

**AGENDA**  
**Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC)**  
**Wednesday, June 19, 2013**  
**9:30 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.**  
**1290 Broadway**  
**Independence Pass Board Room**

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. May 15, 2013 Meeting Summary  
(Attachment A)

**ACTION ITEMS**

4. **Motion to select, clarify, and prioritize additional regional planning topics that may be explored during the process to develop Metro Vision 2040.** (90 minutes)  
(Attachment B)
  - Setting the Framework (Staff presentation-5 minutes)
  - MVPAC Discussion and Action (85 minutes)

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

5. MVPAC Committee Check-in (5 minutes)
6. Announcements (10 minutes)
  - [MVPAC Issues Tracking](#)
  - [2014 New Partners for Smart Growth Conference](#)
7. Next Meeting
  - Joint TAC/MVPAC meeting will be either July 22 or July 29 (29 is most likely) at 1:00 p.m.
8. Other Matters by Members
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 Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC) Wednesday, May 15, 2013

---

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gretchen Armijo	CO Dept. of Public Health & Environment
Christopher Auxier	Adams Cty. Housing Authority
Lesli Ellis	City of Boulder
Erin Fosdick	City of Longmont
Steve Gordon	City and County of Denver
Randy Harrison	RW Harrison & Associates
Steve Hebert	City of Lone Tree
Leanne Jeffers	Regional Instit. for Health & Envrnmntl. Leadership
Glenda Lainis	City of Thornton
Kyle Legleiter	The Colorado Health Foundation
Lynn Merwin	City and County of Broomfield
Anne Miller	CO Dept. of Local Affairs
Katherine (Kati) Rider	Douglas County
Frederick Rollenhagen	Clear Creek County
Jerome Tinianow	City and County of Denver
Will Toor	Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Robert Watkins	City of Aurora
Brad Weinig	Enterprise Community Partners

DRCOG staff: Brad Calvert, Nicole Klepadlo, Eric Ross, Dan Jerrett, Casey Collins

#### Call to Order

Robert Watkins called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. Anne Miller, CO Dept. of Local Affairs, was introduced as a new member, replacing Andy Hill.

#### Public Comment

Danny Katz, director of Colorado Public Interest Research Group (CoPIRG), commented on his organization's report on transportation trends: [A New Direction: Our Changing Relationship with Driving and the Implications for America's Future.](#)"

#### Summary of April 24, 2013 Meeting

Two corrections to the summary were noted:

1. add Lynn Merwin to the attendee list.
2. on page 3, in last paragraph, *Local Government Survey-First Draft*, change from Steve Gordon (Golden) to Steve Glueck (Golden).

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **Motion to recommend to the Board of Directors two initial scenarios to begin the Metro Vision scenario analysis process.**

Brad Calvert presented the proposed Scenarios A and B that the May 1 Metro Vision Issues Committee recommended to be considered at the May meeting of the DRCOG Board (May 15). Scenario analysis will provide "what if" information for Board to consider as it makes policy decisions for funding, goals, and action strategies. The MVPAC was directed to provide feedback/refinements on the MVIC-recommended scenarios A and B. The refined scenarios will be provided to the DRCOG Board.

In review, Brad said the MVIC guidance to MVPAC noted:

- the importance of running an initial set of scenarios (A and B) to determine that modeling tools are working and that results can inform future policy conversations. Time and resources are a consideration as modeling a scenario takes several weeks.
- the importance of sharing information and concerns so that everyone feels equally informed.
- MVIC is not expecting to make policy decisions based on the initial round of scenario analysis.
- MVIC recommended the deletion of 'external' factors such as increasing future gas price; and not changing base assumptions.

MVPAC discussion followed on scenarios A and B.

