

AGENDA

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Monday, March 28, 2016

1:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, West side

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. February 22, 2016 TAC Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)

ACTION ITEM

4. Discussion on the project selection process for the *Traffic Signal System Improvement Program (TSSIP)* and *Regional Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Deployment Program* Miscellaneous Equipment call for projects.
(Attachment B) Greg MacKinnon

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

5. Discussion of CDOT Region 1 Regional Priority Program (RPP) projects for the *FY 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*.
(Attachment C) Todd Cottrell and CDOT staff
6. Discussion on policies and information requirements related to HOV/Toll/Managed Lanes.
(Attachment D) Jacob Riger
7. Discussion of the 2016 DRCOG Federal Certification Review.
(Attachment E) Steve Cook

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

8. Member Comment/Other Matters
9. Next Meeting – April 25, 2016
10. Adjournment

Persons in need of auxiliary aids or services, such as interpretation services or assisted listening devices, are asked to contact DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (303) 480-6744.



ATTACHMENT A

**MEETING SUMMARY
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Monday, February 22, 2016**

MEMBERS (OR VOTING ALTERNATES) PRESENT:

Kent Moorman (Alternate)	Adams County – City of Thornton
Kimberly Dall	Adams County – City of Brighton
Travis Greiman	Arapahoe County-City of Centennial
Dave Chambers	Arapahoe County –City of Aurora
Tom Reed	Aviation
Heather Balsler	Boulder County-City of Lafayette
George Gerstle	Boulder County
Debra Baskett	Broomfield, City and County
Steve Klausing	Business/Economic Development
Jeff Sudmeier (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation, DTD
Keith Sheaffer (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation, Reg. 4
David Gaspers	Denver, City and County
Ryan Billings (Alternate)	Denver, City and County
Doug Rex	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Art Griffith	Douglas County
John Cotten	Douglas County-City of Lone Tree
Rick Pilgrim	Environmental
Greg Fischer	Freight
Bob Manwaring (Chair)	Jefferson County-City of Arvada
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Lenna Kottke	Non-RTD Transit
Ken Lloyd	Regional Air Quality Council
Bill Sirois (Alternate)	Regional Transportation District
Aylene McCallum	TDM/Nonmotor
Dick Leffler	Weld County, City of Frederick

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bryan Weimer (Alternate)	Arapahoe County
Mac Callison (Alternate)	Arapahoe County, City of Aurora
Flo Raitano (Alternate)	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Mike Salisbury (Alternate)	Environmental
Dave Baskett (Alternate)	Jefferson County-City of Lakewood
Kate Cooke (Alternate)	Regional Air Quality Council
Brian Allem (Alternate)	Senior
Aaron Bustow (Ex Officio Alternate)	FHWA

Public: Tony DeVito, Richard Zamora, CDOT Reg. 1; Karen Schneiders, CDOT Reg. 4;
Kelsey Relph, Infrastructure Engineers

DRCOG staff: Steve Cook, Todd Cottrell, Robert Spotts, Jacob Riger, Matthew Helfant,
Mark Northrop, Will Soper, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Chair Bob Manwaring called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m. Several new committee members or alternates (as of January, 2016) were introduced: 1.) *Member-Environmental Interests*: Rick Pilgrim, HDR Engineering Inc.; 2.) *Alternate-Senior Interests*: Brian Allem, DRMAC; and 3.) *Alternate-CDOT Region 4*: Keith Sheaffer.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Summary of January 25, 2016 Meeting

The meeting summary was accepted, with a correction to note addition of new Non-RTD Alternate, Hank Braaksma, as of January, 2016.

ACTION ITEMS

Discussion on 2015 Cycle 2 amendments to the 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan, along with the 2015 Cycle 2 Amendments to the Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination and the 2015 Cycle 2 Amendments to the CO and PM10 Conformity Determination, concurrently.

Jacob Riger presented the proposed 2015 Cycle 2 amendments to the 2040 RTP, which are primarily modifications to projects already in the 2040 RTP. The proposed amendments were reflected in modeled networks and passed all pollutant emission budget tests. A public hearing was held on January 20, 2016 and one speaker provided oral/written testimony.

Sponsor	Project Location	Current RTP Project Description	Type of Change to the FC-2035-RTP	Model Network Staging Period
CDOT	<u>C-470 (New Managed Toll Express Lanes):</u> • EB: Wadsworth Blvd. to I-25	Advance eastbound segment (1 new lane from Wadsworth Blvd. to Platte Canyon Rd.) to 2015-2024 stage		2015 – 2024
CDOT	<u>I-70 (New Managed Lanes):</u> • I-25 to Chambers Rd. (1 new lane in each direction)	Change scope from 2 managed lanes in each direction (Brighton Blvd. to I-270) to 1 managed lane in each direction (I-25 to Chambers Rd.)		2015 – 2024
Commerce City	Pena Blvd./Tower Rd.	Not in 2040 RTP	Construct missing on-ramp to WB Pena Blvd.	2015 – 2024
Commerce City	Tower Rd.: Pena Blvd. to 104 th Ave.	Widen 2 to 6 lanes (2015-2024 stage)	Change widening to 2 to 4 lanes (2015-2024 stage); add widening to 4 to 6 lanes (2025-2034 stage)	2015 – 2024 2025 – 2034
E-470 Authority	E-470: Parker Rd. to Quincy Ave.	Widen 4 to 6 lanes (2025-2034 stage)	Advance to 2015-2024 stage	2015 – 2024
Jefferson County	<u>McIntyre St.:</u> • 44 th Ave. to 52nd Ave. • 52nd Ave. to 60th Ave.	Not in 2040 RTP	Add project: widen 2 to 4 lanes	2015 – 2024
Jefferson County	Quincy Ave.: C-470 to Simms St.	Widen 2 to 4 lanes (2025-2034 stage)	Advance to 2015-2024 stage	2015 – 2024
Wheat Ridge	Wadsworth Blvd.: 35 th Ave. to 48 th Ave.	Widen 4 to 6 lanes (2025-2034 stage)	Advance to 2015-2024 stage	2015 – 2024

There was no further discussion.

