

Board Officers

Jack Hilbert, Chair
Jackie Millet, Vice Chair
Elise Jones, Secretary
Doug Tisdale, Treasurer
Sue Horn, Immediate Past Chair
Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

AGENDA
Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee
Wednesday March 19, 2014
9:00 a.m.- 11:00 a.m.
1290 Broadway
Independence Pass Board Room

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. February 19, 2014 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)

ACTION ITEM

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

4. Metro Vision 2040 – Community Health and Wellness Update
(Attachment B and Enclosure-[MV2040 Community Health and Wellness Issue Paper](#))
Darcie White (Clarion and Associates)
5. Metro Vision 2040 - Edge Development Next Steps
(Attachment C)
Brad Calvert
6. Metro Vision 2040 - Regional Housing Strategy Update
(Attachment D)
Nicole Klepadlo
7. Metro Vision 2040 - Regional Economic Strategy Update
(Attachment E)
Brad Calvert

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

8. Updates
 - MVPAC Issues Tracking March 2014
9. Member Comment/Other Matters
10. Next Meeting- April 16, 2014 9:00 a.m.
11. Adjournment



ATTACH A

ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC) Wednesday, February 19, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lesli Ellis	City of Boulder
Erin Fosdick	City of Longmont
Steve Glueck (Chair)	City of Golden
Steve Gordon	City and County of Denver
Steve Hebert	City of Lone Tree
Leanne Jeffers	Regional Institute for Health & Envrnmtl. Leadership
Steve Klausung	Denver South Economic Dev. Partnership
Glenda Lainis	City of Thornton
Kyle Legleiter	The Colorado Health Foundation
Bryce Merrill	Western States Arts Federation
Ann Norton	Ann Norton Law Offices
Katherine (Kati) Rider	Douglas County
Frederick Rollenhagen	Clear Creek County
Jerome Tinianow	City and County of Denver
Will Toor	Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Brad Weinig	Enterprise Community Partners

DRCOG staff: Brad Calvert, Nicole Klepadlo, Daniel Jerrett, Rachel Baxter, Flo Raitano, Teri Whitmore, Jennifer Schaufele, Todd Cottrell, Matthew Helfant

Public: Tareq Wafaie, Clarion Associates

Call to Order

Chair Steve Glueck called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

Public Comment

No public comment was heard.

Summary of January 15, 2014 Meeting

The summary was accepted.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Metro Vision 2040 Infill and Redevelopment Issues Paper

Brad Calvert introduced Tareq Wafaie, Clarion Associates, who gave an overview of the draft *MV 2040 Infill and Redevelopment Issues Paper*. The paper identifies challenges, how DRCOG can help address challenges (policy, tools), and how local agencies can develop strategies to address challenges to infill and redevelopment in communities around the region. A list of best practices, with regional infill and redevelopment projects and case studies from other regions is also included in the draft report. Information was collected from focus groups, stakeholder interviews, an Idea Exchange, online feedback (OUR Shared Vision), and the MV 2040 Local Government Survey.

Of the 27 responses from the local government survey, 26 agreed there is increase in overall development activity. Development Types noted with increased activity: New development (77%); Redevelopment (65%); Previously approved, but unbuilt projects (58%); Infill development (58%)

Tareq summarized the report findings, as follows:

Key challenges to infill and redevelopment

- Inconsistency with local comprehensive plans
- Lack of advanced planning and organizational support
- Land use regulations, including zoning and other development regulations
- Remaining sites tend to be “challenged”
- Neglected structures or sites, brownfield contamination, physical site constraints, i
- Costs to improve/provide infrastructure
- Market and feasibility limitations
- Construction defects legislation

MV 2040: Build On Existing Goals and Policies

- Expand focus from urban centers to include key transportation corridors
- Address role of incremental infill and redevelopment occurring outside of centers and corridors
- Acknowledge immediate concerns such as market incompatibility, construction defects legislation, and financing

Potential Regional Actions

- Connect developers with development opportunities
- Expand educational tools
- Evaluate and disseminate national best practices

Local Strategies for Encouraging Infill and Redevelopment

- Establish a supportive policy foundation
- Remove regulatory barriers
- Promote productive community dialogue
- Consider creative financing for infill and redevelopment (infrastructure, developer incentives, brownfields, etc.)

