alternate)	Arapahoe County-City of Aurora
Dave Baskett (Alternate)	Jefferson County-City of Lakewood
Rich McClintock (Alternate)	TDM/Non-motor

Public: Paul Jesaitis, CDOT Reg. 1; Tom Reiff, Town of Castle Rock; David Bunch, Kiewit; Karen Schneiders, CDOT Reg. 4; Ashley Busnay, CDOT

DRCOG staff: Steve Cook, Jacob Riger, Melina Dempsey, Matthew Helfant, Todd Cottrell, Robert Spotts, Will Soper, Lawrence Tilong, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Chair Debra Baskett called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

Public Comments

There was no public comment.

Summary of December 16, 2013 Meeting

The meeting summary was accepted without change.

ACTION ITEMS

Motion to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee adding \$142,000 in STP-Metro funding to the Boulder County SH-119 Underpass project (TIP ID 2012-058) in FY2014.

Doug Rex presented a request from Town of Lyons for assistance in meeting a \$142,000 local match commitment for a 2012-2017 TIP streetscape project on US-36 from Stone Canyon Road to 3rd Avenue (TIP-ID: 2012-009).

Lyons was declared a federal Major Disaster Area after the September 2013 floods. Meeting the FY2014 match commitment would be difficult for Lyons at this time. An option was developed, in conjunction with Boulder County, to allow a funding swap that would deduct \$142,000 from the \$600,000 overmatch Boulder County committed to the SH-119 underpass (FY2014 funds) and program STP-Metro funds for the same amount to the SH-119 underpass. Boulder County agreed to apply the \$142,000 in match savings to the Lyons project.

Gene Putman MOVED to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee adding \$142,000 in STP-Metro funding to the Boulder County SH-119 Underpass project (TIP ID 2012-058) in FY2014. Art Griffith SECONDED the motion and the MOTION PASSED unanimously.

Motion to recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) 2016-2021 TIP benefit criteria methodologies recommended by DRCOG staff for transit projects and bicycle/pedestrian projects.

Steve Cook presented and noted MVIC is the lead in 2016-2021 TIP Policy criteria development. In November 2013, MVIC requested TAC's input on making benefits criteria less predictive and more understandable; i.e., replace the values used in determining Air Quality benefits, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction, and Person Miles Traveled (PMT).

In response, TAC suggested conducting technical work group sessions to explore alternatives. Work group sessions on bicycle/pedestrian criteria and transit criteria were held separately on December 17, 2013. Staff compiled recommended indicators as a result of the work groups, and from either the census, focus model, or from RTD data sources for transit.

Melina Dempsey presented the recommendations for bicycle/pedestrian/multimodal (defined as first/last mile, bike parking, etc.) indicators. The following indicator units would be used to replace two of the existing Air Quality benefits and User Base criteria, and in determining the PMT when calculating cost-effectiveness. Melina noted a ½ mile buffer area around a project site.

1. Population + Jobs with Mixed Use Index Applied
2. Student Population (all ages >5)
3. Zero Car Households
4. Short (≤1.5 miles) Drive-Alone Trips

Member comments:

- Gene Putman requested a better definition of Zero Car households—does it include motorcycles, scooters, etc.?
- George Gerstle encouraged points for first/last mile connections to transit, as these connections serve both bike/ped and transit criteria. He said indicators seems focused on short trips in urban area, and seems to preclude regional bicycle connections for longer than 1½ mile trips.
- George Gerstle asked how projects in same geographic area would be differentiated. Would cheapest project score higher than the most cost-effective project? Steve said the “funding request effectiveness” criteria (formerly cost-effectiveness) would be used.

- Gene Putman asked if projects already in service within an area are taken into consideration as a competing or new benefit.
- Bryan Weimer asked whether projects would be double-counted if in overlapping circles within the 1½ mile perimeter. Maybe there should be a special category to allow a large project to score higher?
- Art Griffith felt having overlapping projects could encourage sponsors to divide into smaller projects to get more cost-effectiveness. Melina said each project is compared to another. Steve Cook said this could further complicate criteria and MVIC specifically wants simplification.
- Art Griffith agreed with George Gerstle on incorporating first/last mile connections to transit, making linkages, as it serves both bike/ped and transit. Steve Cook suggested including this proposal as a “trait” of a project versus quantifiable criteria. Melina noted an existing criterion, “connectivity”, takes this into consideration. Steve said a project on the regional vision corridor system would also count.
- Rich McClintock asked if a project near first/last mile of a transit stop get more points than one (i.e., bike way) near open space. Steve Cook noted yes, and this is already in Metro Vision criteria.
- George Gerstle asked how cost-effectiveness is calculated for bicycles, particularly if not counting Person Miles Traveled. Steve Cook said it is ratio of the cost to the benefit unit.