Steve Klausing MOVED to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the 2015 Cycle 2 amendments to the *2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan*, along with the *2015 Cycle 2 Amendments to the Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination* and the *2015 Cycle 2 Amendments to the CO and PM10 Conformity Determination*, concurrently. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Discussion on amendments to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Todd Cottrell presented the three amendments requested.

Sponsor	TIP ID	Proposed Amendment	
CDOT	2012-043	I-25/Arapahoe Rd Interchange Reconstruction	Move project into the current 2016-2021 TIP. Add \$7.2 million RAMP funding. Adjusted prior funding to reflect prior spending. This is a requirement to bring the project to advertisement for construction.
Arapahoe Cty.	2012-087	Arapahoe Rd and Yosemite St Intersection Operational Improvements	Move project into current 2016-2021 TIP. This is a companion project to the above project (2012-043). Due to its proximity, CDOT plans to bring both projects to advertisement for construction at the same time.
CDOT	New Project	RoadX Pool	Create pool to fund 2 technologically innovative pilot projects (I-25 Managed Motorway and I-70 Connected Vehicles) with \$18.8 million in Transportation Commission contingency funding.

Steve Klausing spoke in support of all requests.

John Cotton MOVED to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the amendments to the *2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Discussion of Environmental Justice (EJ) definitions to be used in MPO planning processes.

Robert Spotts presented on staff's preparation of a report, *Status and Impacts of DRCOG Transportation Planning and Programming with Environmental Justice*.

To lay groundwork for the report, staff is reevaluating how geographies of EJ are defined, based on levels of concentration. He noted there is no prescribed methodology for MPOs to use besides a focus on minority and low-income areas. DRCOG historically uses TAZs (transportation analysis zones) as a basis. In the DRCOG region, EJ areas are currently defined as TAZs above the regional level for either *minority population* (above 33%) or *poverty status* (above 11%). TAZs with populations under 20 people are excluded.

There was some discussion on how geographic EJ areas are defined and on how stringent a TAZ threshold should be. Various options were presented.

Comments

- George Gerstle said the location of a project as it relates to a certain population doesn't necessarily tell you who benefits or is impacted by a project.
- George Gerstle, noting the housing crisis, said to take into consideration both where EJ populations work and live.
- Ryan Billings asked how many TIP projects qualified for EJ designation in last cycle. (Staff research showed 50% of all submitted projects received EJ points.)

- Mac Callison asked if there are any guidelines to differentiate for temporal situations; e.g., college students, etc. Staff said it is difficult to differentiate, as income and housing is so mixed. Staff said the new EJ report will delve more into this area.
- John Cotton suggested looking at households that have fulltime working people (noting Douglas County projected increase in retirees).
- Kimberly Dall suggested using the H+T Index (housing and transportation costs) as it would tie to Metro Vision.
- Lenna Kottke recommended decoupling *minority population* and *poverty status*.

Discussion of 2016-2021 TIP Review White Paper.

Doug Rex presented a summary of the TIP Review White Paper. The white paper was requested by the Board in August 2015 to address issues associated with the 2016-2021 TIP process. Per the Board's direction, a work group was formed to develop the document. The white paper was presented to the Board on February 17.

Recommendations made in the white paper include: develop a project selection process purpose statement for the TIP; further explore the regional/ subregional dual project selection model; create a project selection process that places more emphasis on project benefits, overall value and return on investment; explore opportunities to exchange CDOT state funds with DRCOG federal funds; and evaluate off-the-top programs and projects.

The Board further directed the work group to continue exploration of the dual model and the recommendations made in the white paper, with no specific timeline assigned. The work group is expected to resume in early April.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Member Comment/Other Matters

Aaron Bustow, FHWA, announced the public meeting on the DRCOG Federal Quadrennial Certification will be held March 28 (5:00 pm) in Independence Pass Conference Room after the TAC meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:39 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for March 28, 2016.

ATTACHMENT B

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Greg MacKinnon, Regional Transportation Operations Program Manager
303-480-5633 or gmacKinnon@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 28, 2016	Action	4

SUBJECT

This item describes the proposed project selection process to allocate fiscal year 2016 and 2017 federal funds for contingency and Multimodal Signal Operations Support identified in the *Traffic Signal System Improvement Program (TSSIP)* and the *Regional Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Deployment Program*.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

DRCOG staff recommends approval of the proposed miscellaneous equipment project selection process.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The [Traffic Signal System Improvement Program \(TSSIP\)](#) [adopted September 2013] and the [Regional Intelligent Transportation System \(ITS\) Deployment Program](#) [adopted June 2014] both identify contingency funds to ensure the programs' capital improvements are fully funded. After any contingencies are satisfied, the remaining funding is available to purchase needed "miscellaneous" equipment. In addition, the TSSIP program identifies funding for Multimodal Signal Operations Support.

Staff proposes issuing a combined call for applications (Attachment 1) to allocate funds for "miscellaneous" equipment for TSSIP, ITS and Multimodal Signal Operations Support projects. The following funding is available by program category:

	FY16	FY17	Total
TSSIP	\$435,000	\$328,000	\$763,000
Multimodal Signal Operations Support		\$356,000	\$356,000
ITS	\$127,300	\$513,700	\$641,000
			\$1,760,000

"Miscellaneous" equipment allocations are to be used for equipment purchases only. Design and equipment installation is NOT eligible for funding. Installation must be performed by operating agency staff or contractors with no federal participation. The installed equipment must advance the Regional Traffic Operations (RTO) goals and initiatives and must be procured and installed within 12 months of award.

The funding source is the federal Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) program and is programmed for regional transportation operations. As such, projects must be located

on the DRCOG-designated Regional Roadway System and must demonstrate and report emission reduction benefits. In addition, the project implementation process must conform to the System Engineering Analysis process defined in the *Code of Federal Regulations, Title 23, Part 940—[Intelligent Transportation System Architecture and Standards](#)*. The risk assessment (Attachment 2) and the project sheet (Attachment 3) are critical minimum elements of the systems engineering requirement and, as such, are incorporated in the application process. The project sponsor is responsible for conforming throughout the rest of the implementation. This includes the provision of a Concept of Operations that must be completed prior to the application to be considered for allocation.

