

AGENDA

TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Monday, April 27, 2015

1:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, West side

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. March 23, 2015 TAC Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)

ACTION ITEMS

4. Motion to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the *DRCOG Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process Self-Certification Statement*.
(Attachment B)
Todd Cottrell
5. Move to recommend to the Board of Directors eligibility rules and evaluation criteria for FY2016-2017 studies funded through the Station Area Master Plans/Urban Center Planning Studies Pool outlined in the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
(Attachment C)
Michelle Anderson
6. Move to recommend guidance to the Metro Vision Issues Committee on specific questions related to Metro Vision measures and targets.
(Attachment D)
Jacob Riger

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

7. Upcoming 2016-2021 TIP-related activities
(Attachment E)
Todd Cottrell
8. Development of the transit component of the *Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (MVRTP)*.
(Attachment F)
Matthew Helfant

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

9. Member Comment/Other Matters
10. Next Meeting – May 18, 2015
11. 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 23, 2015

MEMBERS (OR VOTING ALTERNATES) PRESENT:

Kimberly Dall	Adams County-City of Brighton
Jeanne Shreve	Adams County
Bryan Weimer (Alternate)	Arapahoe County
Dave Chambers	Arapahoe County-City of Aurora
Tom Reed (Alternate)	Aviation Interests
George Gerstle	Boulder County
Phil Greenwald (Alternate)	Boulder County, City of Longmont
Steve Klausing	Business/Economic Development
Paul Jesaitis (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation, Reg. 1
Jeff Sudmeier (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation, DTD
David Gaspers	City and County of Denver
Douglas Rex	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Art Griffith	Douglas County
John Cotten	Douglas County-City of Lone Tree
Mike Salisbury (Alternate)	Environment Interests
Bob Manwaring	Jefferson County-City of Arvada
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Lenna Kottke	Non-RTD Transit
Bill Sirois (Alternate)	Regional Transportation District
Tex Elam (Alternate)	Senior Interests
Dick Leffler	Weld County

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mac Callison (Alternate)	Arapahoe County-City of Aurora
Tom Reiff (Alternate)	Douglas County-Town of Castle Rock
Dave Baskett (Alternate)	Jefferson County-City of Lakewood
Aaron Bustow (Alternate)	FHWA Non-voting member

Public: Danny Herrmann, CDOT Reg. 1; Jane Boand, City and County of Denver, Eugene Howard, Douglas County; Larry Squires, FTA; Eric Herbst, Northeast Transportation Connections

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

Call to Order

Vice Chair Bob Manwaring called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. The following changes to the TAC membership were announced:

- Arapahoe County's new member, Travis Greiman (Centennial Engineering Manager) replacing Joy McGee.
- Jefferson County's new member, Steve Durian (Jefferson County Transportation & Engineering Manager) replacing Kevin French.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Summary of February 23, 2015 Meeting

The meeting summary was accepted as written.

ACTION ITEM

Move to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee approval of the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program, and the associated DRCOG CO and PM 10 Conformity Determination and the Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination.

Todd Cottrell presented the action draft of the 2016-2021 TIP document and the two associated air quality conformity determination reports.

- TIP development over the last 18 months included updating of the TIP Policy document and a call for projects. (CDOT, RTD, and DRCOG each used their own selection process and funding sources.)
- TIP projects were modeled for air quality conformity which passed all pollutant emission tests.
- A public hearing on the documents was held on March 18. Two public comments were received and provided to the committee on Friday, March 20. The DRCOG Board is expected to approve April 15.
- Several adjustments/changes to the public hearing draft, as proposed by project sponsors, have been incorporated into the Action Draft (Attachment 1).

George Gerstle MOVED to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee approval of the *2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program*, and the associated *DRCOG CO and PM 10 Conformity Determination* and the *Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination*. John Cotten SECONDED the motion

Jeff Sudmeier, CDOT, requested the following revisions to the Action Draft version of the 2016-2012 TIP document.