Steve Glueck, Chair, asked for committee discussion on the proposed role of DRCOG (bullet points on page 5), as follows:

- *Aligning regional goals and policies to better address infill and redevelopment*
- *Developing a toolkit for local action that:*
 - *Connects developers with development opportunities*
 - *Establishes tools calibrated for different community contexts*
 - *Provides educational tools for local governments related to infill and redevelopment*

Member Comments

- Important to acknowledge infill/redevelopment occurring outside centers.
- Proposed role seems “light”, given the importance of infill development in achieving adopted regional goals (e.g., 10% increase in regional density and accommodating 50% of new housing and 75% of new employment in urban centers).
- DRCOG could play a role in also providing statistical data on how much vacant or underutilized land there is, and how much development opportunity may be associated with these areas. An analysis of potential sites could inform how successful jurisdictions have been in moving potential sites to entitlements.
- The draft paper provides good framework, but expansion is needed.
- Are there any challenges unique to the Denver region that the paper revealed?
 - Tareq Wafaie (Clarion Associates) noted construction defects challenges and that not all communities are addressing infill and redevelopment in their comprehensive plans.
- Is it the role of a regional body to tell individual communities how to handle infill issues?
 - Tareq noted other MPOs (Southern California Association of Governments) are developing tools to promote the development potential of infill parcels around the region.

- Infill development is a local jurisdiction's decision - not sure DRCOG can be helpful in promoting infill besides providing toolkits, educational tools, and cross-training opportunities for local jurisdictions and developers. There could also be a role for DRCOG in assisting with community engagement and outreach.
- Metro Vision 2040 can set the stage for infill, but may need to be at the incremental level than a parcel-level analysis.
- The document may be one-sided, felt document stressed the challenges of infill and redevelopment, without indicating the many benefits.
- DRCOG TIP funding for plans and studies could be mentioned in this report – this regional support has helped create the necessary local vision for many infill areas.
 - Brad Calvert (DRCOG) noted the report indicates the public sector has to lead on the infill and redevelopment issue through detailed sub-area planning. These planning efforts can reveal site constraints and help build buy-in from the surrounding community.
 - Brad further noted the private developer interviews indicated their desire to invest in areas with “walkable urbanism” – which may not be universally present in communities around the region.
- DRCOG plays a key role in making regional decisions about infrastructure. These infrastructure investments should support infill and redevelopment rather than investing at the edges of the region.
- Previous scenario planning indicates, for public infrastructure costs, putting development into existing communities is far less expensive than putting outside existing urbanized areas. The report only notes the expense of infrastructure improvements at infill sites vs. the regional cost savings they may be associated with an infill strategy.
- DRCOG plays a role in funding planning (i.e., STAMPs) and should explore other ways to support infill and redevelopment opportunities.
- TIP funding criteria should be tied to infill and redevelopment versus new development in areas outside urban growth boundary.
- The region should focus infrastructure investments in key corridors, urban centers and filling gaps in existing developed areas.
- Have other MPOs gone beyond STAMPs in funding infill and redevelopment.
 - Tareq said his research did not reveal any examples.
 - Brad mentioned there are other MPOs that have programs to invest infrastructure dollars in areas that have also received sub-area planning funds through the MPO.
- The issues paper should help to encourage looking at key corridors when TIP criteria policies are developed.

Brad Calvert committed to sending a high level summary of the discussion to the committee and asked committee to send comments on the paper over the next 10 days.

Metro Vision 2040 – Edge Development Next Steps

Brad Calvert presented a follow-up discussion to the January 8, 2014 Focus Group on Edge Development. He asked the committee consider two key issues.

- Confirm that the fundamental principles in Metro Vision 2035 remain valid (e.g., limiting scattered development outside established boundaries (UGB); and
- Should Edge Development remain in a separate plan element vs. integrating with Extent of Urban Development?

Brad reviewed the history of Edge Development policy development. Large-lot development was not in the original MV 2020 plan, but first appeared in MV2030 (Jan. 2005) as a separate plan element (Semi-Urban Development). Incorporation into the Extent of Urban Development section was recommended, but was not done at that time. The Metro Vision 2035 plan established a regional growth target (vs. individual jurisdiction) for households in semi-urban development areas (1-10 acres). The target aimed to maintain the current (2006) proportion of semi-urban households,

estimated at the time to be approximately 3%. DRCOG analysis of the interim results of the development type mapping indicated that in 2011 3.33% of households in the region were located in semi-urban areas. DRCOG is currently finalizing the development type analysis and will review the revised results in the coming months.

