

AGENDA

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Monday, April 25, 2016

1:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, West side

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. March 28, 2016 TAC Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)

ACTION ITEM

4. Discussion on policies and information requirements related to HOV/Toll/Managed Lanes.
(Attachment B) Jacob Riger

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

5. Briefing on Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study.
(Attachment C) Steve Cook
Rick Pilgrim, HDR Engineering

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

6. Member Comment/Other Matters
 - Extension of public comment period for the Federal Transportation Planning Certification Review until May 13, 2016.
7. Next Meeting – May 23, 2016
8. 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, March 28, 2016

MEMBERS (OR VOTING ALTERNATES) PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve	Adams County
Kimberly Dall	Adams County – City of Brighton
Travis Greiman	Arapahoe County-City of Centennial
Dave Chambers	Arapahoe County –City of Aurora
George Gerstle	Boulder County
Debra Baskett	Broomfield, City and County
Steve Klausing	Business/Economic Development
Richard Zamora (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation, Reg. 1
Janice Finch	Denver, City and County
Douglas Rex	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Art Griffith	Douglas County
John Cotten	Douglas County-City of Lone Tree
Greg Fischer	Freight
Bob Manwaring (Chair)	Jefferson County-City of Arvada
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Bert Weaver	Non-MPO Area
Ken Lloyd	Regional Air Quality Council
Bill Sirois (Alternate)	Regional Transportation District
Sylvia Labrucherie	Senior
Aylene McCallum	TDM/Nonmotor

OTHERS PRESENT:

Kent Moorman (Alternate)	Adams County – City of Thornton
Flo Raitano (Alternate)	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Tom Reiff (Alternate)	Douglas County – Town of Castle Rock
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: Ron Papsdorf, CDOT Government Relations; Danny Herrmann, CDOT Region 1, Karen Schneiders, CDOT Reg. 4; Jeff Purdy, FHWA

DRCOG staff: Steve Cook, Todd Cottrell, Greg MacKinnon, Robert Spotts, Jacob Riger, Matthew Helfant, Will Soper

Call to Order

Chair Bob Manwaring called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Summary of February 22, 2016 Meeting

The meeting summary was accepted.

ACTION ITEM

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.

Greg MacKinnon presented an overview of the proposed project selection process for a combined Call for Applications to allocate set-aside funding for TSSIP, ITS, and Multimodal Signal Operations Support projects. The process will determine selection of miscellaneous equipment projects and allocation of the FY 2016 and FY 2017 CMAQ funding remaining after contingency requirements are satisfied. Projected funding distribution is as follows:

	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

George Gerstle MOVED to recommend to the Board of Directors 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. There was a second and the motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Discussion of CDOT Region 1 Regional Priority Program (RPP) projects for the *FY 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*.

Danny Herrman, CDOT Region 1, presented a review of projects on the draft FY2019 and 2020 RPP project list, as itemized in Attachment 1. Mr. Herrmann noted CDOT has adopted a rolling STIP process along with its new cash management system. The FY20 RPP projects will be added to the current STIP on July 1, 2016.

Discussion on policies and information requirements related to HOV/Toll/Managed Lanes.

Jacob Riger continued the discussion started in January on addressing HOV/Toll/Managed lanes policies in the DRCOG transportation planning process. The discussion centered on two components:

- 1) whether the DRCOG Board should develop an overall HOV and managed lanes policy at the regional level; and
- 2) a review of the latest updates (incorporating the January TAC feedback and other clarifying edits, as highlighted) of proposed revisions to the information requirements for tolled projects in the FC RTP. It was noted the CDOT HPTTE information requirement proposal would incorporate the CDOT HOV policy.

Mr. Riger said the enabling legislation only addresses MPO review of proposed tolling projects. The question is whether to include, and to what extent DRCOG may want to include, HOV considerations in the review process for FC-RTP toll projects.

Other comments included:

- Bert Weaver said the policy should apply to include the whole TPR, not just the MPO area; and said funding derived from a subregional tolling facility should remain in that subregion.

- Debra Baskett asked if the Board should consider whether there should be policy that addresses private toll roads, noting a potential issue could arise should a private tolling company say it can't meet revenue expectations with an HOV2 or HOV3 model.
- George Gerstle said to consider how the SB-1601 process would relate to this HOV policy, (i.e., when a privately-funded tollway intersects with a state highway.)

Doug Rex said TAC discussion would continue next month to develop a policy concept to bring to a future Board Work session.

Staff was asked to research how other MPOs address HOV, toll, and managed lane policies for further TAC discussion.