Member comments:

- Growth and development factors should be constant for both A and B.
  - How base assumptions were determined. (i.e., 17%/48% new housing/ employment in urban centers). Is this an average of 5 years, over 20 years? Base assumption is historical trend and what is expected to happen without any policy change.
  - Two distinct scenarios should be crafted, rather than holding constant values for both. For instance in terms of the share of housing and employment growth could be 17/48 in Scenario A and something closer to goal of 50/75 in Scenario B.
  - Concern was expressed that Scenario B would 'force' (beyond the base assumption) the transit figure, but does not do the same for the housing/development figure. Brad said this is because the transportation model is more robust than the land use model. The housing number should not be carried forward for both A and B, but be crafted separately.
    - Communities in the region are doing analysis using urban center development numbers that relate transit increases to housing/business development. HUD, a key funder of this effort, would likely not want to see a scenario that does not address changes in housing over current trends.
  - How sensitive is the model to the addition of new facilities (50 miles vs. 100 miles in a regional system – and is that a significant enough number)?
  - What is the link between developing policy and scenario analysis? Brad noted that the initial scenario analysis is to test the process first and policy conversations would be later.
  - Proximity to transit/bicycle facilities would make a more attractive area, and lead to an assumption of more population/employment. Steve Cook said modeling scenarios A and B would allow variable testing of the urban center goals. Steve also noted that the base assumption of 17% housing /48% employment growth in the urban centers is based on local government inputs.
  - Dan Jerrett, DRCOG's Regional Economist, commented briefly that the utility factors in the land use model would need to be adjusted to influence the share of future growth in urban centers.
  - What are the funding assumptions for each scenario; how will funding availability affect outcomes; and how can scenario analysis influence policy? Steve Cook said more 'roads' funding in A and 'transit' funding in B is assumed, but said no additional funding is anticipated at this time (but could change).
  - Steve Cook discussed some variables of the proposed Scenarios A and B. He noted the current freeway/tollway system base includes 2,000 lane miles.
1. **Rapid Transit– Bus/HOV Center Line miles** Steve Cook said the base assumption is 47 miles. He noted Scenario A includes an additional 100 managed lane miles (which, for modeling purposes, might include envisioned projects such as I-70 East Corridor, C-470,

and I-25 North). Steve noted this would align with CDOT policy to add managed lanes when adding capacity.

#### Member comments

- Scenarios A and B should have an equal number of managed lanes, with perhaps more BRT arterial lanes in the transit-oriented Scenario B.
- Scenarios should consider the conversion from free- to managed-lanes on South I-25. Steve Cook said the model is not sensitive enough to show different regional level results with lane conversion changes.
- It should be clearer that funding assumptions are unconstrained in both scenarios. There should be discussion about how unconstrained the scenarios should be.

**2. Additional Arterial Roadway Lane Miles** Steve Cook noted the base case assumes 800 new arterial lane miles (in the current fiscally constrained plan). Scenario A adds 200 more arterial lane miles and Scenario B reduces by 400 lane miles. Steve said the Transportation Advisory Committee will identify the specific road project changes at their May meeting (May 20).

#### Member comments

- Adding additional non-tolled lane miles in Scenario A and reducing in Scenario B makes sense. When adding bus service in Scenario B, to have some portion be additional arterial BRT (i.e., not assume BRT happens only on tolled freeway lanes).
- Clarification as to why the Miles of Bicycle Facilities in Scenario A was blank. Steve clarified it would be the base assumption of 2,000 miles. Steve noted bicycle facilities are not modeled, but are considered an indicator for utility factors used in the model as an attractiveness factor.
- How are pedestrian facilities, connectivity to destinations, etc. measured? Scott Ramming, DRCOG Senior Travel Modeler, commented on how the model selects a choice probability based on utility factors and characteristics of the area.
- Are other MPOs modeling bicycling/pedestrian facilities directly, not by utility factors. Steve Cook said a few organizations do, including Portland, but modeling a bicycle or pedestrian system is a complicated endeavor. Steve said DRCOG will be doing a feasibility study next year to investigate this in our region.
- Scenario B should have a more robust utility factor to increase the attractiveness of bicycling/pedestrian travel. The committee agreed with this recommendation.
- Why was the cost of parking removed? Should scenarios look at parking constraints or paid parking within TOD areas. Scott Ramming noted the model doesn't have parking capacity constraints; it only has a cost entered in the mode choice for driving. Scenario analysis should consider adding parking costs in TOD areas. Staff noted that MVIC specifically chose to remove this.
- In general the table is unclear for understanding scenarios across the board. Adding a column on the left of the table to designate the "current" level of miles might help.
- Clarification was sought on the base assumption for the urban growth boundary (UGB) - is 260 square miles is what exists now versus the 2035 vision. Steve Cook said yes. Will UGB change in Scenarios A and B? Several committee members weighed in that the UGB should remain constant.
- Scenario B should accurately represent improvements in the transit and bike/ped system that we would like to see, perhaps being more visionary for 2040.