Kevin French MOVED to recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) 2016-2021 TIP benefit criteria methodologies recommended by DRCOG staff for bicycle/pedestrian projects. Art Griffith SECONDED the motion.

George Gerstle made a friendly amendment to also reflect the benefits for regional connectivity beyond 1½ mile in the criteria and if on a route that connects to urban centers or major destinations. Kevin French, the maker, accepted the friendly amendment, saying it is already in existing criteria, under “connectivity”. Art Griffith, the second, also agreed.

Discussion continued.

- Steve Klausing had concerns, stating there is an overemphasis on density and the balance between jobs and housing. He does not see suburban area projects scoring well. Steve Cook noted 75% of TIP funding is based on score, while 25% is based on other factors, i.e., equity, in 2nd Phase allocations. MVIC will be evaluating this further in February or March.
- Bill Sirois noted new indicators can have unintended consequences, should have ability to be modified if adjustments are needed.
- Gene Putman said he would not support the motion, because the table does not show all TIP criteria (both changed and unchanged). Steve Cook noted MVIC will be making more changes over the next few months, so this process is still under development.
- Bert Weaver agreed with George Gerstle for more emphasis on regional connectivity.

The (bicycle/pedestrian/multimodal criteria) MOTION PASSED, with 2 opposed.

Matthew Helfant presented the recommendations for transit project indicators. He said the following indicator units would be used for three of the existing overall Bus Service Projects criteria (Usage, Cost-effectiveness, and Air Quality benefits); and two of the existing overall Transit Passenger Facilities criteria (Usage and Air Quality benefits). Matthew noted a ½ mile buffer around a fixed-route transit project, or for call-n-Ride projects, the total area covered) would be used.

1. Population + Jobs with Mixed Use Index Applied
2. Retail and service jobs
3. Health care jobs
4. Senior population (age 75+)

5. Students (all ages >5)
6. Lower income households
7. Zero Car households
8. Eco Pass ownership by employees
9. Weekly bus/rail runs that intersect with project
10. Proposed annual service hours

Member comments:

- Gene Putman questioned using age 75+ for senior designation. Lenna Kottke, Via, said the transit use is much higher for seniors over 75 than those over 65.
- Gene Putman said other ADA transit providers could possibly be more cost-effective than RTD on access-a-Ride type routes. Steve Cook clarified that ADA (door-to-door) types of transit service projects are not DRCOG TIP-selected projects.
- George Gerstle made several comments:
 - How will increasing services on existing routes be handled. Matthew said the TIP criteria evaluates only the additional proposed service.
 - Consider all community transit pass programs, not just EcoPass.
 - The process seems to encourage service on existing routes, and makes it a challenge for underserved communities (How to provide for non-existing transit?).
 - Give more credit for encouraging longer trips vs. shorter, as this reduces VMT. Steve Cook said the Connectivity criterion takes this into account, but could be enhanced.
 - Needs to reflect the importance of first/final mile infrastructure.
- Art Griffith said activity centers should be included. Matthew noted activity centers were not included as number of centers was too low.

George Gerstle MOVED to recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) 2016-2021 TIP benefit criteria methodologies recommended by DRCOG staff for transit projects, and additionally, recognizing the benefit of longer and regional trips, first/final mile connectivity, and to look at community transit pass programs. Bert Weaver SECONDED the motion.

Steve Cook noted staff would first look into details of the community transit pass prior to MVIC.

The (transit criteria) MOTION PASSED unanimously.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

2040 RTP roadway capacity project evaluation process.

Jacob Riger presented on the status of the development of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP). Jacob reviewed a general timeline for 2040 RTP development over the next 11 months, as outlined in the agenda memo. Board adoption of the 2040 RTP is scheduled for December 17, 2014.

Jacob noted the 2040 RTP is the fiscally constrained subset of full Metro Vision 2040 RTP. (The full Metro Vision RTP includes both the fiscally constrained 2040 RTP and the unfunded Vision projects).

Jacob asked the committee to review the draft list of 2035 RTP projects (Table 1) and contact staff with any changes. The list will be updated over the next few months.

Twenty-five projects currently in the 2035 RTP will be re-evaluated for 2040 RTP inclusion as it has been ten years since projects were last evaluated. A few new projects may be considered.

Jacob noted Figure 1 shows very few regionally-funded projects anticipated for inclusion in the 2040 RTP (due to funding). Table 2 listed the proposed 'high-level' scoring evaluation criteria (scoring applies to regionally significant roadway capacity projects).