Specific priorities for project implementation were used to develop the TSSIP and ITS programs. Those priorities (Attachments 4 and 5) will be used to rank funding requests for traffic signal system-related equipment and ITS-related equipment. For the Multimodal Signal Operations Support requests, ranking will be based on the benefit-to-cost ratio determined by the project sponsor and affirmed by both DRCOG staff and the RTO Working Group.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the Board of Directors the proposed miscellaneous equipment project selection process for fiscal year 2016 and 2017 federal funds identified in the *Traffic Signal System Improvement Program (TSSIP)* and the *Regional Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Deployment Program*.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Call for Applications information
2. Project Risk Assessment Form
3. Application Project Sheet
4. Draft TSSIP MEPP Prioritization Table
5. Draft ITS MEPP Prioritization Table

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Greg MacKinnon, Regional Transportation Operations Program Manager, at 303-480-5633 or gmackinnon@drcog.org.

ATTACHMENT 1

Call for Applications information

FY 16/17 Regional Transportation Operations Miscellaneous Equipment

Introduction

This is the fiscal year 2016 and 2017 (FY16/17) call for applications for the following:

- TSSIP miscellaneous equipment procurement
- ITS Pool miscellaneous equipment procurement
- Multimodal signal support procurement

The miscellaneous equipment procurement funds are first contingency funds to ensure the completion of the capital projects for each fiscal year. Remaining contingency funds at the end of the fiscal year fund the call for equipment procurement. The miscellaneous equipment procurement funds available are:

- TSSIP miscellaneous funds: \$438,000 [FY16] plus \$328,000 [FY17]
- ITS Pool miscellaneous funds: \$127,300 [FY16] plus \$513,700 [FY17]
- Multimodal signal operations support funds amount to \$356,000 [FY17]

These projects must advance the goals and initiatives identified in the DRCOG *Regional Concept of Transportation Operations* (RCTO), and must be responsive to the requirements below.

CDOT will administer the execution of these projects. Federal allocations of less than \$100,000 will be administered under CDOT's Purchase Order process. Other projects will be administered as IGAs. Regular Local Agency Manual processes will apply, which includes reporting the congestion and air quality benefits of the implemented project.

Eligibility

Project requests may only be directed to one source of funds identified above. These funds are designated to support operations projects. As such, the project locations must be on the Regional Roadway System or be contained in the Denver downtown core (bounded by I-25, I-70 and Colorado Boulevard).

The funds are to be used for equipment purchases only. Design and equipment installation is NOT eligible for funding. Installation must be performed by operating agency staff or contractors with no federal participation. All equipment purchased will be owned, operated, and maintained by the operating agency. The installed equipment must advance the RTO goals and initiatives and must be procured and installed within 12 months.

TSSIP Miscellaneous

TSSIP funds are eligible for 100% federal share.

ATTACHMENT 1

Call for Applications information

These projects must be consistent with the current update of the *DRCOG Traffic Signal System Improvement Program* (TSSIP).

TSSIP funds are designated for signal improvements that promote and support coordinated signal timing operations. Corridors that were retimed before **2013** and have an average signal spacing no greater than ½ mile are eligible for funding.

ITS Pool Miscellaneous

The ITS Pool funds require a minimum 20% local match.

These projects must be consistent with the current update of the *DRCOG Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems Deployment Program*.

ITS Pool funds are designated for technology projects that promote and support improved regional transportation operations.

Multimodal Signal Operations Support

Multimodal signal operations support funds are eligible for 100% federal share.

The multimodal signal operations support funds are designated for traffic signal improvements that support multimodal operations. As these funds were identified as part of the TSSIP program, the eligibility requirements for that program govern.

Submission Requirements

When putting your request together, you are encouraged to think in terms of discrete geographic-based projects (e.g., along corridors or zones) on Principal Arterial roadways and above. Isolated requests should be listed as separate projects. Applicants are not restricted in the number of projects that can be submitted. Each application must consist of:

- Completed application form (risk analysis and systems engineering project sheet)
- Project location map
- Concept of operations (or reference to existing document)
- Estimate of annual congestion and air quality benefits due to project*
- Projected schedule milestones*:
 - Procurement initiated
 - Procurement complete
 - Installation complete
 - Project complete

*Included on systems engineering project sheet.

ATTACHMENT 1

Call for Applications information

Evaluation Process

DRCOG staff will evaluate the applications separately for each source of funds.

TSSIP Miscellaneous

The TSSIP Miscellaneous projects will be evaluated against the attached project priority table. Projects will be ranked by priority and funding will be allocated to that priority until it is exhausted. In the event that projects within a priority level exceed total available funding, the evaluation will consider additional criteria provided on the priority table to further prioritize projects within the priority level.

ITS Pool Miscellaneous

The ITS Pool Miscellaneous projects will be evaluated against the attached project priority table. Projects will be ranked by priority and funding will be allocated to that priority until it is exhausted. In the event that projects within a priority level exceed total available funding, the evaluation will consider additional criteria provided on the priority table to further prioritize projects within the priority level.

Multimodal Signal Operations Support

Multimodal signal operations projects will be ranked based on the benefit/cost ratio derived from the estimated congestion benefits divided by the federal request. Funding will be allocated to that priority list until it is exhausted.

DRCOG staff recommendations will be presented for confirmation as follows:

- RTO Working Group JUN22-16
- DRCOG TAC JUL25-16
- DRCOG RTC AUG16-16
- DRCOG Board AUG17-16

Reporting Requirements

All three calls use Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) program funds. As such, post-implementation project benefits must be reported for the projects. For the TSSIP Miscellaneous and the Multimodal Signal Operations Support – improvements in the efficiency and reliability of traffic signal timing – DRCOG staff will assist with the implementation of an optimized signal timing coordination plan to measure the project benefits. For the ITS Pool Miscellaneous, the project sponsor is responsible determining the project benefits.

Please complete and submit your application form(s) to DRCOG no later than 12:00 PM, Friday, May 27, 2016, Attn: Jerry Luor (jlur@drcog.org). Please contact me directly if you need additional information or have any questions.

