

AGENDA
Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee
Wednesday October 16, 2013
9:30 a.m.
1290 Broadway
Independence Pass Board Room

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. August 21, 2013 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)

ACTION ITEM

4. **Scenario Planning**
(Attachment B)
Brad Calvert

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

5. **Metro Vision 2040 Project Update**
(Attachment C)
Brad Calvert

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

6. Updates
 - MVPAC Issues Tracking October 2013
7. Member Comment/Other Matters
8. Next Meeting - November 20, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.
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!



ATTACH A

ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC) Wednesday, August 21, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Christopher Auxier	Adams Cty. Housing Authority
Lesli Ellis	City of Boulder
Erin Fosdick	City of Longmont
Steve Glueck (Chair)	City of Golden
Steve Gordon	City and County of Denver
Randy Harrison	RW Harrison & Assoc.
Steve Hebert	City of Lone Tree
Leanne Jeffers	Regional Instit. for Health & Envrnmntl. Leadership
Steve Klausing	Denver South Economic Dev. Partnership
Glenda Lainis	City of Thornton
Kyle Legleiter	The Colorado Health Foundation
Bryce Merrill	Western States Arts Federation
Lynn Merwin	City and County of Broomfield
Ann Norton	Ann Norton Law Offices
Katherine (Kati) Rider	Douglas County
Frederick Rollenhagen	Clear Creek County
Jerome Tinianow	City and County of Denver

DRCOG staff: Brad Calvert, Jacob Riger, Scott Ramming, Dan Jerrett

Call to Order

Chair Steve Glueck called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

Public Comment

No public comment was heard.

Summary of June 19, 2013 Meeting

Committee suggestions to the provided meeting summary:

- Bus Rapid Transit should be included in member comments within the *"Multimodal Transportation"* section (page 3).
- Other comments were not included.
- The *"Other issues to consider"* section (page 5) should be more clear that, though some members brought these topics up, the MVPAC did not vote on or provide group consensus for these additional topics.

Brad said the above members could contact him after the meeting for specific clarification. Brad said, for future meetings, a draft summary could be distributed within two weeks of the meeting, for committee review.

ACTION ITEMS

Motion to recommend to the Transportation Advisory Committee up to three additional 2040 scenarios to be modeled by DRCOG staff.

Brad Calvert presented and gave a current status overview on initial modeling done for Scenarios A (Roadway Emphasis) and B (Multimodal Emphasis). Scenario A modeling has been completed and B is still underway. Brad also asked the committee to make recommendations on more scenarios to consider for modeling.

Brad noted the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) will be reviewing scenario recommendations on August 26 at 1:30 p.m. He encouraged MVPAC members to attend the August 26 TAC meeting and participate.

Brad presented the two initial scenarios (A and B) and modeling results:

Scenario A (Roadway) overview:

- Additional 200 lane miles of freeway managed lanes
- Additional 200 arterial lane miles

Key Modeling Results (A):

- Vehicle and person miles traveled increase slightly (less than 1%).
- Several congestion measures decrease (e.g., vehicle hours of delay – 11% decrease).
- Variations in many measures were insignificant.

Scenario B (Multimodal) overview:

- Completes FasTracks.
- Additional 200 lane miles of freeway managed lanes (same as Scenario A).
- Decrease of 400 lane miles of arterials (future widenings and new facilities).
- Increased bus service on routes with more than 20 minute headways.
- Additional arterial BRT (Colfax, US 287, SH-7).

- Reduced transit fares (50%).
- Doubling of ped/bike attractiveness factor.

Modeling Results (B):

- B modeling has not been completed as of today's meeting (August 21). Expected to be completed by Monday, August 26.

Overall model evaluation:

- Models are performing sufficiently, but are time-intensive (modeling takes 4-5 weeks to run) – the travel model alone requires more than 30 steps.
- The existing land use model (spreadsheet-based) was not sensitive to the transportation network changes in A and B.