- On page 11 of the *Public Hearing* version of the TIP Policy, under *CDOT TIP Selection Process*:
 - In first paragraph, *remove* the sentence: State law requires CDOT (and by extension, the two enterprises) to display all “capital” projects in the TIP and State TIP, regardless of funding source. (Mr. Sudmeier noted it is a federal, not state requirement, and is referenced elsewhere.)
 - In second paragraph, *add* the sentence: RTD and CDOT are represented on the DRCOG Board as non-voting members and provide comment and advice to the Board.

George Gerstle, the maker, amended his motion to include the two revisions proposed by Jeff Sudmeier (above). John Cotton, the second, agreed. The MOTION PASSED unanimously.

Move to recommend to the Board of Directors eligibility rules and process for the selection of FY2016-2017 projects to be funded through the DRCOG TDM Pool set-aside program of the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Melina Dempsey presented several clarifications on TDM Pool eligibility that required TAC' s reconsideration of its recommendation last month.

Since last TAC meeting, FHWA ruled that:

- transit fare subsidies and pass programs are intended to be associated with high-ozone days during March through September. Also, they must be associated with a program to alert participants of predicted “high-ozone days”
- carshare memberships/subsidies are not eligible.
- direct cash payment incentive programs are not eligible.

Ms. Dempsey said projects must demonstrate how they directly reduce SOV travel and VMT, and that bike and pedestrian travel ways are eligible if linked to transit and under \$100,000 (i.e., not eligible for TIP funding). George Gerstle recommended and discussion followed on not requiring the project to link to transit.

There was also discussion on the targeting of high-ozone days and how passholders are notified. More specific information on this process was requested. (The RAQC disseminates advisories of high ozone days (emails, Twitter, etc.). It was noted short-segment or multi-location projects can be aggregated.

Steve Klausing MOVED to recommend to the Board of Directors eligibility rules and process for the selection of FY2016-2017 projects to be funded through the DRCOG TDM Pool set-aside program of the *2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*, with the clarification that transit linkage or having to be within 1.5 miles of transit be removed. George Gerstle SECONDED the motion and the MOTION PASSED unanimously.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

Briefing on 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2040 MVRTP)

Jacob Riger gave an initial overview and proposed outline of the new 2040 MVRTP stating that the adopted 2040 fiscally constrained RTP will eventually be integrated into a new Metro Vision RTP once adopted by the Board. Mr. Riger said the Transit Element will be included within the MVRTP, rather than as a stand-alone document.

- Lenna Kottke suggested forming a more inspiring target for congested roadways. (target currently states not more than twice as many severely congested roadways as we have now).
- George Gerstle suggested looking at measuring “how many people are in congestion” rather than “how many vehicles are in congestion”. Goal should be to move people without being in congestion. Target should be what we are trying to achieve.
- Mr. Gerstle asked how the BRT regional study is being incorporated. Mr. Riger noted the study won't be done by the time of the plan's adoption, but can be amended into the document at later date.
- Steve Klausing suggested not measuring in number of miles, but amount of time lost in congestion.
- Bryan Weimer asked how these MV performance measures can be used as a management tool for decision-making. Staff said there will be reporting on the progress of attaining foundational measures, but the Board will need to establish prioritization of foundational measures.
- There was some discussion on when to have the TIP Policy ‘post-mortem’. (The Board will also be doing its own version.) Doug Rex said an ad hoc group will be formed more likely in June to have this discussion.
- George Gerstle suggested keeping the year “2040” in the targets.

Briefing on 2040 MVRTP Regional Bicycle Corridor System Vision.

Melina Dempsey briefed on the activity to update the Regional Bicycle Corridor System Vision that will be included in the Regional Transportation Plan later this summer. Mapping will define the regional network *vision* (not an inventory) and is the first part of a potentially larger-scale update. Staff is collaborating with local governments and other stakeholders to define the regional network, and will rely heavily on up-to-date data from the jurisdictions.