ATTACHMENT 2

DRCOG ITS Project Risk Assessment Form

Which of the following best describes the *Level of New Development* for this project?

1. No new software development / exclusively based on COTS software and hardware or based on existing, proven software and hardware.
2. Primarily COTS software / hardware or existing software / hardware based with some new software development or new functionality added to existing software—evolutionary development.
3. New software development for new system, replacement system, or major system expansion including use of COTS software. Implementation of new COTS hardware.
4. Revolutionary development—entirely new software development including integration with COTS or existing legacy system software. Implementation of new COTS hardware or even prototype hardware.

Rationale:

Answer Number: []

Which of the following best describes the *Scope and Breadth of Technologies* for this project?

1. Application of proven, well-known, and commercially available technology. Small scope both in terms of technology implementation (e.g., only CCTV or DMS system) and size of implementation (i.e. pilot project). Typically implemented under a single stand-alone project, which may or may not be part of a larger multiple phase implementation effort.
2. Primary application of proven, well-known, and commercially available technology. May include non-traditional use of existing technology(ies). Moderate scope in terms of technology implementation (e.g., multiple technologies implemented, but typically no more than two or three). May be single stand-alone project, or may be part of multiple-phase implementation effort.
3. Application of new software / hardware along with some implementation of cutting-edge software, hardware, or communication technology. Wide scope in terms of technologies to be implemented. Projects are implemented in multiple phases.
4. New software development combined with new hardware configurations / components, use of cutting-edge hardware and/or communications technology. Very broad scope of technologies to be implemented. Projects are implemented in multiple phases.

Rationale:

Answer Number: []

DRCOG ITS Project Risk Assessment Form

Which of the following best describes the need for *Interfaces to Other Systems* for this project?

1. Single system or small expansion of existing system deployment. No interfaces to external systems or system interfaces are well known (duplication of existing interfaces).
2. System implementation includes one or two major subsystems. May involve significant expansion of existing system. System interfaces are well known and based primarily on duplicating existing interfaces.
3. System implementation includes three or more major subsystems. System interfaces are largely well known but includes one or more interfaces to new and/or existing systems / databases.
4. System implementation includes three or more major subsystems. System requires two or more interfaces to new and/or existing internal/external systems and plans for interfaces to “future” systems.

Rationale:

Answer Number: []

Which of the following best describes the need to account for *Requirements Fluidity* during development of this project?

1. System requirements are very well defined, understood, and unlikely to change over time (i.e. standard equipment)
2. System requirements are largely well defined and understood. Addition of new system functionality may require more attention to requirements management.
3. New system functionality includes a mix of well-defined, somewhat-defined, and fuzzy requirements. System implementation requires adherence to formal requirements management processes.
4. System requirements not well defined, understood, and very likely to change over time. Requires strict adherence to formal requirements management processes.

Rationale:

Answer Number: []

Which of the following best describes the need to account for *Technology Evolution* during the expected life of this project?

1. Need to account for technology evolution perceived as minor. Example would be to deploy hardware and software that is entirely compatible with an existing COTS-based system. Ramifications of not paying particular attention to standards considered minor. System implemented expected to have moderate to long useful life.

DRCOG ITS Project Risk Assessment Form

2. Need to account for technology evolution perceived as an issue to address. Example includes desire for interoperable hardware from multiple vendors. Ramifications of not paying particular attention to standards may be an issue, as an agency may get locked into a proprietary solution. Field devices expected to have moderate to long useful life. Center hardware life expectancy is short to moderate. Control software is expected to have moderate to long life.
3. Need to account for technology evolution perceived as a significant issue. Examples might include implementation of software that can accommodate new hardware with minimal to no modification and interoperable hardware. Ramifications of not using standards based technology are considerable (costs for upgrades, new functions, etc.) Field devices expected to have moderate to long useful life. Center hardware life expectancy is short to moderate. Control software is expected to have an extendable useful life.
4. Need to account for technology evolution perceived as major issue. Examples include software that can easily accommodate new functionality and/or changes in hardware and hardware that can be easily expanded (e.g., add peripherals), maintained, and is interoperable. Ramifications of not using standards-based technology are considerable (costs for upgrades, new functions, etc.). Field devices expected to have moderate to long useful life. Center hardware life expectancy is short to moderate. Control software is expected to have an extendable useful life.

Rationale:

Answer Number: []

Which of the following best describes the potential impact of **Institutional Issues** with ITS projects?

1. Minimal—Project implementation involves one agency and is typically internal to a particular department within the agency.
2. Minor—May involve coordination between two agencies. Formal agreements not necessarily required, but if so, agreements are already in place.
3. Significant—Involves coordination among multiple agencies and/or multiple departments within an agency or amongst agencies. Formal agreements for implementing project may be required.
4. Major—Involves coordination among multiple agencies, departments, and disciplines. Requires new formal agreements.

Rationale:

Answer Number: []

Which of the following best describes the lead agency's **Experience and Resources** with ITS projects?

ATTACHMENT 2

DRCOG ITS Project Risk Assessment Form

1. Major—Lead agency has experience with the implementation and operation of large scale ITS projects. The agency has dedicated staff responsible for the design, implementation, operations and maintenance for ITS.
2. Significant—Lead agency has experience with the implementation and operation of large scale ITS projects. The agency has staff responsible for the design, implementation, operations and maintenance for ITS, but do not devote 100% of their time to that work.
3. Minor—Lead agency has experience with the implementation and operation of small scale ITS projects. The agency has staff responsible for the operations and maintenance for ITS, but do not devote 100% of their time to that work. This staff may or may not be involved in design and implementation.
4. Minimal—Lead agency has no experience with the implementation and operation of ITS projects or has been involved in small scale ITS project implementation. The agency has no staff responsible for the operations and maintenance for ITS or has staff that devote less than 25% of their time to that activity.