Steve Cook discussed several other **Scenario B** (transit/bicycle/pedestrian focus) variables:

**3. Rapid Transit System-Rail miles.** In Scenario B, this includes no other rail besides the completion of FasTracks, as approved by the voters in 2004.

4. **Bus service increase.** Increase by 20% (from among routes with high headways).
  - It was suggested that increased bus service be focused on corridors not served by rail, including suburb-to-suburb connections.
  - Steve Gordon suggested adding circulators where not served by RTD,
5. **Cost (fares) for Transit.** Steve noted fares will be reduced by 50%, but we are not able to model free EcoPasses for specific geographic areas.
  - Reduced fares should be kept in Scenario B to increase transit accessibility.
  - How do we define what “DRCOG can control”? For instance, can DRCOG influence the price of fuel and/or the fare to travel via transit? Steve Cook said MVIC has specified that gas price be removed from the initial scenario planning effort (A & B). DRCOG cannot affect large scale transit pricing, but has provided funding for transit passes in selective areas. It was noted that from a modeling perspective, reducing transit cost simplifies the process.

#### Member Comments

- Scenario A will not account for variable costs of vehicular (gas, parking, etc.) but Scenario B will vary costs for transit – is this the right approach? Steve Cook said previous modeling in 2007 had used all free transit.
- Will modeling of transit and auto operating costs have an effect on policy decisions? Steve Cook said this factor will effect VMT growth, increase in transit use, and accessibility to jobs, etc. In 2007, it did effect a policy decision regarding the urban growth boundary.

Steve Cook summarized the **recommendations** made:

- Rapid Transit System – Rail miles (in Scenario B) - The assumption is that all of FasTracks is completed. FasTracks completion assumes completion with Northwest Rail and North Metro Line.
- Rapid Transit - Bus/HOV centerlane miles - Change to an additional 100 miles (to match Scenario A).
- Bus Service Levels– Overall 20% increase, but reflect selective locations of decreasing the headway (e.g., on routes with higher headways).
- Cost (fares) for Transit - Reduce price of transit by 50%.
- Additional Roadway Miles – Add in some selective arterial BRTs (as part of the 200 lane miles).
- Acceptance (Utility Factor) of Walk/Bicycling – Double the utility factors, for acceptance of bicycling and walking trips.

Steve Cook noted if general land use assumptions are kept the same, then we will be able to see how Scenario A and Scenario B might affect growth in urban centers.

- The committee is very interested in discussing this area further.
- Other issues that should be considered during the scenario analysis process: impact on aging and handicapped access and further discussion on equity issues.
- Brad Calvert said a very rough equity screen will be done on the initial scenarios.

Steve Hebert asked when the initial scenario analysis work will conclude. Brad Calvert said findings would likely be presented in July at a joint TAC and MVPAC meeting.