Brad gave an overview of issues discussed at the Focus Group:

- Market demand shifting away from larger lots
- In some areas, a desire to subdivide existing subdivisions to accommodate smaller lots
- Demand for specialty farming activities
- Existing intergovernmental agreements IGAs may not reflect current circumstances
- What does economic development at the edge look like?
- Impact fees (e.g., roads) – varying degrees of success
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

Brad reviewed potential takeaways from the Focus Group:

- Need to broaden the discussion beyond “large-lot” residential
- Integrating other uses into these areas – including smaller lot housing
- What does economic development at the edge look like?
- What local tools should be developed to increase flexibility and respond to changing needs

Member Comments:

- The paper seems less fully developed than *Infill and Redevelopment Issues Paper*. Seems more opinion-based and needs more detailed recommendations. The paper should focus on the shift towards smaller lots in outer areas from a cost of services perspective and could include case studies from other communities.
- There is a case to be made for integrating with the Extent of Urban Development element. This may be the place in the plan to address the “middle ground” – e.g., areas in the region that are neither urban, nor rural.
- It’s not clear why, from a regional perspective, we would be interested in looking for new ways to develop land at the edge, if large lots no longer desirable.
- It was noted that the information in the agenda packet was a summary from a 1-2 hour focus group and was not intended to be a final report on this topic.
- It’s important for the group to remember when this element of the plan was developed there were significant concerns about large-lot development occurring on the urban fringe.
- The focus group notes feel like two distinct conversations – relationship between municipalities and counties at the “edge” of incorporated areas and large-lot development in unincorporated areas located farther out from more developed areas.
- Counties experience developers asking for smaller lot development in areas not supported by the local comprehensive plan.
- Surprised that hasn’t been any mention of emergency preparedness and response – how will insurance requirements impact this type of development in the future?
- What does edge development look like in the more rural parts of the region? Rural communities are experiencing a push for tourist, natural resource, and casino development – these types of issues are absent from the existing discussion of large lot development in the plan.
- Is the 3% target the number of households or land area? Brad said the target is related to the percentage of households in the region located within semi-urban areas.
- The cost of infrastructure should be looked at.
- Steve Glueck, Chair, said the 3% figure is not the key issue in meeting our goals – these will be met by focusing other parts of the region, including those that are densifying.
- This topic should also include a discussion on the impacts on agriculture.

- Brad noted that staff would prepare an outline of next steps for committee consideration in March.

Metro Vision 2040 Regional Transportation Plan – Project Update

Doug Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations, presented an update on development of the region's long-range transportation plan scheduled for adoption in December 2014. The plan includes the region's transportation goals and policies, vision (unfunded) rapid transit and roadway system expansion projects, and the fiscally constrained plan.

Doug described the process to develop the fiscally constrained portion of the plan, Metro Vision 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

- Fiscally constrained (i.e., those with a reasonable expectation of funding over the next 25 years) regional projects such as new rapid transit rail, new interchanges, new lanes on principal arterials, and new managed lanes on freeways, must be identified in the 2040 RTP, regardless of funding source.
- Projects must pass air quality conformity modeling tests per federal requirements. Modeling of identified projects is scheduled to start by June 2014.
- Rapid transit rail projects are tied closely to RTD decisions.
- As limited funding is expected over the next 25 years, roadway system capacity projects desiring regional funding with DRCOG or CDOT funds go through a competitive process to determine inclusion in the 2040 RTP. Roadway capacity projects selected then become eligible for funding through the *Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*

To identify projects to include in the fiscally constrained plan, DRCOG staff is currently:

- Re-evaluating capacity projects in the current 2035 RTP for inclusion in the 2040 RTP.
- Discussing re-prioritization of 2035 projects for possible project removal, or consideration of up to two additional projects per sponsor (more for Denver).
- Developing revised TIP Policy criteria to be used to evaluate projects to the 2040 RTP.
 - The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) will be reviewing results of the TIP criteria work group outcomes at its February 24 meeting.

CDOT is expected to propose an interregional bus service to include in the 2040 Plan.

CDOT is expecting its Program Distribution allocation to be completed within a month.