Rationale:

Answer Number: []

ITS Project Level Score (Answer Number Total): []

Risk Level	Low	Medium	High
ITS Project Level Score	7–10	11–18	19–28

*This form is adapted from *NCHRP Report 560, Guide to Contracting ITS Projects*

DRCOG Systems Engineering Project Sheet

Submittal Checklist

Project Assessed Risk is **LOW**

- CDOT Systems Engineering Analysis Checklist (this form)
- CDOT ITS Project Risk Assessment Form

Project Assessed Risk is **MEDIUM**

- CDOT Systems Engineering Analysis Checklist (this form)
- CDOT ITS Project Risk Assessment Form
- Concept of Operations
- Project Turbo Architecture File (prepared by maintainer of regional ITS architecture)

Project Assessed Risk is **HIGH**

- CDOT Systems Engineering Analysis Checklist (this form)
- CDOT ITS Project Risk Assessment Form
- Concept of Operations
- Project Plan
- Project Turbo Architecture File (prepared by maintainer of regional ITS architecture)

Select Miscellaneous Equipment Funding Opportunity

- Traffic Signal System Improvement Program (TSSIP)
- Multimodal Signal Operations Support
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Pool (requires at least 20% match of non-federal funds)

Project Priority

For TSSIP and ITS Pool applications, please enter the applicable project priority (number and letter, as necessary).

Traffic Signal System Improvement Program project priority

Intelligent Transportation System Pool project priority

DRCOG Systems Engineering Project Sheet

Section 1 Project Information

Contact

Name:

Phone:

E-Mail:

Project Title

Project Number

New Project

Modification to existing project

Project Description

Project Location

(attach map)

Estimated Project Dates

Start Date:

End Date:

Project Estimate

(attach details)

State \$

Federal \$

Non-federal \$

Total \$

Nature of Work

 Scoping Design Software / Integration Construction Operations

 Evaluation Planning Maintenance (Equipment Replacement) Other

If Other Explain:

Relationship to other projects and phases

Section 2 Needs/Benefits Assessment

What needs does this project address?

Include explanation of project's advancement of RCTO goals/initiatives

How were these needs identified?

 Internal Agency Assessment Stakeholder Involvement Study Other

Attach any relevant documentation / meeting notes

DRCOG Systems Engineering Project Sheet

What are the projected operations benefits?

Estimate the reduction in person-hours of travel (PHT) and criteria emissions

Section 3 Regional ITS Architecture

For medium and high risk projects, provide a description of how this project fits into the appropriate regional ITS architecture (with specific references to the specific regional ITS architecture plan):

Regional Architectures impacted by the project:

- Statewide
 DRCOG (Region 6)
 Region 1 & 2
 Region 4
 Region 3 & 5
 Other:

Changes recommended to CDOT / Regional Architectures due to the project? No Yes

If Yes Provide Detail:

Section 4 Alternatives Analysis

Describe the alternative concepts/ideas considered and how the best alternative was selected.

Section 5 Key Systems Engineering Documents

Project Matrix – Documentation (attach existing documents)

	Existing	To be Modified	To be Completed	Comments:
Concept of Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
System Functional Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Detailed Design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Operations & Maintenance Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Testing and Evaluation Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Section 6 Procurement

Procurement method **Check all that apply

DRCOG Systems Engineering Project Sheet

- Construction Contract
 Request for Proposal
 Invitation to Bid
 State Price Agreement Contract
 Other

Project Key Dates:

(start and end of design; start and end of procurement; start and end of installation; project end date)

Comments:

List equipment to be purchased with project funding

Section 7 Operations and Maintenance

Procedures and resources needed for operation and maintenance

Estimated annual operations and maintenance costs

Identify both the stakeholder responsible for maintenance and the funding source

Section 8 Agreements

List any agreements needed or utilized for this project

Section 9 Project Summary Documents

	Complete	Date:	Comments:
Benefits Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Completed Testing and Evaluation Plan*	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Revised Concept of Operations (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Revised System Functional Requirements (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Revised Operations &	<input type="checkbox"/>		

DRCOG Systems Engineering Project Sheet

Maintenance Plan (if applicable)			
Intergovernmental Agreements (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Lessons Learned	<input type="checkbox"/>		

* Low risk projects require e-mail to party responsible for maintaining the relevant ITS architecture

ATTACHMENT 4

**2016 TSSIP Miscellaneous
Prioritization Table**

Priority Level	Priority Justifications
1	<p>Purchases to assure proper operation of existing traffic signal systems, in descending priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Replacement of equipment that is obsolete/incompatible or has a demonstrated history of poor reliability. b. Replace/upgrade communications equipment/system where existing communication has a demonstrated history of poor reliability. <p>The application must illustrate how the equipment is obsolete/incompatible and/or document history of poor reliability.</p>
2	<p>Purchases to extend the reach of traffic signal system control to locations not currently under system control (operating agency must already have an operational system to which the proposed locations would be added), in descending priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Installation of controller (and related) equipment. b. Installation of communications equipment.
3	<p>Purchases to install uninterruptable power supply (UPS) at signalized intersections where existing power has a demonstrated history of poor reliability.</p> <p>The application must document history of poor reliability.</p>
4	<p>Purchases that facilitate coordinated traffic signal operations across multiple agencies, in descending priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improvements in or expansion of the shared (inter-agency) communications network. b. Improvements in inter-agency data sharing. c. Improvements in performance measures reporting. d. Improvements in shared monitoring between jurisdictions. e. Improvements in coordination and integration of multi-modal traveler information. <p>The operating agency must demonstrate significant commitment from all stakeholders.</p>
5	<p>Purchases that upgrade beyond base level signal control for agencies migrating from a base-function control system with an already-owned higher-function control system, in descending priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Upgrading agency-owned communication, which is incompatible with the higher-function system. b. Migrating from leased to agency-owned communication, if required by the higher-function system. c. Deploying system detector equipment to support adaptive traffic control improvements. d. Implementing higher system functions at traffic signal controller locations to support operation improvements for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit at signalized intersections or crossings.
6	<p>Purchases that enhance systems operational capabilities, in descending priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Upgrading to newer/higher version of existing system software or upgrading beyond base level signal control. The jurisdiction must define in the application the functions/features determined to be necessary that are not available in the current signal system. b. Advancement of traffic signal system management to support bicycle and pedestrian operations. c. Deploying TSP equipment on transit vehicles.

2016 TSSIP Miscellaneous Prioritization Table

Notes: Traffic control signalization projects are counted among select safety projects that are eligible for an increased federal share.