The three key update activities being considered are 1. connecting to key destinations, 2. consolidating corridor types, and 3. identifying existing and unbuilt facilities.

A project kickoff meeting was held in early March, attended by jurisdictions, counties, and other stakeholders. Smaller workgroups are being scheduled by county. Committee members were encouraged to confer with their bike/ped local staff and attend meetings.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Member Comment/Other Matters

Steve Cook noted no formal requests were made for Cycle 1 2015 amendments, but there will be model network updates.

The committee was encouraged to participate in local activities scheduled for the *Stand Up 4 Transportation* event on April 9.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for April 27, 2015.

ATTACHMENT B

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 #
April 27, 2015	Action	4

SUBJECT

The self-certification of the metropolitan transportation planning process is presented for TAC action.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends the metropolitan transportation planning process self-certification.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

Federal regulations require the State and MPO, concurrent with the submittal of a new TIP to FHWA and FTA, to self-certify that the metropolitan transportation planning process is being carried out in accordance with the applicable federal requirements.

The proposed self-certification statement for the DRCOG MPO is shown in Attachment 1.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Motion to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the *DRCOG Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process Self-Certification Statement*.

ATTACHMENTS

Draft *Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process Self-Certification*.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

MPO Self-Certification

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS SELF-CERTIFICATION

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) hereby certify that the transportation planning process is being carried out in accordance with all applicable requirements including:

- 1) 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303;
- 2) Title VI of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d-1) and 49 CFR part 21;
- 3) 49 U.S.C. 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment of business opportunity;
- 4) Section 1101(b) of the SAFETEA-LU (Pub. L. 109-59) and 49 CFR part 26 regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in USDOT funded projects;
- 5) 23 CFR part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts;
- 6) The provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et. seq.) and 49 CFR parts 27, 37, and 38;
- 7) The Older Americans Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101), prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age in programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance;
- 8) Section 324 of title 23 U.S.C. regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender;
- 9) Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794) and 49 CFR part 27 regarding discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and
- 10) Sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506 (c) and (d) and 40 CFR part 93.

Denver Regional Council of Governments

Colorado Department of Transportation

Signature

Signature

Jennifer Schaufele

Shailen P. Bhatt

Executive Director

Executive Director

Date

Date

ATTACHMENT C

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Michele Anderson, Regional Planner
303-480-6776 or manderson@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 27, 2015	Action	5

SUBJECT

Staff will share details on the proposed 2016/2017 call for urban center studies and station area master plans.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends the eligibility rules and evaluation criteria for the 2016-2017 Call for Urban Center Study/Station Area Master Plan studies.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The DRCOG Board established several “off-the-top” set-aside programs as part of the *Policy on TIP Preparation for the 2016-2021 TIP*. One of these programs is the Urban Center Study and Station Area Master Plan (UC/STAMP) pool. Each of the last three TIPs included funds to support local planning activities in these areas.

\$1.2 million (federal) is available over two fiscal years (FY16 and FY17). RTD administers and is the contracting entity for these funds and will charge a 10% administrative fee for all studies.

The funds are used to create local visions and action strategies in designated urban centers and station areas. There are four study types: original urban center study/station area master plans; next steps studies; corridor-wide studies; and area planning and implementation activities. Eligible studies are proposed to be evaluated using the attached criteria. Sponsors are eligible to receive funding for two projects with a minimum award amount of \$75,000. The maximum award amount for each study is \$200,000.

The TAC is asked to review and recommend **two components** of the new UC/STAMP Pool process:

- **Eligibility Rules and Selection Process** (Attachment 1)
- **Evaluation Criteria** (Attachment 2).

The projected schedule for UC/STAMP pool is as follows:

- May 20 – Board approval of process components
- May 26 – Open call for studies
- June 26 – Applications due
- August 19 – Staff and review panel recommendations submitted to DRCOG Board
- September 3 – Orientation meeting for project sponsors of funded studies

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the Board of Directors eligibility rules and evaluation criteria for FY2016-2017 studies funded through the Station Area Master Plans/Urban Center Planning Studies Pool outlined in the *2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program* (TIP).