Jacob asked the committee to comment on two issues:

1. how to determine additional roadway capacity projects to score; and
2. project evaluation criteria and scoring.

The committee will make recommendations at the February TAC meeting on these two subjects.

Member comments:

- George Gerstle asked if a work group would be formed to refine the two issues further. There was committee consensus. Doug Rex agreed that a workshop be held and asked for volunteers. Art Griffith, George Gerstle, David Gaspers, Dave Baskett, Gene Putman volunteered at the meeting. An email will be sent to solicit volunteers.
- David Gaspers asked if jurisdictions will be able to nominate RTP projects to be scored (after Board action on the RTP-related recommendations in February). Jacob said yes, and can probably begin in mid-March.
- Gene Putman said several PEL (Planning and Environmental Linkage) studies were done in last few years. He looks forward to being able to submit projects that came out of these studies. George Gerstle agreed.
- Dave Baskett asked if the project readiness would be addressed in the work group discussions (i.e, ROW, environmental clearances). Jacob said the concept is looked at when staging projects, not in the scoring criteria. George Gerstle agreed.
- Art Griffith said discussions should include how to decide ranking.
- George Gerstle asked for clarification regarding managed lanes vs. general purpose projects. Steve Cook said if the project was in roadway right-of-way, it would be a "road" category; but there are a lot of perspectives to consider.

FY2013 Annual Listing of Federally Obligated Projects.

Todd Cottrell presented the draft report, *FY 2013 Annual Listing of Federally Obligated Projects*. The report lists all transportation projects in the Denver region obligated with federal funds in federal fiscal year 2013 (Oct. 1, 2012 through Sept. 30, 2013). A net total of \$342.9 million was obligated in FY2013 for 135 transportation projects.

Other Matters

Rich McClintock asked for any MVIC feedback on last month's TAC discussion on transportation goals for 2040 MVRTP, particularly on continuing the 10% reduction of VMT and SOV. Doug Rex said MVIC is continuing its discussion as part of the overall 2040 development. More clear direction is expected in the next few months. Rich suggested TAC have discussion in February or March on 2040 VMT modeling trends, specifically the baseline question of "What is the assumption for VMT going forward?" Ted Heyd agreed.

Kevin French noted the passing of a Jefferson County Sheriff's Officer in a motorcycle accident on SH-93, north of Golden.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m. Next meeting is scheduled for February 24, 2014.

ATTACH B

ATTACHMENT B

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager

303 480-6749 or scook@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
February 24, 2014	Action	4

SUBJECT

Evaluation and selection of roadway capacity projects for the *Fiscally Constrained 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP)*

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends a proposal for evaluating and soliciting roadway capacity projects for the 2040 RTP.

ACTION BY OTHERS

MVIC, January 8, 2014 - Recommended TAC as the 2040 RTP technical lead to develop the evaluation criteria and process for determining regionally-significant projects.

SUMMARY

At the previous TAC meeting ([agenda](#)), staff noted that all regionally-significant roadway capacity projects, such as new interchanges, new lanes on principal arterials, and new managed lanes on freeways must be identified in the fiscally constrained 2040 RTP.

Roadway capacity projects are scored to help determine which projects are included in the RTP as eligible for regional funds. The TAC directed staff to facilitate a work group session to review the current evaluation criteria and also discuss the process for identifying a limited number of additional roadway capacity projects to be considered for regional funding.

Twelve people participated in a work group session on February 11. The group included several TAC members as well as local government staff.

Recommendations derived from work group session:

1. Utilize the revised evaluation criteria shown in Table 1. These criteria encompass several factors to evaluate projects from a high-level, comparative, long range planning perspective. The criteria use readily-available data, an important schedule consideration.
2. Solicit additional roadway capacity projects to be scored for regional funding and inclusion in the 2040 RTP. Projects already in the 2035 RTP identified with regional funding do not have to be resubmitted. They will be re-scored. It was further recommended that the following limits be placed on the number of additional projects to be submitted for evaluation:
 - Local Governments – maximum of 2 each (City and County of Denver – maximum of 4)
 - CDOT – No specific maximum, but target limit of 15.

Note: Preliminary funding forecasts for 2040 indicate there will not be enough revenues to complete the regionally funded projects currently identified in the 2035 RTP.

3. Local government submitted projects on a state highway must include signed concurrence from CDOT.
4. Request local governments to reconfirm their commitment to locally funded and “vision” roadway capacity projects in the 2035 MVRTP to retain in the 2040 RTP.