Member Comment

- Are the corridors in the 2040 RTP system able to handle higher density in urban centers and corridors. Doug noted the discussion is continuing throughout the fall; but capacity projects need to be selected by June in order to be modeled, as federally required.
- Steve Glueck, Chair, commented that most of the TIP projects applied for (CMAQ, multimodal, operational) do not need to be in the fiscally constrained plan.
- Are the outcomes from housing studies, scenario analysis, and particularly the TIP evaluation criteria going to be reflected in the 2040 RTP? Brad said the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) has been discussing TIP evaluation criteria since the beginning of the year, including affordable housing. DRCOG staff anticipates giving a full update on the housing work to MVIC in April.
- There is a need for appropriate TIP criteria that reflect the intent of Metro Vision.
- Projects promoting walking/biking should be considered regionally significant.
- The region should evaluate regional corridors for arterial Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) – many corridors may have the opportunity to implement BRT. Other studies in the region have

suggested that BRT-technology can greatly increase ridership in key corridors. DRCOG could take a lead role in this effort.

- Steve Glueck, Chair, commented others besides the transportation implementing organizations should be able to provide input on the RTP.
- DRCOG's Regional Economic Strategy should also influence transportation policy and project selection.
- It's not clear, based on the schedule presented, that the work on Metro Vision 2040 will have any influence over the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.
- When will the revised TIP evaluation criteria be used to evaluate submitted projects?
 - Todd Cottrell, TIP Manager, clarified that projects selected for inclusion in the fiscally constrained 2040 RTP will be modeled for air quality in May/June, 2014. These capacity projects will then be eligible to apply for TIP funding during the new 2016-2021 TIP Call for Projects issued in July/August, 2014. The TIP is scheduled for adoption in March 2015. Projects funded for federal fiscal year 2016 can begin in October 2015.
 - Steve Glueck, Chair, noted the revised TIP evaluation criteria (2016-2021 TIP Policy) will be used, but will be based on Metro Vision 2035, and the Board's interpretation of where we are heading for Metro Vision 2040.

Metro Vision 2040 – Small Area Forecast Process

Daniel Jerrett, DRCOG Regional Economist, briefed the committee on plans to implement the new UrbanSim land use model during the DRCOG conformity modeling process (June -August 2014).

In the first week of March, DRCOG will email all member governments a request to review the initial forecast results of the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) level households and employment. Members should suggest any changes to the initial TAZ allocation of households and jobs. The feedback will be used in the final calibration of the UrbanSim. UrbanSim, in conjunction with the Focus travel model, will be used to produce the final long range small area forecasts for the region.

DRCOG staff is available to facilitate technical conversations on both the forecast review process and/or the UrbanSim land use model over the next few months. The process is expected to conclude by May 1.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March 19, 2014 at 9:00 a.m.

ATTACH B

ATTACHMENT B

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee

From: Brad Calvert, Senior Planner
303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcoq.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 19, 2014	Information	4

SUBJECT

Distribution of Metro Vision 2040 Community Health and Wellness Issue Paper.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff from Clarion Associates will brief the committee on issue paper findings and recommendations.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

As part of the Metro Vision 2040 update process regional stakeholders, including local planners and elected officials have consistently identified community health and wellness as a key strategy that should be reflected in the final plan.

DRCOG retained Clarion Associates to prepare the attached issue paper. The issue paper was informed by several engagement efforts including local government and stakeholder focus groups, and a Metro Vision Idea Exchange (February 11, 2014).

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

Draft [Metro Vision 2040 Community Health and Wellness Issue Paper](#)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcoq.org.

ATTACH C

ATTACHMENT C

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee

From: Brad Calvert, Senior Planner
303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 19, 2014	Information	5

SUBJECT

This item concerns large lot development, a current element of the Growth and Development section of Metro Vision 2035.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for information and discussion.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

On January 8, 2014 DRCOG hosted a focus group with local government staff from seven jurisdictions. In February, staff shared the focus group summary for discussion and guidance on next steps from MVPAC (see Attachment A for a summary of the discussion).

MVPAC will discuss the proposed next steps for potential plan and policy development (see attachment).

Exploring revisions to this element of the current Metro Vision 2035 plan is one of several significant revisions or new elements being considered during the process to develop Metro Vision 2040. As the scope of the proposed revisions becomes more clear DRCOG staff and MVPAC will revisit whether the adjustments can be made during the current update cycle.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

MVPAC, February 19, 2014 - Edge Development Focus Group Summary

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

Metro Vision 2040 Edge Development: Next Steps

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org.