ATTACHMENTS

FY16-17 Urban Centers/Station Area Master Plans:

1. Evaluation Criteria
2. Eligibility Rules

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Michele Anderson, Regional Planner, at 303-480-6776 or manderson@drco.org.

ATTACHMENT 1

FY 16-17 Urban Center Studies and Station Area Master Plans Evaluation Criteria

Metro Vision establishes the importance of urban centers and transit stations areas in the region's efforts to reach our goals for healthy, livable communities connected by a robust multi-modal transportation network. These communities have high levels of internal connectivity and are well-connected to the region at large. DRCOG staff will identify eligible urban center study or station area master plan submittals. All eligible submittals will be evaluated using the criteria below. The FY16-17 Urban Center Studies and Station Area Master Plans review committee will include representatives from DRCOG, RTD and jurisdictions that previously received funds, but are not seeking funding during the current call for studies.

All funding recommendations will be forwarded to the DRCOG Board of Directors for their consideration in determining final funding commitments. In addition to the evaluation criteria, the funding recommendation provided to the Board will be informed by the regional priorities listed below.

Study Evaluation Criteria

Project Impact Evaluation Study Need (20%)

- Application will include an issue statement that clearly identifies the local /regional need of the study along with the desired outcomes.

Potential to contribute to the vision, goals and policies embodied in Metro Vision (60%)

- Application will identify how the project contributes to the following:
 - Be active, pedestrian-, bicycle-, and transit-friendly places that experience a higher density than surrounding areas and a mix of uses;
 - Promote regional sustainability by reducing per capita VMT, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions; and
 - Provide reliable mobility choices to all users: residents and visitors of all ages, incomes and abilities, as well as businesses that provide services and produce or sell goods.

Local commitment and ability to implement (10%)

- Application will describe prior activities in support of quality growth projects in the study area.
- Applicant will demonstrate their ability to successfully complete the project in a timely fashion.

Innovation and feasibility (10%)

- Application will demonstrate:
 - Innovation in project scope; Practicality/feasibility of scope of work;
 - Coordination with other local governments, organizations, and non-profits; and
 - Transferability of project outcomes locally and regionally.

Regional Prioritization

- Priority will be given to proposed study areas including a rapid transit station and an urban center designated in Metro Vision.
- Priority will be given to urban centers currently designated as "existing" or "emerging".
- Priority will be given to existing transit corridors and planned transit corridors included in the Fiscally Constrained Rapid Transit, Park-n-Ride, & Station Locations identified in Figure 11 of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan.
- Priority will be given to proposed studies or plans that directly advance Metro Vision policies through regional planning and implementation.

ATTACHMENT 2

FY 16-17 Urban Centers Studies & Station Area Master Plans

Eligibility Rules

Urban Center Studies and Station Area Master Plans create local visions and action strategies that ultimately assist in the implementation of Metro Vision, the region's long-range plan for growth and development. There are four types of planning studies eligible through this funding opportunity: Urban Center Study/Station Area Master Plan (original); Next Steps Study; Corridor-wide Plan; and Area Planning and Implementation Strategies. Eligible project sponsors include local governments, RTD and non-profits (e.g. TMAs/BIDs). Non-profits must provide letters of support from impacted jurisdictions. Sponsors may submit any number of proposed studies, but are limited to two funded studies per fiscal year.

Urban Center Study or Station Area Master Plan

Eligible projects must include:

Stakeholder Engagement

- Outreach and engagement process that promotes the involvement of regional partners (e.g. DRCOG and RTD), stakeholders in the study area, with efforts and accommodations made to include low to moderate income, minority, and elderly or disabled citizens.