2040 RTP Roadway Capacity Project Identification Schedule:

- Feb TAC/March MVIC - Define process and evaluation criteria for determining regionally-funded capacity projects.
- March – Send out solicitation for roadway capacity projects desiring regional funding.
- April – Solicitations due; begin evaluation and scoring.
- Mid-May - Complete project scoring.
- May TAC/June Board - Approve roadway capacity projects (and staging schedule) to include in the 2040 RTP.
- July-September - Conduct air quality conformity model runs.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committee evaluation criteria and solicitation process for regionally funded roadway capacity projects for the 2040 RTP.

ATTACHMENTS

Table 1 – Proposed project scoring evaluation criteria for the 2040 RTP

Link to the [2035 MVRTP](#) (see Chapter 5)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager, at 303 480-6749 or scook@drcog.org.

Table 1: Proposed Project Scoring Evaluation Criteria for 2040 RTP
Regionally Significant Roadway Capacity Projects
Revised February 17, 2014

Draft 2040 Criteria Category	Point Distribution Process	Maximum Points
1. Congestion Severity (Existing and Future) <i>(current or parallel facility)</i> Existing: Congestion Management Program (CMP) Score Future: 2040 Existing and Committed Network Model	Existing Congestion: Points (0-20) based on CMP score Future Congestion: Points (0-10) based on peak period v/c >.75 (6.5 hour) Prorate by 1-point increments based on range of values	35 30
2. Cost per Person Mile Traveled (PMT) <i>2040 model run</i>	Project cost divided by PMT (from FOCUS Travel Model) Prorate by 1-point increments based on range of values	15 17
3. Gap Closure <i>completes all or part of a lane or segment gap</i>	15 points for full segment gap, 13 points for full lane gap 8 points for partial gap closure (min 50% closure) (gap must be < 5 miles)	40 15
4. Arterial Roadway Spacing <i>proximity to parallel Regional Roadway System facilities</i>	5 points if nearest parallel arterial is > 3 miles away 2 points if > 1.5 miles away	5
5. Regional Roadway System Classification <i>Freeways, MRAs, or NHS-Principal Arterial segments</i>	4 points for freeway 2 points for major regional arterial (MRA) 1 point for principal arterial on National Highway System (NHS)	4
6. Total Users <i>2040 model run</i>	Average daily person volume (from FOCUS Travel Model) Prorate by 1-point increments based on range of values	4 0
7. Serves Urban Centers/Rural Town Center <i>Proximity to designated Urban Centers/Rural Town Centers</i>	5 points if project is within or touching 3 points if within 1 mile	5
8. Safety Measure <i>Most recent 3-years of crash data</i>	Based on weighted crash rate (crashes/vmt) (Injury and fatal crashes factored by 5) 8 points to 10% of projects with highest value 4 points to next 15% of projects	6 8
9. Urban Growth Boundary/Area <i>is project entirely within the UGB/A?</i>	2 points if the project is entirely within the contiguous urban growth boundary area (including preserved land)	2
10. Serve Major Intermodal or High Security Facility <i>DIA, Union Station, GA airports intermodal freight terminals, Buckley AFB</i>	4 points if project is within or touching 2 points if within 1 mile	4
11. Rapid/Frequent Transit Corridor <i>support of major transit corridors</i>	Rapid Transit Tier 1 Corridor: 10 points. 15 mins. or better headway (average weekday) corridor: 5 points	10
		100

ATTACH C

ATTACHMENT C

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager
303 480-6749 or scook@drco.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
February 24, 2014	Information	5

SUBJECT

This item concerns revenue levels for the Financial Plan of the *2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP)*.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for information only.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A.

SUMMARY

Federal transportation law requires that the 2040 RTP be based on reasonably expected revenues over the life of the plan. There are several local, state, and federal funding programs used as the basis for determining revenues for the DRCOG region. CDOT and the Transportation Commission will be making decisions in March regarding program distribution – the allocation of federal and state revenues to different state and regional funding programs.

DRCOG staff is most concerned with those programs which can be used for regionally significant roadway capacity projects through 2040. As a result, staff will be concentrating their efforts on the following funding sources:

- State (CDOT):
 - Regional Priority Program (RPP)
 - FASTER Safety
 - Strategic Projects (SB-228)
 - Bridge Enterprise
 - FASTER Transit (only for roadway projects with major transit component)
 - “Extra” local funding beyond typical match
- Regional (Federal Programs):
 - STP-Metro (+ match)
 - CMAQ (+ match)
 - “Extra” local funding beyond typical match

Needs for system preservation and regional policy priorities will dictate the amount available for roadway capacity projects. Staff will provide TAC with funding tables for discussion following the state Transportation Commission meeting on February 19.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager, at 303 480-6749 or scook@drcog.org.