

AGENDA
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, June 2, 2014
1:30 p.m.
1290 Broadway
Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, west side

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

ACTION ITEM

4. **Motion to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the *Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Deployment Program.***
(Attachment B)
Greg MacKinnon

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

5. **Discussion on fiscally constrained roadway capacity projects for the *2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP).***
(Attachment C)
Jacob Riger

ACTION ITEM

6. **Motion to recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committee the draft *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation, Procedures for Preparing the 2016-2021 TIP.***
(Attachment D)
Todd Cottrell

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

7. Member Comment/Other Matters
8. Next Meeting - June 23, 2014
9. 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, May 19, 2014

MEMBERS (OR VOTING ALTERNATES) PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve (Alternate)	Adams County
Gene Putman	Adams County-City of Thornton
Mac Callison (Alternate)	Arapahoe County – City of Aurora
Tom Reed (Alternate)	Aviation Interests
George Gerstle	Boulder County
Heather Balsler	Boulder County – City of Louisville
Debra Baskett (Chair)	Broomfield, City and County
Steve Klausing	Business/Economic Development
Sandi Kohrs (Alternate)	Colorado Dept. of Transportation, DTD
Danny Herrmann	Colorado Dept. of Transportation, Reg. 1
Janice Finch	City and County of Denver
Steve Gordon	City and County of Denver
Doug Rex	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Art Griffith	Douglas County
Dan Sailer (Alternate)	Douglas County-Town of Castle Rock
Greg Fischer	Freight Interests
Bert Weaver	Non MPO
Lenna Kottke	Non RTD Transit
Ken Lloyd	Regional Air Quality Council
Bill Sirois (Alternate)	Regional Transportation District
Bob Davis	Senior Transportation
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motor

OTHERS PRESENT:

Maria D'Andrea (Alternate)	Adams County
Dave Gaspers (Alternate)	City and County of Denver
John Cotten (Alternate)	Douglas County –City of Lone Tree
Dave Baskett (Alternate)	Jefferson County-City of Lakewood

Public: Brian Love, Arapahoe County; Paul Jesaitis, CDOT Reg. 1; Scott Burton, Jefferson County; Kent Moorman, City of Thornton

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

Call to Order

Chair Debra Baskett called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

Public Comments

There was no public comment.

Summary of March 24, 2014 Meeting

The meeting summary was accepted without change.

ACTION ITEMS

Motion to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the May 2014 amendments to the 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Todd Cottrell presented the two proposed amendments to the 2012-2017 TIP.

1. CDOT Region 1 – FASTER Transit Pool – Add 7 new projects in \$5.6 million in FASTER transit funding and \$1.1 million in local match in FY2015.
2. CDOT Region 6 (1) – Bridge On-System Pool – Add \$14.1 million for bridge repairs in FY2014-2017

Dave Baskett MOVED to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the May 2014 amendments to the *2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*. Gene Putman SECONDED the motion and the MOTION PASSED unanimously.

While not part of proposed amendments, Gene Putman expressed concern about the lack of bus stops for Thornton, Longmont, and Douglas County areas for the new FASTER-funded CDOT intercity bus system. Bill Sirois, RTD, said he would talk with CDOT on proposed bus stops. Art Griffith noted Castle Rock would be interested in bus service. Steve Klausung asked that RTD and CDOT revisit the proposed bus stops to add DTC, as well as Castle Rock stops. Debra Baskett asked Sandi Kohrs, CDOT, to request more information from CDOT Transit on this issue.

Motion to recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committee Project Location-related Metro Vision Implementation evaluation criteria for job growth and environmental justice for the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Steve Cook presented the evaluation criteria modifications (as revised by MVIC) for job growth and environmental justice for further TAC review and recommendations, per request by MVIC at its May 7 meeting. MVIC specifically requested TAC consider the following items (in red font):

-
- Instead of using the rate of growth as the threshold measure, should the net increase be used? (e.g., TAZ had at least 200 additional jobs between 2005 and 2013 = 1 point and greater than 500 jobs = 2 points.