Eligible projects are those that are:

- Focus on traffic control signalization
- Improve inter-agency signal timing coordination
- Located on Principal Arterials and higher
- Corridors that have not implemented new signal timing with DRCOG traffic operations program assistance since 2012

Poor Reliability = Equipment has a documented history of failures or malfunctions that impact corridor coordination. **Documentation that illustrates both failure/malfunction and the consequent impact on coordinated signal operations and travel time reliability. The threshold is an impact on four or more peak periods in one month.**

In the event that projects within a priority level exceed total available funding, the evaluation will consider the following criteria:

1. Foremost, the congestion and air quality benefits of installing equipment must be documented by either a signal timing project or similarly credible benefits analysis. Projects that anticipate positive congestion and air quality benefits are considered more critical.
2. Other factors that will be considered:
 - a. projects with a signal spacing of ½ mile or less are considered more critical; and,
 - b. projects on corridors that have not been retimed in less than 4 years are more critical.
 - c. projects on corridors with a higher congestion grade in the *DRCOG Congestion Management Process (CMP)* are considered more critical;
 - d. projects on corridors and at intersections with poor safety performance scores in the *Report on Transportation Safety in the Denver Region* are more critical; and,
 - e. projects on corridors within a ½ mile of a planned transit park-n-Ride are considered more critical.
3. Projects will be examined to determine feasibility of splitting into more than one project.
4. Relevant applicants will be contacted, if necessary, to further ascertain their priorities and perspectives.

Last Update: 10/09/15

ATTACHMENT 5

**2016 ITS Pool Miscellaneous
Prioritization Table**

Priority Level	Priority Justifications
1	<p>Purchases that facilitate coordinated operations across multiple agencies, in descending priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improvement in regional traffic incident management b. Improvements in or expansion of the shared (inter-agency) communications network. c. Improvements in inter-agency data sharing. d. Improvements in performance measures reporting. e. Improvements in shared monitoring between jurisdictions. f. Improvements in coordination and integration of multi-modal traveler information. <p>The operating agency must demonstrate significant commitment from all stakeholders.</p>
2	<p>Purchases that extend traffic monitoring infrastructure, in descending priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Arterials b. Freeways <p>The operating agency will follow CDOT's <i>Regional Integrated Traveler Information Display Guidelines</i> and will commit to efforts (following/establishing regional standards and implementing CTMS software modifications, as necessary) to share data produced by the project with CDOT's CTMS.</p> <p>The operating agency must coordinate to share monitoring data (and access) with at least CDOT and potentially other neighbors. The operating agency must demonstrate significant commitment from all stakeholders.</p>
3	<p>Purchases that improve work zone/special event management, in descending priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improvements in Regional Traveler Information coordination. b. Field implementation projects (i.e. work zone management)
4	<p>Purchases that enhance systems operational capabilities, in descending priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Deploying CCTV field equipment at traffic signal controller locations. b. Deploying Road-Weather Stations.

ATTACHMENT 5

2016 ITS Pool Miscellaneous Prioritization Table

- Notes:** In the event that projects within a priority level exceed total available funding, the evaluation will consider the following criteria:
1. Foremost, the congestion and air quality benefits of installing equipment must be documented by either a signal timing project or similar before-after analysis. Projects that anticipate positive congestion and air quality benefits are considered more critical.
 2. Projects that assist the DRCOG region in achieving the *Denver Regional Concept of Transportation Operations* (RCTO) goals and objectives are considered more critical, in descending order of priority:
 - a. Improvements focused on incident management coordination (active management).
 - b. Improvements focused on performance monitoring.
 - c. Improvements focused on shared monitoring (active monitoring).
 3. Other factors that will be considered:
 - a. projects on corridors with a higher congestion grade in the *DRCOG Congestion Management Process* (CMP) are considered more critical;
 - b. projects on corridors and at intersections with poor safety performance scores in the *Report on Transportation Safety in the Denver Region* are more critical; and,
 - c. projects on corridors within a ½ mile of a planned transit park-n-Ride are considered more critical.
 4. Projects will be examined to determine feasibility of splitting into more than one project.
 5. Relevant applicants will be contacted, if necessary, to further ascertain their priorities and perspectives.
- * Equipment that is used mainly for traffic signal coordination purposes can be considered for 100% federal funds.

Last Update: 09/23/15

ATTACHMENT C

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner
303-480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 28, 2016	Information	5

SUBJECT

CDOT Region 1 proposed FY2019 and FY2020 Regional Priority Program (RPP) projects.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The purpose of this agenda item is to solicit TAC comments on CDOT Region 1 proposed FY2019 and FY2020 Regional Priority Program (RPP) projects.

A representative from CDOT Region 1 will present and receive comments on the proposed projects. A list of the proposed (FY 19-20) RPP projects is attached.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

1. Proposed CDOT Region 1 projects with RPP funding in FY2019 and 2020.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner at (303) 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.

ATTACHMENT 1

New CDOT Region 1 RPP-Funded Projects

DRAFT - March 2016

Proposed Projects	FY2019	FY2020
I-25: Santa Fe and Alameda Reconstruction		\$ 3,000,000
I-25: Monument to Castle Rock Post PEL, NEPA, Design	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
I-70 Slip Ramp and Transit Center Connection (Idaho Springs)*	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000
Mount Evans Summit Lake Frost Heave Repair*		\$ 1,000,000
RPP Unassigned		
Small CDOT projects		\$ 2,000,000
Devolutions		\$ 1,766,875
Potential Local Agency Match for DRCOG Projects		\$ 3,000,000
Total	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 16,766,875

*outside the MPO area, but within CDOT Region 1

ATTACHMENT D

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Jacob Riger, Transportation Planning Coordinator
303-480-6751 or jriger@drco.org.

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 28, 2016	Information	6

SUBJECT

This item continues TAC's January discussion about how DRCOG could address High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV), managed lanes, and toll highway policies in its transportation planning process.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

[July 2, 2014](#) – MVIC

SUMMARY

At its January meeting, TAC provided initial input regarding two components of potentially developing an HOV and managed lanes policy at the regional or project levels: 1) CDOT's new HOV policy; and 2) updates to DRCOG information requirements for tolled projects proposed for inclusion in the *Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan* (FC-RTP).