Member comments:

- Question to staff asking if models shows how a specific variable impacts the end results (i.e., the specific impact transit fare reduction has).
 - Scott Ramming, DRCOG Senior Travel Modeler, said separating out individual factors would be difficult as the variables all work together. Modeling tests a package of variables that create cumulative regional “themes” (i.e., roadway, multimodal, etc.).
 - Steve Glueck, Chair, noted the scenarios being modeled are “big picture” themes and choosing how *particular* variables affect outcomes would be a different conversation.
- Steve Glueck asked if there are more land use variables used than what is included in Table 1.
 - Brad said Table 1 is a summary and does not include all measures/outcomes. (*Detailed analysis/discussion of results to come later this fall (will include all scenarios)*)
- If not doing arterials widenings (in Scenario B), how does the model account for bicycle and pedestrian improvements (e.g., improved sidewalks, separated bike lanes, making bus stops more attractive with benches, etc.)
 - Brad said this was the “attractiveness factor” – the model does not include specific bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Will there be a cost analysis done for transportation infrastructure costs, as well as other infrastructure costs (water/sewer) not typically done on a regional level.
 - Brad said MVPAC can make a recommendation to do this analysis.

- What triggered (in Scenario A) the increase in additional non-single occupancy SOV trips.
 - Jacob Riger, DRCOG's Long Range Transportation Planning Coordinator, said the additional 200 lane miles of new freeway managed lanes drives more shared trips.
 - Scott Ramming added that HPTE's managed lanes policy of HOV2 to HOV3 that allows carpools to use the lanes for free would encourage increase.
 - Brad noted the increase is not a demonstrably significant figure, and is not a dramatic change.
- Scenario A results show Cost of Congestion Travel Delays decreasing about 12%. Did DRCOG analyze historical data (e.g. last 25 years) to verify that lane expansions reduce congestion?
 - Scott Ramming said the Focus model was adapted from a 2005 base year (validating back to 1997) and is not a pure historical model that uses numerous individual years as data.
 - Jacob Riger commented that scenario planning is theoretical, and should be thought of a means to test a variety of distinct variables, while being cognizant of fiscal constraints limits.
- Steve Glueck asked how the Cost of Congestion Travel Delays is measured. Brad said it is the monetized version of hours, i.e, what the hour delay costs the traveler.
 - Steve Glueck asked that the units of measure be indicated in future results tables.
- Can the "Double the ped/bike attractiveness factors" measure (in Scenario B) be broken out in detail with clearer definitions the modeling results are finished.
 - Scott Ramming said it would be difficult to do, as it is very crude in the model. Scott said attractiveness could include a combination of wider sidewalks, separated bike lanes, education programs, etc. but is up to the community to decide. Scott said currently there is no representation of the sidewalk or bicycle network in the model. Future improvements to the model may include more developed pedestrian environment factors.
 - The committee felt bike/ped attractiveness factor is confusing, and it would be helpful to have more specific information on how the model arrives at the results.
- Does each zone have an 'arbitrary' score for ped/bike attractiveness and the scenario just doubles that.
 - Scott said it is more of a preference-ranking of various modal alternatives; it is regional rather than being zone-based.

Brad presented two staff recommended additional scenarios (C and D) for the committee to consider. Both scenarios were based on previous MVPAC and TAC discussions.

Proposed Scenario C (Urban Centers Emphasis) overview:

- Adjust share of population (housing) and employment growth in urban centers to meet Metro Vision goal of 50% housing/75% employment
- Assumptions: All other Base 2040 assumptions held constant (i.e., current FasTracks system as in fiscally constrained plan)

Steve Glueck summarized that Scenario C would increase attractiveness of urban centers, thereby decreasing the attractiveness of other areas; population and employment would gravitate towards these centers; and it would have no change of transportation network above the base.

Member comments:

- Is it realistic to achieve Scenario C without having most of Scenario B in place. Can you accommodate increased urban centers without increased transit, etc.?

