

**AGENDA  
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Monday, April 22, 2013

1:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, west side

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. March 25, 2013 Meeting Summary  
(Attachment A)

**ACTION ITEMS**

4. **Motion to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee second quarter 2013 policy amendments to the 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).**  
(Attachment B)  
Todd Cottrell
5. **Motion to approve actions proposed by DRCOG staff regarding project delays of Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects—February 1, 2013 update.**  
(Attachment C)  
Todd Cottrell

**INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS**

6. Crafting of Regional 2040 Modeling Scenarios  
(Attachment D)  
Steve Cook
7. Discussion on FY 2014 – FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)  
(Attachment E)  
Todd Cottrell

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

8. Member Comment/Other Matters
9. Next Meeting – May 20, 2013
10. Adjournment

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

*We make life better!*



## ATTACHMENT A

### MEETING SUMMARY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE Monday, March 25, 2013

---

#### MEMBERS (OR VOTING ALTERNATES) PRESENT:

Gene Putman	Adams County-City of Thornton
Daren Sterling	Adams County-Commerce City
Mac Callison (Alternate)	Arapahoe County-City of Aurora
George Gerstle (Chair)	Boulder County
Phil Greenwald (Alternate)	Boulder County-City of Longmont
Debra Baskett	Broomfield, City and County
Susan Aldretti	Business Interests
Sandi Kohrs (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation, DTD
Tony DeVito	Colorado Dept. of Transportation Reg. 1
Myron Hora (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation Reg. 4
Steve Rudy	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Art Griffith	Douglas County
Kathleen Osher	Environmental Interests
Kevin French	Jefferson County
Bob Manwaring	Jefferson County-City of Arvada
Bert Weaver	Non-MPO
Lenna Kottke	Non-RTD Transit
Ken Lloyd	Regional Air Quality Council
Bill Van Meter	Regional Transportation District
Bob Davis	Senior Interests
Jennifer Barbour	TDM/Non-Motor

#### OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve (Alternate)	Adams County
Steve Klausung (Alternate)	Business Interests
Lizzie Kemp (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation
Dave Baskett (Alternate)	Jefferson County-City of Lakewood
Kate Cooke (Alternate)	Regional Air Quality Council

Public: Brian Graham, Boulder County Transportation Dept.; Bob Watts, Town of Castle Rock; Betsy Jacobsen, CDOT Bicycle & Pedestrian; Amy Schmaltz, CDOT Region 6; Travis Greiman, City of Centennial; Karen Worminghaus, eGo Car Share; Susan Wood, RTD; Angie Rivera-Malpiede, Stapleton Area TMA; Enka Kampe, Transportation Solutions

DRCOG staff: Melina Dempsey, Steve Cook, Mark Northrop, Jacob Riger, Robert Spotts, Todd Cottrell, Brad Calvert, Lawrence Tilong, Rush Wickes, Casey Collins

#### Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. A quorum was present.

#### Public Comment

Brian Graham, Boulder County Transportation Dept., commented on *Agenda item #5 - TDM Program Pool process and policies* and distributed a summary sheet of comments to the committee.

Karen Worminghaus, eGo CarShare Director, commented on *Agenda item #5* regarding 1.) Buy America waiver issues, and 2.) concern about for-profit entities interested in the carshare market.  
Summary of February 25, 2013 Meeting

The meeting summary was accepted without change.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **Recommendations regarding the proposed process for evaluating and selecting FY 2014 and FY 2015 FTA Section 5310 (*Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities*) projects for the Denver-Aurora Urbanized Area for RTD.**

Jacob Riger presented the proposed project evaluation and selection process recommendations for the FY 2014 and FY 2015 FTA Section 5310 process. \$2.9 million is estimated to be available for the Denver Urbanized Area.

Jacob gave an overview of the process and the committee was asked to make recommendations on project type categories, peer review panel composition, evaluation criteria, and the peer review application scoring and selection process.

Jacob said DRMAC (Denver Region Mobility and Access Council) suggested providing more clarity on the difference between mobility management and the pilot category *Regional Service Coordination*. DRMAC also suggested providing more criteria on capital, and also asked how multiple projects are scored, what's the baseline to apply performance measures, will there be regional equity, geographic equity, and how will the what-if scenarios be handled.

Gene Putman expressed concern that this program is a duplication of the RTD access-a-Ride service. Jacob said, while there are similarities, the 5310 program is specifically targeted to elderly and disabled, and can go beyond access-a-Ride parameters. Gene asked for clear definition of the differences, so as to not duplicate services.

Lenna Kottke noted there are strict certification and eligibility requirements for access-a-Ride. For older adults who can or should not drive, but don't qualify for access-a-Ride, there is a need for other services to fill this gap. Debra Baskett agreed.

Lenna Kottke MOVED to recommend the process regarding the proposed process for evaluating and selecting FY 2014 and FY 2015 FTA Section 5310 (*Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities*) projects for the Denver-Aurora Urbanized Area for RTD, with the understanding criteria is still under development and to allow time for more stakeholder discussion. Debra Baskett SECONDED the motion and the MOTION PASSED unanimously.