Placemaking

- Identification (map) of type and density of future land uses, including public spaces.
- Internal circulation plan(s) (maps or graphics) for motor vehicles, transit, bicycle and pedestrian and strategies to increase multi-modal connections with the larger region.
- Identifying barriers (e.g. parking, zoning, infrastructure, etc.) to desired station area and/or urban center development.
- Detailed development and investment strategies that allow people of all ages, incomes and abilities the opportunity to access a range of housing, employment, and services.
- A market or fiscal feasibility analysis that assesses plan recommendations and ensures the proposed plan is realistic and/or strategies to market the area to the development community in cases where the market for urban center and transit-oriented development is still emerging.

Action Plan and Implementation Strategies

- A clear and realistic action plan to address key findings, including identification of necessary policy or regulatory changes (e.g. comprehensive plan, zoning, etc.); infrastructure improvements, and housing strategies.
- An implementation strategy that describes the organizational structure and process that will be used to ensure the action plan is implemented, including the roles of community and regional partners.

Assessment and Impacts

- Indicators or metrics related to key strategies (e.g. multi-modal connectivity, leveraging private investment, environmental quality, etc.)
- Identification of the transportation impacts and air quality benefits of the proposed plan
- Current and future population, housing units, and employment estimates to the year 2040 (in five-year increments), including distribution of planned housing units by type and square feet of future non-residential development

Next Step Studies

Eligible projects:

- Planning activities that are related to transportation infrastructure for use by the general public.
- Next step studies should be identified in an existing Urban Center Study/Station Area Master Plan or similar effort. Examples of eligible activities include:
 - Parking assessment and management studies
 - Access management plans
 - Corridor redevelopment strategies

ATTACHMENT 2

- Design studies and concepts for multi-modal infrastructure projects
- Street design standards/manuals
- Multi-use Trail/Bike facilities plan
- Pedestrian facilities plan
- Urban design guidelines
- Comprehensive wayfinding plans and strategies
- Traffic circulation studies
- First/Last-mile mobility implementation, financing, partnership studies
- Transit enhancement feasibility studies
- Transportation demand management studies and implementation activities

Corridor-wide Studies

Eligible projects:

- Studies that aim to maximize multi-modal connectivity within transit corridors (including high frequency bus corridors that serve one or more urban centers – high frequency bus corridors have headways of 15 minutes or less) and at individual urban center/station areas along the corridor.
- Studies that identify barriers to station area development and increased transit use along the corridor – barriers could include current land use, zoning and development standards; parking availability and cost; inadequate bike and pedestrian facilities, first/last mile challenges, etc.
- Efforts to create corridor-wide implementation strategies and/or an action plan identifying such things as needed plan updates, code revisions, marking activities and financial or regulatory incentive.
- Corridor-wide studies must involve all the local jurisdictions and other major stakeholders along the corridor.

Area Planning and Implementation Activities

Eligible Projects:

- Will promote innovative planning activities that can be replicated throughout the Denver region.
- Include multiple jurisdictions, station areas and urban centers aiming to study a common issue while focusing on local context and implementation strategies.
- Potential studies could include:
 - Parking management planning and strategies
 - TOD strategies including zoning and financing for water, sewer, storm water, parks, recreational facilities, parks and open space infrastructure
 - First- and final-mile mobility implementation, financing, feasibility and partnership studies
 - Pedestrian facility assessment and needs plan
 - Bike amenities and share programs
 - Roadway corridor revitalization plans, strategies and design standards
 - Development of Complete Streets policies and ordinances
 - Alternative fuel/Electric vehicle facility planning
 - Regional multi-use trail feasibility and alignment study

ATTACHMENT D

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 27, 2015	Action	6

SUBJECT

TAC will review the latest draft *Metro Vision Plan* transportation-related foundational measures and targets and provide guidance to the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC).

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

At the request of MVIC, provide a recommendation to specific questions about Metro Vision measures and targets.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

In fall 2014, TAC reviewed the draft *Metro Vision Plan* transportation element (*A Connected Multimodal Region*) and its associated regional measures. A subset of the measures are proposed to be designated as foundational measures with associated targets established.