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

Both informational items, Urban Centers Initial Analysis and Regional Equity Atlas Version 2 Overview, were postponed.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

Brad announced the following MVPAC Small Group Meetings:

- Modeling 101: meets on May 20, 2013 (3:30 – 5)
- Quantifying Fiscal Impacts of Growth: meets on May 23, 2013 (1:00 – 3:30)
  
- Background data for the urban centers analysis items that was delayed was requested. Brad offered to host a webinar prior to the June meeting to share the analysis and answer specific questions.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 a.m. The next scheduled meeting is June 19, 2013.

## ATTACHMENT B

To: Members of the Metro Vision Planning Action Committee

From: Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning and Operations  
303 480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org

Subject: **Additional Regional Planning Topics**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
June 19, 2013	Action	4

### REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to select, clarify, and prioritize additional regional planning topics that may be explored during the process to develop Metro Vision 2040.

### SUMMARY

- MVPAC members will select, clarify, and prioritize additional planning topics for the DRCOG Board's consideration during the Metro Vision 2040 planning process. Committee members will also be asked to identify key resources that may assist in the exploration of the prioritized topics (see attached *Summary of Additional Topics for Consideration in Metro Vision 2040*).
- The Board has been collecting stakeholder feedback in various ways for several months (see attached). DRCOG staff reviewed all stakeholder input received to date and identified additional planning topics for MVPAC to assess. The topics to be discussed at today's meeting were chosen from stakeholder input based on available resources, capacity, and those better-suited for Board consideration for inclusion in Metro Vision.
- Topic areas include:
  - Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
  - Parks and Open Space
  - Multimodal Transportation
  - Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)
  - Aviation
  - Infill Development
  - Health
  - Fiscal Impacts/Cost of Growth
- Staff will share today's action by MVPAC with the Board as part of regular project updates and make recommendations accordingly.

### PRIOR BOARD ACTION

N/A

### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

### ALTERNATIVES

N/A

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Attachments:
  - Summary of Additional Topics for Consideration in Metro Vision 2040
  - Metro Vision 2040 Stakeholder Engagement Summary

## Summary of Additional Topics for Consideration in Metro Vision 2040

DRCOG staff is requesting feedback from MVPAC on the following topics. Some topics are currently addressed in Metro Vision, but stakeholder input to date has suggested that there may be a need to evolve/enhance the conversation to meet current/future planning needs. Other topics have been suggested by stakeholders, but are not currently a point of focus in Metro Vision.

### Topics Currently in Metro Vision

#### **Topic: Transit Oriented Development (TOD) – Stakeholder Input / Status**

- Access to transit is an emerging issue for home buyers (last 5 years)
- The region needs access to every day destinations by public transit
- Regional approach to TOD – understanding how communities across the region are planning for TOD
- Explore best practices for making local vision become reality

*Status: SCI-supported effort to complete case studies on current corridors and station areas throughout the region. SCI-supported catalytic projects (4) at station areas.*

#### **Guidance needed from MVPAC**

- While there is no shortage of other partners or efforts to address TOD issues, how does Metro Vision specifically address and further all of these efforts?

#### **Topic: Parks and Open Space – Stakeholder Input**

- Stakeholders acknowledge the robust opportunity for outdoor recreation and the desire to maintain and preserve this asset
- Is the region fully leveraging the existing network of parks and open space as a regional asset?
- Access to opportunity including location efficiency, neighborhood revitalization and identity, quality of life issue

#### **Guidance needed from MVPAC**

- Should Metro Vision advance a regional strategy and pursue a more coordinated parks/open space effort?

#### **Topic: Multimodal Transportation – Stakeholder Input**

- Explore how traditional suburban communities and major transportation corridors can become more accessible for walking and bicycling as a mode of transportation
- Need overall strategy to address multi-modal connectivity to transit

#### **Guidance needed from MVPAC**

- Given that multimodal transportation is currently a major point of emphasis in Metro Vision, should Metro Vision respond specifically to the issues raised above?