### **Recommendations regarding the Regional TDM Program Pool process and policies for fiscal years 2014 and 2015; specifically, final recommendations related to the TDM Pool Rules (eligibility), evaluation criteria, and process changes.**

Melina Dempsey presented on (in a continuation from last month) the development of recommendations for TDM Pool Rules on eligibility, evaluation criteria, and selection process for TDM Pool projects in FY 2014 and FY 2015. The TDM Pool has an estimated amount of \$1.75 million to be distributed to projects.

Discussion followed on each of the six remaining questions. The committee was asked to reach consensus and make a recommendation.

---

## **Project/Sponsor Eligibility**

### ***1. Should carshare capital purchases (vehicles) be eligible for funding?***

- Melina noted, on March 21, FHWA provided further recommendations to extend the Buy America waiver until October 1, 2013 and not to pre-empt funds until FY 2015, to allow more time.

- Art Griffith suggested that, if a project is not able to get a waiver in time, it not count as a project delay strike.
- George Gerstle suggested all (instead of “previous”) awardees must show vehicles serve new locations.
- Gene Putman questioned funding carshare projects. Several members discussed the value of carshare projects.

❖ **Question 1 - All but 1 voted in favor of eligibility.**

---

**2. *Should minor infrastructure projects be eligible?***

- Steve Klausung recommended aggregating projects together.
- George Gerstle encouraged continuing to fund smaller projects.
- Debra Baskett recommended funding projects even less than \$80,000. Steve Rudy noted it is not a good use of scarce federal funding on small infrastructure projects, citing NEPA costs, etc. Sandi Kohrs agreed, citing administrative costs.
- Kevin French asked if developing a program like the Traffic Signal Miscellaneous Equipment Purchase program would be effective. Steve Cook said this was looked at, but was not seen as a viable option.

❖ **Question 2 – Split vote. (11 opposed eligibility, 8 in favor of eligibility).**

---

**3. *Should direct cash payment incentive program elements continue to be discouraged?***

❖ **Question 3 – All but 2 voted in favor of discouraging cash payments.**

---

**4. *Should past performance results of TDM projects by project sponsors be incorporated as a criterion or required input for sponsors? If so, should this include a comparison of how well the sponsor’s results compared to benefits predicted in their original application?***

❖ **Question 4 – All voted in favor of not establishing a specific criteria.**

---

**5. *Should the overmatch criteria be eliminated?***

❖ **Question 5 – Passed in favor of elimination.**

---

**6. *Increase project request minimum?***

❖ **Question 6 – Passed to increase minimum request to \$80,000.**

---

**Table 1 – Evaluation Criteria**

After discussion, the committee voted on 3 issues.

**Issue #1. Should criteria 1-3 be combined into 1 (15 point) item? Steve Cook clarified they could be combined into one criteria, but with 3 unique questions on the application form.**

- ❖ There was general consensus.

**Issue #2. Credit for local cash match.**

- ❖ There was general consensus.

**Issue #3. Eliminating the life of project, past VMT reductions results, existing SOV use in area and potential for change.**

- ❖ There was general consensus.

---

**Attachment 3 - Project Selection Process**

- George Gerstle recommended that Panel Review members have expertise in TDM.
- Steve Klausing recommended leaving panel slots open until seeing who is applying.

- ❖ There was general consensus.
- 

**INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS**

**Crafting of regional 2040 modeling scenarios.**

Steve Cook presented on the status of developing 2040 modeling scenarios. The committee was asked to review *Table 1. Draft 2040 Factors to Consider in Scenarios* and to think about providing unique types of 2040 scenarios for consideration.

**Next steps:**

- The committee will finalize its recommendations at its April 22 TAC meeting.
- The Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC) will finalize recommendations at its April 24 MVPAC meeting.
- Staff will compile these recommendations and the May 15 DRCOG Board will discuss/recommend scenarios for staff to begin modeling on.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

Chair George Gerstle noted Steve Rudy is retiring as Transportation Planning and Operations Director and recognized him for his service. The meeting was adjourned at 3:32 p.m. The CDOT RAMP presentation was held immediately afterwards. The next scheduled meeting is April 22, 2013.

## ATTACHMENT B

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

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

Subject: **Second quarter 2013 policy amendments to the 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 22, 2013	Action	4

### REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to recommend to the Regional Transportation Commission second quarter 2013 policy amendments to the *2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*.

### SUMMARY

- Per the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program Preparation*, policy amendments to the *Transportation Improvement Program* are processed quarterly.
- Projects amended are listed below, with reasons for the amendment and the specific details contained in the attached table.

### PRIOR BOARD ACTION

- Quarterly policy amendments procedures are outlined in the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program Preparation*, as adopted July 2010.
- The *2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program* was originally adopted March 2011, and has been amended quarterly since.

### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- As noted in the table

### ALTERNATIVES

1. Recommend approval
2. Do not recommend approval

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

- DRCOG staff recommends approval of the following policy amendments:
  - TIP ID 2007-078: Region 1 Bridge On-System Pool
  - TIP ID 2008-104: Region 6 Bridge Enterprise Pool
  - TIP ID 2008-081: North I-25: Front Range EIS
  - TIP ID 2008-107: Region 6 FASTER Transit Pool
- The attached table provides reasons and details.
- The above policy amendments to the *2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program* have been found to conform with the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality.

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Attachments:
  - Amendments table

## 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

Policy Amendment #1

Pending

TIP#	Project Name: Limits,Sponsor,Scope	Current Funding (dollars in thousands)								
		Amounts in \$1,000s	Prior Funding	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16-17	Future Funding	Total Funding
2007-078	Region 1 Bridge On-System Pool									
Sponsor:	CDOT Region 1									
Scope:	The Bridge On-System Pool funds various bridge projects throughout CDOT Region 1.									
		Federal (BR)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		State		\$6,172	\$10,146	\$2,262	\$2,322	\$4,917		
		Local		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		<b>Total</b>	\$17,770	\$6,172	\$10,146	\$2,262	\$2,322	\$4,917	\$0	\$43,589

Facility Name	Start-At and End-At	Cost (1,000s)
<b>I-25 SB</b>	<b>Surrey Ridge Road &amp; SH-86 at Founders Pkwy</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>
I-70 East	Smith Rd and UPRR	\$12,900
<b>I-70 East</b>	<b>Frontage Road over Middle Bijour Creek</b>	<b>\$3,500</b>
<b>US-40</b>	<b>Byers to Deer Trail</b>	<b>\$755</b>

### Revised Funding (dollars in thousands)

Why Amend?	Project awarded additional funds allocating to new pool projects.	Amounts in \$1,000s	Prior Funding	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16-17	Future Funding	Total Funding
	Add \$5,255,000 of state Bridge On-System funds in FY2013 allocating to: I-70 East: Frontage Road over Middle Bijou Creek (\$3,500,000) and US-40: Byers to Deer Trail Overlay & Bridge Rehabilitation (\$755,000), and I-25 SB: Surrey Ridge Road & SH-86 at Founders Pkwy (\$1,000,000). Increase total project funding.									
		Federal (BR)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		State		\$6,172	\$15,401	\$2,262	\$2,322	\$4,917		
		Local		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		<b>Total</b>	\$17,770	\$6,172	\$15,401	\$2,262	\$2,322	\$4,917	\$0	\$48,844

## 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

Policy Amendment #2

Pending

TIP#	Project Name: Limits,Sponsor,Scope	Current Funding (dollars in thousands)								
		Amounts in \$1,000s	Prior Funding	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16-17	Future Funding	Total Funding
2008-104	Region 6 FASTER Bridge Enterprise Pool									
Sponsor:	CDOT Region 6									
Scope:	Pool contains bridge-related improvements and repairs based on the new FASTER Bridge Enterprise funding program (Colorado Senate Bill 108) in CDOT Region 6.	Federal		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		State (FASTER-B)		\$72,435	\$127,361	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		Local		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		Total	\$138,156	\$72,435	\$127,361	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$337,952



## 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

Facility Name	Start-At and End-At	Cost (1,000s)
County Rd. (Design)	Old Wadsworth@US-36	\$14,000
Federal Blvd	69th Ave	\$15,000
I-25 (Construction)	Santa Fe	\$22,000
I-70	Sand Creek	\$11,500
I-70 EB (Design)	UPRR	\$3,300
I-76	S Platte	\$16,000
<b>I-76 (Construction)</b>	<b>UPRR</b>	<b>\$17,200</b>
I-76 (Design)	UPRR	\$2,835
Pecos (Design)	I-70	\$6,600
Pecos St (Construction)	I-70	\$15,740
<b>Peoria (Construction)</b>	<b>I-76</b>	<b>\$500</b>
Peoria (Design)	I-76	\$1,000
Perry St. (Design)	US-6	\$815
SH-121 (Wadsworth)	Bear Creek	\$8,200
SH-121 (Wadsworth)	US-36	\$32,000
SH-121 EB (Design)	UPRR	\$500
SH-2 (Design)	BNSF	\$500
SH-287	Colfax	\$8,000
SH-30 (Construction)	Havana@Cherry Creek	\$6,500
SH-30 (Construction)	Havana @ I-70 Bridge Replacement	\$16,000