MVIC is currently reviewing the draft *Metro Vision* plan and requested further TAC review and guidance on five measures and targets, as listed below. The committee is asked to provide consensus on the following specific questions, as requested by MVIC:

FM 3: Combined housing + transportation cost as percent of median income household (per the “H+T” Index value published by the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT))

Baseline value (from CNT): 49%

MVIC: Should this measure be designated as a foundational measure? How will transportation “costs” be consistently obtained or calculated?

(Staff subsequently met with one of the developers of the H+T Index to learn more about how the household transportation costs are calculated and converted to regional values. During the discussion, staff confirmed the H+T Index is useful for neighborhood-level analyses, but had concerns about its applicability for use as a regional foundational measure to be tracked closely over time.)

FM 6: Surface transportation-related daily greenhouse gas emissions per capita

Baseline value: 26.8 lbs./person 2040 target: 60% decrease to 10.7

MVIC: Should target be set for per capita emissions or total emissions per day? (baseline total emissions = 82,812,000; 2040 target = 45,800,000 pounds)

FM 7: Non-SOV mode share to work

Baseline value: 25.5%

2040 target: Increase to 35%

MVIC: Should target be higher? (e.g., 40% or 45%)

FM 9: Severe traffic congestion on the Regional Roadway System

Baseline value: 1,170 lane miles
severely congested

2040 target: Not to increase above 2,000
lane miles (current forecast is 3,100)

MVIC: Should an alternative measure be considered foundational, with a future daily target to be defined? Example alternatives:

- Travel time variability index (baseline = 1.22; forecast = 1.45)
 - regionwide average additional time required for rush hour trip
 - Total vehicle hours of delay (baseline = 200,000; forecast = 675,000)
 - Total person hours of delay (baseline = 270,000; forecast = 910,000)
 - Person delay per capita (baseline = 6 minutes; forecast = 14 minutes)
-

FM 10: Number of annual traffic fatalities

Baseline value: 176

2040 target: Less than 100

MVIC: Is the draft target reasonable? How should the target be determined?

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

TAC – [December 1, 2014](#), [December 29, 2014](#)

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend guidance to the Metro Vision Issues Committee on specific questions related to Metro Vision measures and targets.

ATTACHMENT

Draft Metro Vision [A Connected Multimodal Region](#) – March 2015

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT E

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 #
April 27, 2015	Information	7

SUBJECT

Upcoming 2016-2021 TIP-related activities

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

On April 15, 2015, the DRCOG Board of Directors approved the *2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program*. The Board action was the culmination of 18 months of dedicated work by various DRCOG committees including TAC.

However, a number of tasks still remain associated with the 2016-2021 TIP including developing a waiting list of projects, as well as scheduling an open forum to discuss the project selection process and ways it may be improved.

At the April meeting, staff will brief the committee on these and other upcoming TIP related activities.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT F

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Matthew Helfant, Senior Transportation Planner
303-480-6731 or mhelfant@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 27, 2015	Information	8

SUBJECT

This item introduces the topic of developing the transit component of the new *Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (MVRTP)*.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

DRCOG staff is developing the transit component of the new MVRTP. It will also serve as the federally-required “coordinated transit plan” for our region. The coordinated plan inventories existing transit services, and forecasts service and funding gaps. It will identify strategies to address the transportation needs of our region focusing on individuals with disabilities and older adults.

The 2035 MVRTP included a stand-alone Transit Element. Staff proposes to integrate the updated transit component directly into the new MVRTP. This will make the transit component more useful, reduce plan text duplication, and better emphasize our region’s integrated approach to coordinating an array of fixed route and human service transit services.

Staff will present an overview and proposed outline to the MVRTP transit component and ask for TAC input and thoughts.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

[2035 MVRTP Transit Element](#)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Matthew Helfant, Senior Transportation Planner, at 303-480-6731 or mhelfant@drcog.org.