This agenda item will continue the conversation, and staff will seek TAC guidance on two specific topics:

1. Whether the DRCOG Board should develop an overall HOV and managed lanes policy at the regional level.
2. Proposed revisions to DRCOG's FC-RTP information requirements for tolled projects (Attachments 1 and 2).

Topic #1: If DRCOG wishes to establish a specific policy regarding the accommodation of HOVs on public roadway managed/tolled facilities, there are several considerations:

- How should the policy apply? Only for DRCOG-funded/selected projects and associated actions, such as the 2040 MVRTP, TIP, etc.? Or, also apply to projects and facilities funded by other agencies, such as CDOT/HPTE?
- Should a blanket policy apply solely for all future facilities, or on a case-by-case basis (i.e., corridor by corridor)?
- Should the policy be the basis for Board "support" or "opposition" to projects? For example, to include in the TIP or not.

The issues raised by these questions (regardless of how one might answer the questions) are important to consider in whether the Board should develop an HOV/managed lanes policy and how/when it would be applied.

Topic #2: As a reminder, per state statutes in 2009 (linked in attachments), DRCOG adopted requirements for additional information to be submitted whenever a project with a tolling component is proposed for inclusion into the FC-RTP (which includes tolling component-related amendments to projects already in the FC-RTP). Attachments 1 and 2 reflect changes to the 2009 requirements. They incorporate TAC input received in January and other updates. Attachment 1 also incorporates CDOT's HOV policy.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

January 25, 2016 - TAC

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft revised CTE/HPTE additional information requirements for FC-RTP project submittals or amendments with a tolling component
 - a. [Link](#) to track changes version
2. Draft revised Non-HPTE additional information requirements for FC-RTP project submittals or amendments with a tolling component
 - a. [Link](#) to track changes version

Other Links:

- [CDOT memo and resolution to Transportation Commission regarding High Occupancy Vehicle \(HOV\) Policy Guidance \(October 14, 2015\)](#)
- [C.R.S 43-4-805.5 \(HB05-1148\): CDOT/HPTE toll highway construction MPO review requirements](#)
- [C.R.S. 7-45-105/106 \(HB06-1003\): Private Toll Company toll highway construction MPO review requirements](#)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jacob Riger, Transportation Planning Coordinator, at 303-480-6751 or jriger@drcog.org.

ATTACHMENT 1

DRAFT Additional Information Requirements for Roadway Tolling Projects Proposed by CDOT or the Colorado High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) for Inclusion in the DRCOG Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan

Amended by DRCOG Board TBD, 2016

Projects proposed by CDOT or HPTE with a tolling component for inclusion in the DRCOG Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (FC-RTP) will include base information required of sponsors to support all types of project requests.

The DRCOG Board also requires the information described below be submitted for any project with a tolling component (tolling, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV), and/or related aspects). In particular, C.R.S. 43-4-805.5 (pursuant to HB05-1148) requires that five categories be addressed in HPTE tolling submittals to DRCOG for inclusion in the FC-RTP: operations, technology, project feasibility, project financing, and other federally required information. CDOT/HPTE will submit the following information to DRCOG:

1. Operations – Description of the tolling component of the project, including the following:
 - Pricing Structure: Variable, dynamic, or fixed toll rates
 - Toll Lane Separation: Barrier protected or buffered lanes
 - Access/Egress: Locations of slip ramps to general purpose lanes and “direct connect” ramps to interchanges and/or other toll facilities
 - Relationship to overall regional toll highway system
 - Other unique operational features
2. Technology: Confirmation that the toll facility will not require stopping to pay cash and will use transponders and/or tag readers that are interoperable with the region’s other toll facilities. If this is not the case, please explain.
3. Project Feasibility:
 - Summarize the tolling component’s technical feasibility, including implementation opportunities and constraints at a planning level of detail
 - Provide estimated daily, directional traffic volumes for (as applicable):
 - Base Year General Purpose Lanes
 - Forecast Year General Purpose Lanes
 - Forecast Year Toll Facility
 - Forecast Year Total

ATTACHMENT 1

DRAFT Additional Information Requirements for Roadway Tolling Projects Proposed by CDOT or the Colorado High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) for Inclusion in the DRCOG Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan Amended by DRCOG Board TBD, 2016

4. Project Financing:
 - Capital costs for the project with major components and key assumptions, including inflation and contingencies
 - Operation and maintenance add-ons for the toll facility – costs that are in addition to normal non-toll CDOT roadway O&M – and inflation assumptions
 - Financial assumptions, including non-traditional financing sources and innovative financing
 - Identification of public sector financial responsibility if revenue is not sufficient to meet annual costs after toll facility is built and operating
 - Description of how excess revenues will be allocated, should toll revenues exceed those needed to build, maintain, and operate the facility
5. Any other federally required information, if applicable
6. Other Information and assistance:
 - CDOT HOV Policy (October 2015) – How does the proposed tolling component address CDOT’s HOV Policy and Transportation Commission Resolution (TC-15-10-5) regarding the feasibility of toll-free HOV3+?
 - If the proposed project does not include toll-free HOV, explain why it does not?
 - A summary of the environmental examinations and other studies completed to date and those anticipated in the future with key milestones and timeline.
 - A commitment to follow CDOT environmental stewardship guide during project development, including the identification of impacts and mitigation measures.
 - A summary of consultation with local governments and other MPOs/TPRs completed to date, with issues and resolution; a plan for future additional consultation with local governments and other MPOs/TPRs during project development; and the relationship of the project to local transportation plans.
 - Assistance to DRCOG staff with response to public comment as needed.

ATTACHMENT 2

DRAFT Additional Information Requirements for Non-CDOT/HPTE Roadway Tolling Projects Proposed for Inclusion in the DRCOG Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan

Amended by DRCOG Board TBD, 2016

Projects proposed by non-CDOT/HPTE entities, such as private toll companies or toll highway authorities, for inclusion in the DRCOG Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (FC-RTP) will include base information required of sponsors to support all types of project requests.