Facility Name	Start-At and End-At	Cost (1,000s)
SH-30 (Design)	Havana@ Cherry Creek	\$300
SH-30 (Design)	Havana @ I-70 Bridge Replacement	\$1,800
<b>SH-40 (Construction)</b>	<b>Sand Creek</b>	<b>\$13,500</b>
<b>SH-40 (Design)</b>	<b>Sand Creek</b>	<b>\$2,500</b>
<b>SH-44 (Construction)</b>	<b>104th Ave@Bull Seep</b>	<b>\$6,300</b>
SH-44 (Design)	104th Ave@Bull Seep	\$1,000
SH-44 (Design)	104th Ave@ S. Platte	\$700
<b>SH-58 (Construction)</b>	<b>Ford</b>	<b>\$7,200</b>
SH-58 (Design)	Ford	\$982
SH-88 (Construction)	Arapahoe Rd@Cherry Creek	\$21,500
<b>SH-88 (Pre-Construction)</b>	<b>Arapahoe Rd@Cherry Creek</b>	<b>\$9,350</b>
Sheridan (Design)	UPRR	\$7,400
US-40 EB (Design)	Tollgate Creek	\$1,400
<b>US-40 EB (Pre-construction)</b>	<b>Tollgate Creek</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>
<b>US-6</b>	<b>Bridge Construction (Platte, Bryant, BNSF)</b>	<b>\$59,918</b>
US-6 (Design)	BNSF	\$2,000
US-6 (Design)	Bryant and S Platte	\$2,000
US-6 (Design)	Sheridan	\$11,533
US-6 (Design)	Garrison St	\$2,000
<b>US-85 NB (Design)</b>	<b>Dad Clark Gulch</b>	<b>\$3,451</b>

## 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

### Revised Funding (dollars in thousands)

Why Amend?

Project awarded additional funds, allocating to new and existing pool projects.

Add \$44,960,000 of state FASTER Bridge funds in FY2013 allocating to the following new and existing pool projects:

- SH-40 (Design) at Sand Creek (+\$1,200,000 = \$2,500,000 total)
- Peoria (Construction) at I-76 (\$500,000)
- SH-44 (Construction) at 104th @ Bull Seep (\$6,300,000),
- SH-88 (Pre-construction) at Arapahoe Rd @ Cherry Creek (+\$4,000,000 = \$9,350,000 total)
- US-40 EB (Design) at Tollgate Creek (+\$2,000,000 = \$4,500,000 total)
- US-40 EB (Design) at Sand Creek (+\$1,200,000 = \$5,700,000 total)
- US-40 EB (Pre-construction) at Tollgate Creek (\$2,000,000)
- SH-58 (Construction) at Ford (+\$2,000,000 = \$7,200,000 total)
- US-85 (Design) at Dad Clark Gulch (+\$550,000 = \$3,451,000 total)
- I-76 (Construction) at UPPR (\$17,200,000)
- US-6: Bridge Construction (Platte, Bryant, BNSF) (+\$5,310,000 = \$59,918,000 total)
- Reduce pool project SH-40 & Sand Creek (Construction) by \$2,500,000.

Increase total project funding.

Amounts in \$1,000s	Prior Funding	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16-17	Future Funding	Total Funding
Federal		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
State (FASTER-B)		\$72,435	\$172,321	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Local		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
<b>Total</b>	\$138,156	\$72,435	\$172,321	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$382,912

## 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

Policy Amendment #3

**Pending**

TIP#	Project Name: Limits,Sponsor,Scope	Current Funding (dollars in thousands)								
		Amounts in \$1,000s	Prior Funding	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16-17	Future Funding	Total Funding
2008-081	North I-25: Front Range EIS									
Sponsor:	CDOT Region 4									
Scope:	Funds will be used to complete the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the Record of Decision for Phase I of North I-25 (MP 214 - 269), and for design and Right of Way for phase I elements. Project funding shown is for DRCOG portion only.									
		Federal		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		State (7th Pot)		\$0	\$450	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		State (R P P)		\$2,900	\$585	\$1,035	\$1,035	\$0		
		Local		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		<b>Total</b>		\$1,200	\$2,900	\$1,035	\$1,035	\$1,035	\$0	\$0 \$7,205

### Revised Funding (dollars in thousands)

Why Amend?	Project awarded additional funding.	Revised Funding (dollars in thousands)								
		Amounts in \$1,000s	Prior Funding	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16-17	Future Funding	Total Funding
	Add \$2,303,000 in FY2014, \$2,303,000 in FY2015, and \$5,852,000 in FY2016-17 of state RPP funds. Increase total project funding.									
		Federal		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		State (7th Pot)		\$0	\$450	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		State (R P P)		\$2,900	\$585	\$3,338	\$3,338	\$5,852		
		Local		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		<b>Total</b>		\$1,200	\$2,900	\$1,035	\$3,338	\$3,338	\$5,852	\$0 \$17,663

## 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

Policy Amendment #4

4/8/2013

Pending

TIP#	Project Name: Limits,Sponsor,Scope	Current Funding (dollars in thousands)								
		Amounts in \$1,000s	Prior Funding	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16-17	Future Funding	Total Funding
2008-107	Region 6 FASTER Transit Pool			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Sponsor:	CDOT Region 6									
Scope:	Pool contains transit-related projects based on the new FASTER Transit program (Colorado Senate Bill 108) in CDOT Region 6.									
		Federal		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		State (Faster-T)		\$3,331	\$5,783	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		Local		\$1,160	\$4,780	\$0	\$0	\$0		
		Total	\$17,879	\$4,491	\$10,563	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,933