---

**Topic: Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) – Stakeholder Input / Status**

- Sense that the 2040 boundary should not be much different from the current 2035 boundary
- Explore making the urban growth boundary more enforceable

*Status: DRCOG Board voted to delay allocation process until after Metro Vision 2040 adoption. Results of Development Type will soon be vetted by local governments – this analysis will detail recent development trends (e.g., how much land has been consumed within existing UGB).*

**Guidance needed from MVPAC**

- Should there be a new conversation to further how the UGB addressed, maintained, executed in Metro Vision?
- 

**Topic: Aviation – Stakeholder Input**

- DIA and other general aviation airports are key regional economic assets

**Guidance needed from MVPAC**

- Is there a desire to expand the conversation in Metro Vision?
- 

**Topic: Infill Development – Stakeholder Input**

- Key challenge in local communities – potential to address housing product shortage, but there is often significant community resistance (particularly density and height)
- Infill development should be a key part of the overall regional growth strategy
- Need incentives to facilitate infill development

**Guidance needed from MVPAC**

- Given current policies such as UGB and urban centers, what infill policies/strategies can be promoted at the regional level that recognizes the importance of local context?

Topics Not Currently in Metro Vision

**Topic: Health – Stakeholder Input**

- Access to healthy food options have been identified as a need for the region
- Access to health care/mental health infrastructure

**Guidance needed from MVPAC**

- What's the right role of Metro Vision / DRCOG?
- How can DRCOG best leverage existing resources/expertise?

**Topic: Fiscal Impacts/Cost of Growth – Stakeholder Input**

- MVIC direction to consider the local fiscal impact of growth in scenario analysis and throughout the planning process
- Some have suggested the need for micro and macro level analysis
- Citizens in some communities are asking that fiscal impacts be considered in local land use decisions

**Guidance needed from MVPAC**

- What is needed on this topic: more information/analysis, local tools, case studies, policies, etc.?

## Metro Vision 2040 Stakeholder Engagement Summary

### 1. 2012 DRCOG Board Workshop

In January 2012, DRCOG Board members utilized its annual workshop to discuss desired stakeholder engagement for the Metro Vision 2040 update. They discussed levels of involvement, directed staff to ensure the participation of a diverse set of stakeholders in the regional planning process and identified many new organizations and groups to reach out to.

### 2. 2013 DRCOG Board Workshop

In February 2013, the Board workshop included discussion groups of Board members and alternates on Metro Vision 2040. Participants were asked to provide feedback on the most important areas on which the plan should focus. Board feedback included key points of emphasis including land use, transportation and demographic shifts. The Board will discuss this further at its May meeting.

### 3. Metro Vision Listening Tour

In spring 2012 DRCOG conducted a Listening Tour to achieve the following objectives:

- Identify issues the DRCOG Board may wish to explore in depth during the two-year Metro Vision 2040 planning process, including emerging issues not specifically addressed in earlier plans; and
- Engage a broad and diverse set of stakeholders and residents of the region.

The Listening Tour incorporated participation and dialogue with community leaders, subject matter experts, public, private and non-profit stakeholders and residents via 11 focus groups, 24 in-depth interviews and on an online survey that garnered over 1,200 responses. The following seven key elements were identified as key topics for further exploration in the Metro Vision 2040 process.

- Transportation
- Housing and development
- Environment
- Economy
- Education
- Community health
- Western spirit and commitment to regional collaboration

### 4. Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI) Consortium Meeting

The March 2013 bi-annual gathering of grant partners and stakeholders offered an opportunity to educate attendees on the resources available to further the discussion on housing and community and economic development as it relates to the region and the Metro Vision 2040 update.