In addition, C.R.S. 7-45-105 and 106 (pursuant to HB06-1003) require that five categories be addressed in private toll company submittals to DRCOG for inclusion in the FC-RTP: operating plan, technology, project feasibility, long-term project viability (project financing), and environmental documentation. The project sponsor will submit the following information to DRCOG:

1. Operating plan – Description of the tolling component, including the following:
 - Pricing Structure: Variable, dynamic, or fixed toll rates
 - Toll Lane Separation: Barrier protected or buffered lanes
 - Access/Egress: Locations of slip ramps to general purpose lanes and “direct connect” ramps to interchanges and/or other toll facilities
 - Relationship to overall regional toll highway system
 - Other unique operational features
2. Technology: Confirmation that the toll facility will not require stopping to pay cash and will use transponders and/or tag readers that are interoperable with the region’s other toll facilities. If this is not the case, please explain.
3. Project feasibility:
 - Summarize the tolling component’s technical feasibility, including implementation opportunities and constraints at a planning level of detail
 - Provide estimated daily, directional traffic volumes for (as applicable):
 - Base Year General Purpose Lanes
 - Forecast Year General Purpose Lanes
 - Forecast Year Toll Facility
 - Forecast Year Total
 - Identify any proposed non-compete clauses (probable restrictions on improvements to other roadways or transit facilities)

ATTACHMENT 2

DRAFT Additional Information Requirements for Non-CDOT/HPTE Roadway Tolling Projects Proposed for Inclusion in the DRCOG Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan

Amended by DRCOG Board TBD, 2016

4. Long-term project viability (project financing):
 - Capital costs for the project with major components and key assumptions, including inflation and contingencies
 - Operation and maintenance costs and inflation assumptions for the toll facility
 - Financial assumptions, including non-traditional financing sources and innovative financing.
 - Identify public funding sources or public financing instruments, if applicable
 - Identification of public sector financial responsibility if revenue is not sufficient to meet annual costs after toll facility is built and operating
5. Environmental documentation, including:
 - Description of environmental, social, and economic effects of the proposed toll facility
 - Identification of feasible measures, and cost, to avoid or otherwise mitigate adverse impacts
 - Defined commitment of acceptable environmental mitigation activities and cost
6. Other information and assistance:
 - A summary of studies completed to date and those anticipated in the future with key milestones and timeline
 - A summary of consultation with local governments and other MPOs/TPRs completed to date, with issues and resolution; a plan for future additional consultation with local governments and other MPOs/TPRs during project development; and the relationship of the project to local transportation plans
 - Identify land use assumptions within 5 miles of the toll highway corridor
 - Discuss consideration given to available mitigation of demonstrable negative impacts on the local governments or its citizens
 - Identify commitments to offset incremental costs of public services that will be necessary as a result of development of the project
 - Assist DRCOG staff with response to public comment as needed

ATTACHMENT E

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 #
March 28, 2016	Information	7

SUBJECT

Federal 2016 Quadrennial MPO Planning Certification Review.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

In accordance with the joint planning regulations contained in 23 CFR part 450 subpart C, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) must jointly certify the transportation planning processes in Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) at least every four years. DRCOG coordinates the planning process for the Denver region. The previous certification was completed in October 2012 ([attached link](#)). Significant progress has been made on the recommendations listed in the 2012 report.

The 2016 Planning Certification Review began in November 2015 with a request from FHWA/FTA for information regarding the transportation planning process in the Denver area. With the assistance of its planning partners (CDOT and RTD), DRCOG staff submitted the supporting documentation in January. On February 8, 2016 a site visit and desk review was conducted by FHWA/FTA.

An FHWA/FTA public meeting will be held on March 28, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. to receive comments (Attachment 1).

The purpose of this agenda item is to solicit thoughts and comments from TAC members on the DRCOG transportation planning process as coordinated between DRCOG, RTD, CDOT, and other agencies.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

1. FHWA Notice of March 28, 2016 Public Meeting

Link: [2012 Certification Review Final Report](#)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

Notice of Public Meeting

Federal Transportation Planning Certification Review of the Denver-Aurora Metro Area

The [Federal Highway Administration](#) (FHWA) and the [Federal Transit Administration](#) (FTA) will hold a public meeting in conjunction with their quadrennial review of the transportation planning process in the Denver-Aurora Metro area as administered by the [Denver Regional Council of Governments](#) (DRCOG).

Date: March 28th, 2016
Time: 5:00PM – 7:00PM
Location: Denver Regional Council of Governments
1290 Broadway
Denver, CO 80203
Independence Pass Conference Room, 1st Floor

The [Fixing America's Surface Transportation \(FAST\) Act of 2015](#) requires the FHWA and the FTA to review and certify the [transportation planning process in metropolitan areas](#) with populations of 200,000 or more every four years. The FHWA and the FTA conduct this review in accordance with the joint planning regulations contained in 23 CFR Part 450 subpart C – Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming. *This public meeting is held to provide interested parties an opportunity to express comments on the transportation planning process and how it is addressing the transportation needs of the Denver-Aurora metropolitan area.*

Major elements of the review include, but are not limited to, the organization and management of the transportation planning process, cooperation between the [Colorado Department of Transportation](#), the DRCOG, the [Regional Transit District](#), and other partners, federal planning factors, public participation, congestion management process, plan development, project prioritization and selection, programming, monitoring and evaluation, financial planning and accountability, civil rights, freight planning, air quality, safety, travel demand modeling and forecasting, intelligent transportation systems, and the management and operations of the transportation network.

You may also submit your comments can in writing or voiced directly to either Federal Review Team member by **April 4, 2016**:

Aaron Bustow
Federal Highway Administration
12300 West Dakota Ave., Suite 180
Lakewood, CO 80228-2583
aaron.bustow@dot.gov
(720) 963-3022

Kristin Kenyon
Federal Transit Administration
1961 Stout Street, Suite 13301
Denver, CO 80294-3007
kristin.kenyon@dot.gov
(303) 362-2391

Individuals in need of auxiliary aids or services, such as interpretation services or assisted listening devices, are asked to contact the DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of this meeting by calling (303) 480-6744 or emailing drcog@drcog.org.