## 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

Facility Name	Start-At and End-At	Cost (1,000s)
<b>Arvada</b>	<b>Olde Town Arvada Bus Transfer Facility (FY14 &amp; 15)</b>	<b>\$1,507</b>
CDOT DTR	Bus Purchase for Alamosa/Gunnison to Denver Route (FY13)	\$228
CDOT Region 6	I-25 North Managed Lanes (FY13)	\$3,500
Denver	B-Cycle Expansion (FY12)	\$640
DRMAC	TIP-ID #2012-074 One Click, One Call equipment (FY13)	\$74
Lakewood	Pedestrian Transit Access Signal (FY13)	\$153
RTD	104th park-n-Ride (FY12)	\$2,800
RTD	US-36 Managed Lanes and BRT Facilities (FY12)	\$5,000
RTD	DUS AmTrak Relocation (FY12)	\$5,000
RTD	SE Corridor Light Rail Credit Card Ticket Vending Machines (FY13)	\$440
RTD	Maintenance of Way Building Rehab (FY13)	\$496
<b>RTD</b>	<b>Civic Center Station Phase 2 (FY14 &amp; 15)</b>	<b>\$3,760</b>
<b>RTD</b>	<b>Thornton Park-n-Ride Expansion (FY15)</b>	<b>\$998</b>
<b>RTD</b>	<b>Light Rail Manual to Power Emergency Crossover Upgrade Project (FY14)</b>	<b>\$1,600</b>
RTD	Central Corridor Light Rail Improvements (FY13)	\$692
<b>Seniors Resource Center</b>	<b>“Fix it First” with Alternate Fuel Replacement Vehicles for Aging SRC Urban and A-LIFT Fleet</b>	<b>\$96</b>
South I-25 TMA	Light Rail Shelter Improvements (FY12)	\$646
<b>Thornton</b>	<b>SH-7 at I-25 Carpool Lot (Wagon Road Park-n-Ride Expansion) (FY14 &amp; 15)</b>	<b>\$575</b>
Wheat Ridge	Bus Shelter Replacement (FY12)	\$360
Wheat Ridge	Bus Benches (FY13)	\$200

## 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program

Why Amend?

Project awarded additional funds, allocating to new pool projects.  
 Add \$5,034,000 in FY2014 and \$3,501,000 in FY2015 of state FASTER Transit funds and \$2,518,000 in FY2014 and \$1,537,000 in FY2015 of local match, allocating to the following new pool projects: Arvada- Olde Town Arvada Bus Transfer Facility (\$1,507,000), RTD- Civic Center Station Phase 2 (\$3,760,000), RTD- Thornton Park-n-Ride Expansion (\$998,000), RTD- Light Rail Manual to Power Emergency Crossover Upgrade Project (\$1,600,000), Seniors' Resource Center- "Fix it First" with Alternate Fuel Replacement Vehicles for Aging SRC Urban and A-LIFT Fleet (\$96,000), and Thornton- SH-7 at I-25 Carpool Lot (Wagon Road Park-n-Ride Expansion) (\$575,000). Increase total project funding.

### Revised Funding (dollars in thousands)

Amounts in \$1,000s	Prior Funding	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16-17	Future Funding	Total Funding
Federal		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
State (Faster-T)		\$3,331	\$5,783	\$5,034	\$3,501	\$0		
Local		\$1,160	\$4,780	\$2,518	\$1,537	\$0		
<b>Total</b>	\$17,879	\$4,491	\$10,563	\$7,552	\$5,038	\$0	\$0	\$45,523

## ATTACHMENT C

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

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

Subject: **FY2012 project delays of *Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* projects—February 1, 2013 update**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 22, 2013	Action	5

### REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to approve actions proposed by DRCOG staff regarding project delays of *Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* projects—February 1, 2013 update.

### SUMMARY

- The *FY2012-2017 Policy on TIP Preparation* document identifies expectations for project implementation and the policy for addressing delays for projects/phases that have federal funding. Timely implementation of TIP projects/phases has been an objective of the Board for multiple TIP cycles. Projects/phases that languish, for whatever reason, tie up scarce federal funds that could have been programmed to other ready projects/phases.
- In January, the Board adopted the staff recommendations for the FY2012 project delays report, which included projects/phases where the project delay review process would not begin until February 2013.
- In early February, DRCOG staff reviewed the implementation status of those specific projects/phases with CDOT and RTD. DRCOG staff asked the sponsors of delayed projects/phases to explain the reason(s) for the delay(s) and to provide action plans demonstrating the sponsor's commitment to timely implementation.
- The attached report produced by DRCOG staff identifies project sponsors and associated projects/phases that have encountered delays. The report summarizes reasons for delays and actions to get projects to ad or a particular phase(s) initiated. The report includes DRCOG staff recommendations for committee and Board consideration.

### PRIOR BOARD ACTION

- January 2013 DRCOG Board acted to approve staff recommendation on 2012 project delays.
- July 2010 DRCOG Board adopted [Policy on Transportation Improvement Program \(TIP\) Preparation – Procedures for preparing the 2012-2017 TIP](#) (amended September 2012).

### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Removal of federal funds from delayed projects unless approvals/appeals are granted.