Discussion of the 2016 DRCOG Federal Certification Review.

Aaron Bustow, FHWA, presented an overview of the certification review of the DRCOG transportation planning process that was conducted by FHWA Colorado Division and FTA Region 8 recently. The federal certification review is held every four years. DRCOG staff submitted an in-depth written response to questions asked in the review packet. An FHWA desk review of the submission was completed, followed by an FHWA/FTA on-site visit to DRCOG on February 8. A public comment period is currently underway and a public meeting to solicit comment on the DRCOG Federal Certification Review will held later today (March 28) at DRCOG. The final report and a Certification Review Determination transmittal letter are expected before October 18, 2016.

Mr. Bustow asked for public comment from the committee:

- Bert Weaver said there is a need for inter-regional planning.
- Aylene McCallum commented that while the transportation planning process is transparent, comprehensive and technically accessible, it is often challenging to understand. She said it is sometimes difficult for the general public to make comment on. She suggested DRCOG make a more strategic and comprehensive review of public outreach processes (i.e., make less technical and more understandable.)
- Janet Finch commented there is not enough joint discussion in coordination of the TIP processes between RTD, CDOT, DRCOG and local jurisdictions. She felt there was too much 'pasting together', as opposed to DRCOG and local jurisdictions having input into the CDOT and RTD priorities. She cited her concerns about the:
 - RPP funding process—Said other transportation regions in the state had a joint discussion, while she was not sure there was joint discussion for this region.
 - TAP funding process—Said the process for the CDOT allocation was not transparent and Region 1, Region 4 and DRCOG all had different selection processes.
 - FASTER funding process—Said it is not clear on CDOT versus TIP selection of projects and felt the funding cycle is random. Suggested DRCOG could serve as a clearinghouse to keep local jurisdictions aware of anticipated CDOT funding cycles. Said the RTD transit funding process is vague, and questioned whether local jurisdictions had any input.
- George Gerstle commented that RTD's transit funding allocations could be more transparent. It would be good to know how FTA small urban area funding is allocated and have opportunity to provide input.

The meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for April 25, 2016.

ATTACHMENT B

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 25, 2016	Action	4

SUBJECT

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

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval of the draft revised CTE/HPTE and non-HPTE additional information requirements for Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan project submittals with a tolling component.

ACTION BY OTHERS

[July 2, 2014](#) – MVIC

SUMMARY

At its March meeting, TAC continued its conversation from January on two specific components of addressing HOV, managed lanes, and toll highway policies in DRCOG's transportation planning process:

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

With no consensus reached during the March meeting about developing a regional managed lanes policy, several TAC members asked DRCOG staff to research how other MPOs address HOV, tolls, and managed lane policies. The initial research did not find applicable policy examples from a regional planning and project funding perspective. The few MPOs (and state DOTs) that had any HOV/toll/managed lane policies focused on facility operations and user eligibility (such as [this example](#) from Washington State DOT). CDOT similarly was unable to find other applicable examples when crafting its new HOV policy that TAC reviewed in January.

The updated draft of additional information requirements for FC-RTP project submittals with a tolling component (shown in Attachment 1-*CDOT/HPTE projects* and Attachment 2-*Non-HPTE projects*) incorporate TAC's January and March input. Staff suggests two options for TAC consideration to address regional HOV policy issues:

1. Incorporate CDOT's HOV policy only for CDOT/HPTE projects with a tolling component (Attachment 1).
2. Incorporate CDOT's new HOV policy for both CDOT/HPTE (Attachment 1) and private toll company (Attachment 2) projects with a tolling component. (CDOT's HOV policy assumes HOV 3+ but allows limited exceptions.)

Staff will discuss with TAC the implications of both options.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[January 25, 2016](#) – TAC

[March 28, 2016](#) – TAC

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the updated additional information requirements for FC-RTP project submittals with a tolling component as determined by TAC at its April 25, 2016 meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

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

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 25, 2016	Information	5

SUBJECT

Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

Over the past year, CDOT has administered the Aerotropolis Visioning Study. The core jurisdiction participants include Adams County, Aurora, Brighton, Commerce City, and the City and County of Denver (including DIA). The study created a forum for jurisdictions and stakeholders to share ideas, information, and challenges for realizing the economic potential presented by an aerotropolis. An aerotropolis is an urban plan in which the layout, infrastructure, and economy are centered on an airport, as in Denver International Airport (DIA).

Rick Pilgrim, Vice President of HDR Engineering and a TAC member, will present the findings of the study as outlined in the attached summary report.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

Link: [Summary Report](#) for the Colorado Aerotropolis Visioning Study

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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