Metro Vision 2040 Edge Development: Next Steps

The following are preliminary recommendations as to how the concept of “Edge Development” (a revision of the current Large-lot Development element of Metro Vision) should be addressed in Metro Vision 2040. These recommendations build on input received from a Focus Group with member communities held in January 2014 and a follow up discussion with the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC) in February 2014. Input from both engagement opportunities suggest a potential shift in regional development patterns away from large-lot residential development. Additionally, stakeholders have identified new challenges outside the region’s planned urban areas that should be given consideration in Metro Vision 2040.

Existing Policies

Keep basic policy direction related to “large lot development” fairly consistent, but re-frame policies where needed to address edge development more broadly. This recommendation is based on the assumption that while the market for edge development may be absent today, there is a possibility that it will return in the future, and that fundamental principles established by Metro Vision previously remain valid:

- Limit amount of growth at the edge;
- Discourage scattered development outside of established growth boundaries/areas; and
- Avoid open space/sensitive areas.

Existing policies should be updated as needed to reflect changes in baseline conditions since they were first adopted. For example, what was previously “future open space” is in many cases now “existing open space.”

Potential New Policies/Expanded Policies

Several new topics, not currently addressed by Edge Development policies, emerged through discussions with stakeholders. It is recommended that new policies be developed, or existing policies and supporting information be expanded, to address these emerging issues, which include:

Infill/intensification of existing large lot subdivisions

- This topic applies to both partially developed or largely undeveloped large lot subdivisions
- Significant number of entitled, but vacant lots exist in region
- Need to define what parameters should apply:
 - Where this practice may be appropriate (e.g., within UGB, infrastructure availability, local comprehensive plan support, etc.) and what parameters apply; emphasize value of intensification in these locations
 - Where this practice should be discouraged (e.g., outside UGB and in more remote areas where services are not available) and what options might exist for existing platted subdivisions in these locations; emphasize issues associated with intensification in these locations

Economic development

- Pressure for non-residential development—provide guidance on when development should be encouraged or discouraged (while balancing development with natural, visual, and recreational amenities)
- Emerging opportunity areas outside of defined urban centers, particularly along regional corridors (east and west I-70 at limits of urban area)

Note: Interviews with economic development stakeholders from around the region currently underway – additional guidance may come from these conversations.

Emergency preparedness/response for edge development

- This issue should be considered within the context of any new/expanded policies, both from the standpoint of the ability to be served by emergency services and from a hazard mitigation standpoint.

Note: Hazard mitigation is an issue that has been raised during the economic development interviews – more shaping of this may be needed when interviews are complete.

Smaller scale agricultural operations/food production

- Increasing demand in some parts of region—some within UGB; some outside
- Revised plan element should address role for these uses within UGB (also relates to proposed Community Health and Wellness element)

ATTACH D

ATTACHMENT D

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee

From: Nicole Klepadlo, Planner II
303-480-5636 or nklepadlo@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 19, 2014	Information	6

SUBJECT

Overview of Metro Vision 2040 housing exploration including material from the Fair Housing and Equity Assessment and the Regional Housing Strategy.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff will brief the committee on the initial findings and recommendations completed by BBC Research and Consulting.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

As part of the Metro Vision 2040 update process regional stakeholders, including local planners and elected officials have consistently identified housing as a key issue that should be reflected in the final plan.

DRCOG retained BBC Research and Consulting to complete a Fair Housing Equity Assessment (FHEA) and a Regional Housing Strategy. The Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI) funded by U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires all grantees to complete a FHEA as part of the grant process. In March, initial findings will be shared with MVPAC. Findings were informed by data analysis and stakeholder engagement efforts (focus groups and interviews).

Next Steps

- Resident focus groups (March 2014)
- Entitlement Community Update and Strategy Session (March 25, 2014)
- Metro Vision Issues Committee Project Update (April 2, 2014)
- MVPAC – Key Findings and Recommendations (May 21, 2014)
- DRCOG Board – Key Findings and Recommendations (May 21, 2014)

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

MVPAC preview on August 21, 2013 and January 15, 2014

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Nicole Klepadlo, Planner II, at 303-480-5636 or nklepadlo@drcog.org.

ATTACHE

ATTACHMENT 9

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee

From: Brad Calvert, Senior Planner
303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drco.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 19, 2014	Information	7

SUBJECT

Overview of Metro Vision 2040 Regional Economic Strategy.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff will brief the committee on initial themes emerging from stakeholder interviews and upcoming activities.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The DRCOG Regional Economic Strategy (RES) will identify specific roles, responsibilities, policies, and actions that DRCOG can adopt to promote economic sustainability in the Denver Region. The RES will identify how DRCOG can modify or enhance its activities related to its core functions of land use and transportation planning, transportation investment management, community development and facilitation and coalition building.