## **Implementation delays of *Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* projects**

April 22, 2013

Page 2

### **ALTERNATIVES**

- Alternative 1: Concur with staff recommendations
- Alternative 2: Propose different recommendations for one or more projects
- Alternative 3: Recommend delayed projects should not continue

### **PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**

- DRCOG staff recommends Alternative 1

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- Attachment:
  - TIP Project Delays Report for FY2012 – February 1, 2013 update



# TIP PROJECT DELAYS REPORT

For Fiscal Year 2012 Projects – February 1, 2013 Update

## A. POLICY

The update to the *FY2012 TIP Project Delays Report* outlines projects delayed within the 2012-2017 TIP. Delay policies are outlined in the adopted *2012-2017 Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation*. It states that **“implementation of an entire project or single project phase (if project has federal funding in more than one year) may be delayed only once by the project sponsor.”**

The objective of this delay policy is to minimize the number of projects delayed and the amount of funding thus affected. Per federal guidance, the 2012-2017 TIP delay policy is more aggressive than prior policy.

## B. PROCESS

To implement the policies, the following steps were taken:

1. At the beginning of February (per action taken by the DRCOG Board in January 2013), DRCOG staff requested that CDOT and RTD conduct a comprehensive review of all STP-Metro, CMAQ, and Enhancement projects that were outlined in the previous FY12 report under “Projects with Special Circumstances”, and where the date to begin the delay review process was February 1, 2013.
2. CDOT and RTD reviewed all such project phases and identified those that have been delayed.
3. In late-February, DRCOG staff sent a request to the sponsors of all delayed project phases asking them to attend a formal multi-party meeting (sponsor, DRCOG, and CDOT/RTD) to discuss the project and the reasons for the delay. At that time, the sponsor also reported on the implementation status of all of its federally-funded projects.
4. Sponsors provide their responses to DRCOG and all multi-party meetings were held by the middle of March.
5. DRCOG staff conducts follow-up discussion with sponsors, as needed.
6. All delayed project phases requiring policy action are the subject of this report.

## C. APPROVALS FOR FIRST-YEAR DELAYS

The policy states that each project or project phase (if federal funding is over more than one year) may be delayed only once. If the phases listed here as being delayed have not been initiated by February 1, 2014, the projects will be automatically deleted from the TIP, with any federal funds spend to date required to be returned. This action cannot be appealed to the DRCOG Board.

### 1. Aurora

**Name:** *Nine Mile Station: Bike/Ped Access Improvements*

**TIP ID:** 2012-071

**Project Phase:** Initiate Design

**FY2012 Federal funding:** \$75,000

# TIP PROJECT DELAYS REPORT

For Fiscal Year 2012 Projects – February 1, 2013 Update

Aurora reports the project had been delayed due to starting on the IGA with CDOT later than expected in the fall of 2012. Since the IGA was signed in early March and design is currently underway in house, the design phase is no longer delayed.

**Recommendation**—*Since the phase is no longer delayed, no conditions are placed upon it.*

## 2. Denver

**Name:** *Golden Triangle Area Plan*

**TIP ID:** 2012-023

**Project Phase:** Initiate Study

**FY2012 Federal funding:** \$150,000

Denver reports the project has been delayed due to new staff working on the project that were unaware of some of the particulars to the process and deadlines. Consultant interviews were held in early April, with the kick-off meeting anticipated for June.

**Recommendation**—*DRCOG staff recommends the delay be approved subject to the following conditions:*

- Denver staff aggressively pursue project implementation activities with the kick-off meeting no later than the end of June 2013.
- Denver, RTD, and DRCOG staff meet on this project at the first of each month beginning in August 2013, unless the kick-off meeting has already taken place.

## 3. Denver

**Name:** *Northeast Downtown Next Steps Plan*

**TIP ID:** 2012-022

**Project Phases:** Initiate Study

**FY2012 Federal funding:** \$150,000

Denver reports the project has been delayed due to new staff working on the project that were unaware of some of the particulars to the process and deadlines. The project is on target to hold its kick-off meeting in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter 2013.

**Recommendation**—*DRCOG staff recommends the delay be approved subject to the following conditions:*

- Denver staff aggressively pursue project implementation activities with the kick-off meeting no later than the end of September 2013.
- Denver, RTD, and DRCOG staff meet on this project at the first of each month beginning in November 2013, unless the kick-off meeting has already taken place.

## 4. Denver

**Name:** *Speer Blvd/Colfax Ave/Auraria Next Step Plan*

**TIP ID:** 2012-020

**Project Phases:** Initiate Study

# TIP PROJECT DELAYS REPORT

For Fiscal Year 2012 Projects – February 1, 2013 Update

**FY2012 Federal funding:** \$80,000

Denver reports the project has been delayed due to new staff working on the project that were unaware of some of the particulars to the process and deadlines. The kick-off meeting is scheduled for mid-April.

**Recommendation**—*DRCOG staff recommends the delay be approved subject to the following conditions:*

- Denver staff aggressively pursue project implementation activities with the kick-off meeting no later than the end of April 2013.
- Denver, RTD, and DRCOG staff meet on this project at the first of each month beginning in June 2013, unless the kick-off meeting has already taken place.