After discussion, the following recommendations were made for the Metro Vision Project Related Implementation Criteria (located in Appendix):

- Job Growth: 1 point if project location within ½ mile: 500-999 additional jobs between 2005 and 2013 (or the most recent 2014 data); 2 points if 1,000 or greater.
- Additional 1 point if the project receiving “job growth” points also is within or touching an environmental justice area. This equates to the project having also been designated to receive points under the other specific EJ Criterion per its rules, which also state: “The sponsor must identify the benefits and disadvantages the project may have on the environmental justice community.”

George Gerstle MOVED to recommend. Ted Heyd SECONDED the motion and the MOTION PASSED with three opposing (Heather Balsler, Dan Sailer, and Gene Putman).

-
- Should staff try to extract group quarter residents (e.g., college dorms) out of the tabulations for per capita income?

Lenna Kottke MOVED to recommend not extracting college dorms from low income calculations. Gene Putman SECONDED the motion and the MOTION PASSED unanimously.

-
- A) Should the job growth calculations extend into 2014 (latest quarter of data available?)
 - B) Should job growth calculations include “verified” jobs to be created in the TAZ over the next year?

George Gerstle MOVED to recommend using the most current data available at the time of TIP evaluation process. Gene Putman made a friendly amendment that data be verified and cleaned up. George Gerstle agreed. Heather Balsler SECONDED the motion and the MOTION PASSED unanimously.

-
- What level of proof should be provided by sponsors to ensure the project provides benefits to environmental justice neighborhoods with a higher share of minority or low income residents? Can smaller geographic areas be used to represent the job growth or EJ areas?

The sponsor must identify the project and benefits in the essay to claim the EJ points. DRCOG will have the discretion to determine if the project benefits EJ.

Motion to recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committee Project Type evaluation criteria for the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Todd Cottrell presented staff’s track-changes redline version of revisions to the TIP evaluation criteria for committee discussion.

Steve Gordon questioned the eligibility for roadway capacity projects, saying it should look at person trips, not just vehicles, and should include streetcars, and possibly enhanced bus, not just BRT. George Gerstle agreed and said the definition should apply to all modes that increase mobility. Janice Finch agreed and said definition should be for enhanced transit that improves capacity. Dave Basket noted that MVIC is charged with making policy decisions such as this.

Doug Rex said staff would add rapid transit projects as eligible within Table 8 and change the title of Table 8 from Bus Service Projects to “Transit Service Projects”. Steve Cook noted if a project applies in a rapid transit category, it must first be in the RTP.

Concerning the Multimodal Connectively criterion, there was discussion of the eligibility definition of “directly connected” (schools, etc.) being too restrictive. Janice Finch commented it should be “directly connecting but no more than 1/4 mile, and said 1/8 mile is fine”. Ted Heyd suggested “2 points for directly touching and 1 point for within 1/8 mile.” TAC agreed with this change.

Dave Baskett had concern about a proposed change in the roadway capacity eligibility definition for whether a submittal is scored as a project or a phase (of the larger, entire project) – he preferred project. Art Griffith supported by phase. George Gerstle recommended there be a requirement that each phase brings utility. Steve Cook said at time of project submittal, staff could ask the sponsor if the phase is a needed phase to make the project work.

Table 4 - Roadway Capacity Projects

- Multimodal connectivity - Staff will add 4 points for on-street bike lanes and shoulders (in scoring instructions), per MVIC and TAC recommendations.
 - TAC recommended an increase to 8 points for new transit travel lanes (currently is 4).
 - Art Griffith stated that good planning (i.e., upfront improvements) should not be penalized. If you put in improvements prior to submitting a project, you should be able to still get points “for good planning”. Todd Cottrell said the language could be adjusted “up to 18 points to projects with “the following features *already present....*”. Steve Cook suggested “existing and retained”.
 - Bicycle counters. Doesn’t need to be a permanent installation. Don’t drop the optional point. While there was consensus that bicycle counters didn’t need to be a required component of a construction project, TAC agreed that retaining the optional point was justified.