DRCOG retained the team of Economic & Planning Systems and Development Research Partners to complete the Strategy. In March DRCOG staff will share initial feedback from stakeholder interviews and preview upcoming activities and analysis.

Next Steps

- Complete stakeholder interviews (March 2014)
- Economic and community benchmarking (March 2014)
- Peer Region Best Practices (April 2014)
- Goal and Policy Analysis (April – May 2014)
- Metro Vision Issues Committee – Project Briefing (May 7, 2014)
- MVPAC – Project Update (May 21, 2014)
- DRCOG Board – Key Findings and Recommendations (June 18, 2014)

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

MVPAC discussions on August 21, 2013 and January 15, 2014

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drco.org.



MVPAC Introduction Date	MVPAC Further Discussions	Project	MVPAC Action to Date	Status/Next Steps
1/23/2013	2/20/2013; 4/24/2013; 5/15/2013; 8/21/2013; 10/13/201; 11/20/2013	Metro Vision 2040 Scenario Analysis	Informational, preliminary input, guidance to Board on initial scenarios (A & B)	Status: DRCOG Board briefed on scenarios in December 2013. Next Steps: TBD
1/23/2013		Metro Vision 2040 Listening Tour	Informational	Status: The Listening Tour is complete and available as a final report on the DRCOG website. Process recommendations from the report will be integrated as applicable into the efforts of Metro Vision 2040. Next Steps: n/a
2/20/2013	3/20/2013; 4/24/2013; 8/21/2013; 11/20/2013	Metro Vision 2040 Local Government Survey	Provided recommendations on crafting questions (3/20)	Status: Summary report is complete and will be posted to the DRCOG website. Next Steps: n/a
2/20/2013	8/21/2013; 1/15/2014; 3/19/2014	SCI/Metro Vision Housing	Informational	Status: Project is underway. BBC Research and Consulting is currently interviewing housing stakeholders and analyzing regional housing data. Next Steps: Next MVPAC check-in expected in March 2014.
3/20/2013	8/21/2013; 1/15/2014; 3/19/2014	SCI/Metro Vision Economic Development	Informational	Status: Project is underway. Consultant team is currently interviewing numerous economic development partners around the region. Next Steps: Next MVPAC check-in expected in March 2014.
4/24/2013		Recommendations regarding call for projects for FY14/FY15 Station Area Master Plan/Urban Centers studies	Provided recommendations (4/24)	Status: Recommendations went to MVIC on 5/1 with further discussion. Items for discussion included "pooling" funds, project eligibility and project evaluation. The Board directed staff to move forward with the call for studies. Applications were due July 19 th . Next Steps: The DRCOG Board approved funding for 12 studies on September 18, 2013.
5/15/2013	1/15/2014	Initial Urban Centers Analysis	Informational	Status: This item was scheduled for the 5/15/2013 MVPAC

MVPAC Introduction Date	MVPAC Further Discussions	Project	MVPAC Action to Date	Status/Next Steps
				<p>meeting, but was tabled as the entire meeting was spent on scenario analysis.</p> <p>A webinar was held on June 3rd to cover this material. Staff engaged participants on the call for feedback regarding next steps.</p> <p>Next Steps: Additional analysis including Urban Center interviews and case studies will be completed as part of the Metro Vision 2040 update.</p>
10/16/13	1/15/2014; 2/19/2014	Metro Vision 2040 Project Update	Informational	<p>Status: DRCOG updated MVPAC on recent and upcoming activities.</p> <p>Next Steps: Numerous upcoming activities, including: Metro Vision Idea Exchanges, focus groups, Boomer Bond training and workshop, etc.</p>
1/15/2014		Regional Equity Atlas	Informational	<p>Status: The regional equity atlas 2.0 has been launched. DRCOG provided MVPAC with an overview of the web based tool on 1/15/2014.</p> <p>Next Steps: n/a</p>
3/19/2014		Community Health and Wellness – Metro Vision 2040 Exploration		<p>Status: DRCOG has retained consultants to assist with exploring the topic of Community Health and Wellness. An issue paper has been prepared for review.</p> <p>Next Steps: Share issue paper and findings with MVPAC.</p>