## 5. Douglas County

**Name:** C-470/Lucent Station Area Master Plan

**TIP ID:** 2012-026

**Project Phase:** Initiate Study

**FY2012 Federal funding:** \$90,000

Douglas County reports the study kick-off meeting was held on March 15, making the project no longer delayed.

**Recommendation**—*Since the project is no longer delayed, no conditions are placed upon it.*

## 6. University of Colorado

**Name:** STAMPEDE Bus Service Enhancements

**TIP ID:** 2012-018

**Project Phase:** Initiate Bus Service – Year 1

**FY2012 Federal funding:** \$142,000

University of Colorado reports that an IGA has been signed to allow federal funding to be spent on the bus service that has already been in service, making the phase no longer delayed.

**Recommendation**—*Since the project phase is no longer delayed, no conditions are placed upon it.*

## ATTACHMENT D

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

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

Subject: **Crafting of Regional 2040 Modeling Scenarios**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 22, 2013	Information	6

### REQUESTED ACTION

Guidance to staff on 2040 scenarios to begin modeling.

### SUMMARY

- What are regional “Scenarios”?
  - Future scenarios contain a package of factors, or “what-ifs” that represent a change from our base 2040 assumptions (aka the 2040 Base Scenario).
  - Each scenario will be modeled to produce outcome measures. The measures can be compared among the scenarios to see which particular ones perform better or worse for each scenario.
  - There are two key components of “the model,” aka the integrated regional model. In very simple terms:
    - The travel demand model (FOCUS) estimates travel on the roadways, the transit system, and by walking or bicycling.
    - The land use model represents locations where people live, work, shop, go to school, etc. It also includes demographic characteristics such as age and income.
  - The 2040 Base Scenario will represent policies and planning assumptions of our current 2035 Metro Vision and Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plans.
- Table 1 provides, for discussion purposes:
  - Factors to consider adjusting from the 2040 Base Scenario.
  - The value for factors in the 2040 Base Scenario.
  - Example scenarios A-E.
- The number of possible scenarios and combinations of factors is limitless. However, time constrains us to limit the number to between 4 and 6. When crafting scenarios, the following questions should be considered:
  - Should the scenario reflect several changes, or just one change? If only one change is made for a scenario, then it will be easy to pinpoint the cause of an outcome measure going up or down. If several factors are changed for a scenario, it is more difficult to name the specific factor that has the greatest impact on results.
  - Is it desired to depict extreme scenario variations, to gauge the lowest or highest potential impact of a large combination of adjusted factors?
- As depicted in Table 1, Scenario B reflects changes to several factors. Scenario A, C, and D do not reflect many changes.
- Scenario E will be crafted later in the process. Rather than first establishing adjustments to factors prior to modeling the scenario, and then evaluating the results, Scenario E will first establish the results to be reached as a given, and then adjust

## Crafting of Regional 2040 Modeling Scenarios

March 25, 2013

Page 2

- factors until the results are reached (e.g., DRCOG Metro Vision goals related to per capita VMT and GHG reductions and amount of new development in urban centers).
- In addition to evaluating and presenting regional values of outcome measures, localized “example locations” measures will also be presented. Thus, we can not only evaluate “How will regional measures vary due to the different scenarios?” but also “How do measures vary for a dense established urban center, or a low-income area, or a suburban-styled office park, etc.” The specific example locations will be defined later this year.
  - The current schedule is as follows:
    - TAC to provide guidance/recommendations on April 22.
    - MVPAC to provide guidance/recommendations on April 24.
    - DRCOG staff will compile recommendations into distinct 2040 scenario packages.
    - On May 15, the DRCOG Board will discuss and recommend scenarios for staff to begin modeling work on.

### PRIOR BOARD ACTION

- August 2012 - Approval of approach to using scenario analysis to inform the Metro Vision 2040 plan update process

### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

### ALTERNATIVES

N/A

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Attachment:
  - Table 1: Draft 2040 Factors to Consider in Scenarios – Example Scenarios for Discussion

Table 1  
**Draft 2040 Factors to Consider in Scenarios - Example Scenarios for Discussion**  
 April 15, 2013