- Current congestion criteria. Mac Callison suggested using the most available data. Steve Cook said the measure for congestion management used in project selection is not an engineering level analysis. Steve said this would be difficult to do, but would look into it.

Table 5 - Roadway Operational Improvement

- George Gerstle recommended adding points if there are operational improvements that provide benefits to carpool. Steve Cook said language could be added to Multimodal Connectivity criteria to add points under a transit operational feature recognizing carpool queue jumps. Points were recommended to be changed from 3 to 5 points.
- Delay Reduction criteria: Art Griffith pointed out a typo (should be 16 points – staff will fix).

Table 7 - Transit Passenger Facilities Projects

- Fix the track change redline to 8,000 in Usage and Benefits

Table 8 - Bus Service Projects

- Change table title to Transit Service Projects
- Add third eligibility item – Rapid transit (streetcars, etc.)
- TAC reconfirms to MVIC that funding new bus projects is a good idea.
- Obtain written approval or acknowledgement from transit agency for a new or expanded route. George Gerstle expressed concerns about a hard deadline. Gene Putman said language needs to be explicit to make it clear that, outside the RTD district, sponsors don't have to ask RTD. Art Griffith agreed.

Table 9 - Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

- Are eligibility requirements #1 through #3 appropriately defined? Yes, staff provided flexibility in the criteria.
- Staff will work on definition of material required for bike/ped trails, depending on usage. Steve Cook said, in past, materials that are not paved surfaces (i.e., crusher fines) were not allowed.
- RTP Priority corridors criteria. MVIC had suggested adding 5 points for projects along rapid transit lines. Committee agreed.
- Connectivity criteria. Mac Callison recommended higher points to connect to higher capacity rail, than to bus. Others members did not support.
- Safety criteria. Ted Heyd said examples of physically protected facilities should also be reflected in the Multimodal Connectivity criteria in Tables 4, 5, and 6. Ted recommended increasing points from 2 to 5 for protected or grade separated facilities.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Discussion on draft scores for a portion of candidate roadway capacity projects desiring regional funding in the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan.

Jacob Riger presented a brief preview of this agenda item. Due to time constraints, the full discussion was postponed until next meeting on June 2. An initial list of project scores was emailed to TAC members last Friday, May 16. The list does not include CDOT projects at this time. Modeling of fiscally constrained network is scheduled for this summer. The Public Hearing scheduled for October 2014.

Member Comment/Other Matters

Chair Debra Baskett noted Gene Putman's retirement this month from the City of Thornton and thanked him on behalf of DRCOG for his many years of service since 1980 on the Transportation Advisory Committee.

The meeting ended at 4:03 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for June 2, 2014.

ATTACHMENT B

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
June 2, 2014	Action	4

SUBJECT

This item concerns the *Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Deployment Program*.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends approval of the *Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Deployment Program* as it allows project sponsors to proceed with effective investment in regional transportation operations improvements.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The 2012-2017 TIP includes an annual Regional ITS Program Pool funded with federal CMAQ dollars. The TIP allocated \$825,000 per year for FY 2014 and FY 2015, and there is an additional \$423,000 available from project savings.

The Regional Transportation Operations (RTO) work group, comprised of regional transportation operators, assisted in the development of the *Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Program*, which guides the investment of the TIP funds over the next four years. The program projects a constant level of funding allocation for the latter two fiscal years.