- Approximately 120 attendees participated in table-top breakouts on the two topic issues
- Participants ranged from local government staff and elected officials, subject matter experts, nonprofits, corporate interests, philanthropic and academic organizations and community leaders

### 5. Metro Vision/SCI - Housing focus

The SCI provides resources to expand the regional conversation on housing as part of Metro Vision 2040. An SCI requirement is to complete an assessment of access to housing opportunity and equitable housing options for all in the region. The following are key outreach efforts completed to help garner input and feedback from key housing stakeholders in the region:

- Conducted one-on-one meetings with other sustainable community regional planning grantees from around the country to learn about their deliberation process

## Metro Vision 2040 Stakeholder Engagement Summary

- Conducted one-on-one meetings and one larger group meeting with local governments and regional entities receiving direct HUD funding assistance for housing services, programs and activities
- Metro Denver Association of Realtors
  - Approximately 35 realtors from around the region participated
  - Participants were asked about consumer trends within the region; a sample of responses includes desire for young families to focus on proximity to good schools, options for senior aging in place is minimal and an increase in 3 bedroom homes under \$500,000 are desired
  - Participants were asked how the discussion or proximity to transit has impacted or not impacted consumers decisions; a sample of responses includes many believe the cost of the light rail is too expensive, people are inquiring more about access to transit more than in the past 5 years and light rail hours are not conducive to on-going use

### 6. Metro Vision/ SCI – Community and economic development focus

The SCI also provides resources to expand the regional conversation on community and economic development as part of Metro Vision 2040. The following are key outreach efforts completed to help garner input and feedback from key economic development stakeholders in the region:

- Conducted two focus groups with members of the Metro Denver Economic Development Corporation (MDEDC) Professionals Group
- Conducted a discussion session with the full membership of the MDEDC Professionals Group

Key issues identified included last mile challenges, tax policy, designated areas for growth, workforce development and housing options.

### 7. Transit Alliance Citizens' Academy

The Citizens' Academy provides community leaders with a fundamental working knowledge of how to engage in the process of regional transit and better communicate its benefits. In March 2013 DRCOG staff presented the following information to the regular bi-annual Citizens' Academy: an overview of DRCOG as an organization, Metro Vision and the current plan update and the SCI. Highlights from the presentation were:

- Approximately 45 citizens attended the session representing different areas of the region
- Participants were asked to work in small groups to discuss the strengths and needs/gaps of the region
  - A sample of strengths identified includes walkability, regional collaboration, public art and outdoor lifestyle
  - A sample of needs/gaps identified includes improved air quality, workforce housing, increased density and sustainable water supply

There will be future *specialized* Citizens' Academies that focus on: Metro Vision, East Corridor, Gold Corridor and Northwest Corridor. The corridor-specific academies are funded through the SCI. The East Corridor Citizens' Academy is scheduled for June 2013.

### 8. SCI - Outcomes Assessment and Knowledge Sharing (OAKS)

The University of Colorado-Denver is conducting case studies evaluating existing FasTracks transit corridors and selected transit-oriented development (TOD) sites. The CU Denver team will compile lessons learned and best practices. In summer and fall 2012, stakeholder engagement included:

- Two focus groups and interviews with local government staff and subject matter experts to identify initial case study topics to consider

## ATTACHMENT B2

### Metro Vision 2040 Stakeholder Engagement Summary

- One larger workshop to identify case study topics – topics identified were:
  - Implementing station area vision and attracting private investment
  - Environmental sustainability
  - Managing parking
  - Accessibility
  - Housing
- OAKS is now working to assemble a comprehensive set of lessons learned that will be more applicable to a greater array of municipalities.
- Accordingly, they have focused their initial investigation on the following stations: Englewood, Arapahoe, Alameda, Littleton, Mineral, and Louisiana Pearl.

#### **9. Metro Vision Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC)**

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) serves in an advisory role to the DRCOG Board and the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC) on ways to involve residents in the Metro Vision 2040 planning process. CAC provides input to DRCOG staff on effective and efficient ways to involve residents, assist in increasing awareness and identify potential impacts residents care about throughout the Metro Vision 2040 process. The CAC membership includes residents, citizen advocates, business owners, citizens whom work with minority populations, and transportation advocates, etc.