Factors	2040 BASE Scenario	Scenario A Roadway & Managed Lanes Focus	Scenario B Transit, Bicycle, Pedestrian Focus	Scenario C Really High Pop Growth w/ base transp	Scenario D Really Low Growth w/ base transp	Scenario E Do What's needed to meet MV goals **
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC/DEMOGRAPHIC</b>		<b>Change From Base 2040 Scenario</b>				
Population Growth (2010 to 2040)	1,350,000	same as base	same as base	2,000,000	500,000	same as base
Employment Growth (2010 to 2040)	765,000	same	same	1,300,000	250,000	same
Household Growth (2010 to 2040)	611,000	same	same	841,805	210,451	same
<b>TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM</b>						
Rapid Transit System-Rail miles (2035 FasTracks)	110	same	All FasTracks (+50)	same	same	adjust as needed
Rapid Transit System - Bus/HOV CL miles	47	+100 miles managed lanes	+ 50 miles managed lanes	same	same	adjust as needed
Bus Service Levels (annual hours)	2,970,000		20% increase	same	same	adjust as needed
Bus Service Levels (annual miles)	35,600,000		20% increase	same	same	adjust as needed
Cost (fares) for Transit	Inflation		1/2 Base cost	same	same	adjust as needed
Additional Roadway Lane Miles:						
- new Regional System (non-toll) LM	1,000	+ 200 ln. miles	same	same	same	
Toll Costs / Managed Lane CL miles	committed system	+ 100 miles	+ 50 miles	same	same	
Other Fees, etc.						
Cost of Gasoline (e.g. \$3.80 @ 2%/yr inflation)	~\$6.75/gal		~\$13.50/gal	same	same	adjust as needed
Additional "Cost of Driving"	Inflation		double	same	same	adjust as needed
Miles of Bicycle Facilities	2,000		3,000	same	same	adjust as needed
Acceptance (Utility Factor) of Walk/Bicycling			"double"	same	same	adjust as needed
Share of Pop. "Driving" / Auto availability	1.74 autos/HH		reduce # autos/HH	same	same	
Location/Amount of Free or Pay Parking			Add costs in additional areas?			
<b>GROWTH &amp; DEVELOPMENT</b>						
UGB/UGA Additional Area (sq. miles)	260	?	?	350	?	adjust as needed
Share / Amount of Growth in Urban Centers						
- Housing Units	17%					
- Employment	48%					
Share Infill vs. Greenfield New Development						
Share of Types of Housing Units						
Level of "Mix" of Land Uses						
Retail Square Footage per capita						
Employment Sector Make-up						
Labor Force participation rates						
<b>OTHER</b>						
Average Household Size	2.376					
Level of Teleworking (work at home)	6.3%					
Age Cohort Distribution (e.g. % > age 65)	25%					

Goals: \*\*10% less VMT/capita  
 \*\*10% less GHG/capita  
 \*\* 50% of HH, 75% employment growth in urban centers

## ATTACHMENT E

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

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

Subject: ***FY2014-FY2015 Unified Planning Work Program***

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 22, 2013	Information	7

### REQUESTED ACTION

No action requested. This item is an informational briefing to solicit comments.

### SUMMARY

- The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is a federally-required document that outlines the planning tasks and activities to be conducted within the region with federal transportation planning funds. The document also lists other major planning activities performed by local governments and partner agencies.
- The new *FY2014-FY2015 UPWP*, outlining activities to be conducted from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2015, is currently in development. A full draft document will be brought to the TAC in June, with DRCOG Board consideration scheduled for July.
- The attached document lays out the proposed key variances to the *FY2014-2015 UPWP* compared the current *FY2012-2013 UPWP*.
- The total budget for the new UPWP will likely be similar to the previous two year cycle, depending on federal budgetary actions. Thus, it will be difficult to add many new activities, beyond the activities related to federally-required documents and activities.
- Staff asks for comments, thoughts, and ideas you have regarding the new UPWP.

### PRIOR BOARD ACTION

- May 2012 DRCOG Board adopted an amended version of the *FY2012-2013 UPWP*.

### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- None

### ALTERNATIVES

- None

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

- None

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Attachment:
  - Draft FY2014-15 UPWP Development, Key Variances from 12/13 UPWP
  - Link to the current UPWP: [FY2012-2013 UPWP](#)

# Draft FY 2014/2015 UPWP Development

## Key Variances from 12/13 UPWP

### Additions/Expansions/Refinements

- 2040 Plan Development
  - *Metro Vision 2040 Plan* and 2040 MVRTP
    - Model enhancements (socioeconomic and land use inputs)
    - Scenario analysis and outcomes
    - Preparation of 2040 MVRTP “Element Sections” (e.g., transit, bicycling, pedestrian, freight, etc.)
    - Approval of goals, policies, and action strategies
    - Preparation of plan documents
    - Adopt - Fall 2014
  - *2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan*
    - Incorporate guidance from MAP-21
    - Evaluation of regional roadway and transit improvements and definition of fiscally constrained projects
- Metro Vision 2040 Implementation (post-plan adoption – activities TBD)
- 2012-2017 TIP: Monitor potential CDOT documentation or procedural changes (i.e., expenditure-based TIP), and funding changes
- 2016-2021 TIP
  - Prepare and adopt *2016-2021 TIP Policy*
  - Conduct project solicitation, evaluation, and selection process
  - Adopt - March 2015
- Following completion of RTD’s Bicycle Parking and Accessibility Plan, define possible next step tasks for DRCOG (per postponed FY 2013 study)
- Incorporate MAP-21 performance measure tasks throughout
- Begin preliminary SIP preparation tasks if 2013 and 2014 pollutant monitor results indicate the need to prepare a new Ozone SIP

### Deletions

- Complete *Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan*
- Complete *Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety in the Region* and update of *Overview of Traffic Safety in the Denver Region*
- Develop a *Regional Concept of Transportation Operations (RCTO)*
- Complete the update to the *Regional TDM Strategic Plan*