The program development process consisted of the following:

1. The RTO work group defined the program priorities under the guidance of the *DRCOG Regional Concept of Transportation Operations (RCTO)*, which recognizes that the regional travelers expect reliable service for all travel modes and do not recognize jurisdictional boundaries.
2. A call for projects was conducted that yielded 11 projects from nine jurisdictions for a total request of \$3.6 million in federal funds. The project applications represent the program needs.
3. DRCOG staff evaluated the project applications and assembled a program, which was subsequently endorsed by the RTO work group.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Motion to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the *Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Deployment Program*.

ATTACHMENTS

Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Deployment Program

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT C

To: Chair and Members of the Transportation Advisory Committee

From: Jacob Riger, Transportation Planning Coordinator
303 480-6749 or jriger@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
June 2, 2014	Information	5

SUBJECT

This item concerns development of the *Fiscally Constrained 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP)* to be adopted in December 2014.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for information only.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

To meet federal fiscal constraint and air quality conformity requirements, the 2040 RTP must:

- individually identify regionally significant roadway capacity and rapid transit projects;
- demonstrate that revenues will be reasonably expected to fund these projects through 2040 (fiscal constraint), and
- identify the implementation period of each project for air quality conformity modeling purposes.

At the May 19 TAC meeting, staff provided draft project scoring and evaluation results for non-CDOT-submitted roadway capacity projects for initial review. By the June 2 TAC meeting, staff will provide:

- revised project scores for non-CDOT-submitted projects (attached);
- CDOT-recommended projects to be assigned CDOT revenues;
- expected revenues, particularly for DRCOG-controlled revenues, and
- example approaches for defining a list of fundable roadway capacity projects through 2040.

As a reminder, project scoring is not the only factor considered in determining which projects will comprise the fiscally constrained RTP. TAC will consider scoring and other factors in developing the list of fiscally constrained roadway projects. For the fiscally constrained rapid transit network, RTD anticipates only minor changes at this time.

At its June 2 meeting, TAC will begin the discussion of preparing a list of fiscally constrained roadway capacity and rapid transit projects by staging period. A project list is required for air quality conformity modeling.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

This item is for information only.

ATTACHMENTS

Revised project scores for non-CDOT-submitted projects.

Other attachments forthcoming.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT D

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 #
June 2, 2014	Action	6

SUBJECT

Developing the next *Transportation Improvement Program* (TIP).

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committees the draft *Policy on TIP Preparation* to be used for the 2016-2021 TIP Call for Projects.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program Preparation* serves as the “rules” for all items relating to the TIP, including how the TIP will be developed, how DRCOG will select projects, how amendments will be processed, etc. The process of soliciting funding requests for the TIP cannot begin until the Preparation Policy document is adopted.

MVIC has acted as the body that reviews and recommends policy changes to the Board, with technical assistance from TAC. Numerous technical and policy changes, both minor and more complex, have been made to the *2016-2021 Policy on TIP Preparation*. More complex modifications to the TIP were developed based TAC recommendations and MVIC actions.

Staff has provided two versions of the draft TIP Policy; a track change and clean version. The track change version contains comment boxes in the right margin describing the staff proposed changes. Comment boxes with yellow highlighted text in Tables 4 through 11 and Appendix E reflect TAC recommendations from its May 19 meeting at the request of MVIC.

Please note, Section III.G of the TIP Policy outlines the second phase selection process (highlighted within the document). Due to timing, this section has not been discussed by MVIC and staff is requesting that your recommendation not include this section of text. The adoption of the second phase selection process is not needed to release the TIP Call for Projects and will be brought as an amendment to the document later this summer. Additionally, regionally-funded roadway projects in the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP) will be added to *Appendix C: Eligible Roadway Capacity Projects* once approved by the Board and prior to the 2016-2021 TIP Call for Projects.

MVIC is scheduled to review and recommend the TIP Policy on June 4.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Motion to recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committee the draft *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation, Procedures for Preparing the 2016-2021 TIP*.

ATTACHMENTS

Draft 2016-2021 *Policy on TIP Preparation* (track change and clean versions)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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