- What assumptions would change to make urban centers more attractive?
 - Brad said utility weights could be elevated to demonstrate population/job growth.
 - There is value in the regional goal (increasing share of growth in urban centers), there may not be value of modeling to reach the 50/75 urban center goal without knowing what it would take to reach that end.
 - Brad said modeling the achievement of the goal could be informative – understanding the impact will be helpful in future discussions about the goal and regional strategies to achieve the existing or revised goal.
 - Steve Glueck added that modeling for a 50/75 urban center goal would make sense in order to determine if the 50/75 goal really has significant enough impact on VMT reduction, etc., because while the goal doesn't add cost to the base, it is a challenging objective to implement.
- The proposed Scenario C may show the urban center percentages are not attainable. Perhaps using a different objective could be a different percentage.
- Will the urban center boundaries change?
 - Brad said while several urban centers have requested changes in the last amendment cycle, the model would use the existing 104 designated urban centers. Brad said the technical challenge is determining where the growth will be “pulled” from – other areas will have less growth to support the growth in urban centers.
- Would it make sense to change the focus of urban centers – from many small centers to 6-7 large urban centers?
- Steve Glueck asked if it is feasible to ask DRCOG staff inquire with local jurisdictions if 50 to 70 units per acre density is realistic, noting that feedback from economic development councils say that it may not be?
- Is it problematic to assume 1 million new jobs jammed into a static number of urban centers? Scenario C is a worthwhile scenario, but needs some realistic adjustments.
- Infill could represent much more than just urban centers, corridors with frequent bus service could accommodate growth as well.
 - What, in terms of infill and urban center development, is reasonable development that could be put there – an exercise to determine this amount could be helpful.
 - Denver International Airport (DIA), while not designated an urban center, is a major employment area.
 - As an alternate to modeling the 50/75 goal, DRCOG could rely on build out estimates previously provided by local jurisdictions – although many of these estimates are quite old.
 - Do we know what the local jurisdiction numbers added up to, and Brad said that it does not come to 50/75, and the estimates tend to overestimate jobs.
- Some jurisdictions may object to the density of the 50/75 designation. Many jurisdictions have no urban centers, but expect significant growth through 2040; and by taking the growth and putting it all into urban centers, would experience very little growth, which would be concerning to those communities.
 - Housing/employment percentages may need to be adjusted in the scenarios.
 - Several committee members noted that it may not be realistic to achieve Scenario C without most of Scenario B (transportation network) in place, difficult to assume that level of growth without improvements.
 - Brad agreed noting that amenities packages are needed to support increased density.

- DRCOG should take a closer look at the modeling assumptions used over the last 10 years that relate to the growth allocation to infill and redevelopment parcels, as they may not reflect current trends.
- It would be helpful (for regional policy information) to have an economic analysis done to look at the tradeoffs between investing in road widenings versus transit (an order of magnitude cost comparison).
- The committee has been informed by area economic developers that they are not necessarily attracted to urban centers. There is a disconnect between what economic developer community wants and the 50/75 urban center policy.
 - Brad said DRCOG is currently in the process of contracting a Regional Economic Strategy consultant who will address this specific task.
- A two-tier definition of urban centers could be made (first, urban centers, and then define a secondary desirable intensity areas).
- Steve Glueck asked the DRCOG modelers about the quality of modeling Scenario C with the base travel network assumptions versus using the Scenario B assumption.
 - Staff modelers said either could be used. Steve Glueck felt doing the base would give the most defined information.
- It would be okay to use the base network assumptions, but many of the improvements in B would be needed to get people into urban centers.
- How could Scenario C happen using just the base assumptions—is not a realistic prototype and suggested developing a Scenario E that combines B and C.

Steve Glueck asked if there was a motion at this time. Discussion on the feasibility of the proposed Scenario C without the transportation network assumptions in Scenario B continued.

- Brad noted that scenario analysis looks to “push the boundaries” and with an ambitious goal, you can benefit more from the analysis.

Brad asked for a sense of the committee to proceed with modeling Scenario C as proposed in the memo (with the base assumption). No opposition was heard.

The discussion continued for proposed Scenario D.

Proposed Scenario D (“what will it take”) overview:

- “What would it take to meet MV goals” scenario – adjust transportation facilities, services, and/or costs to meet Metro Vision goals (VMT and GHG), i.e., reduce transit fees by half.
 - Assumptions: Land use: modeled or other assumption? Possible carryover of 50/75 goals from Scenario C.
-

Member comments:

- Steve Glueck suggested focusing first on multimodal tweakings, rather than adding more lanes.
- Start with multimodal, and in areas with proposed BRT and strategic improvements, focus on increasing density along those multimodal corridors, in addition to urban centers.
- Scenario D should start with variables that we can control, i.e., multimodal, and then use a more reasonable assumption about urban center growth (e.g., 30% of new housing / 50% of new employment) before using more unpredictable variables (i.e., cost of driving, etc.)
 - The results of Scenario B and Scenario C are needed before considering D.
 - Steve Glueck summarized to say, while it would not be easy to delay, would it be possible for the committee to wait another month to get the all the results of A, B, and C. Brad noted the tight modeling schedule, as modeling results take a month to perform.

- The cost of housing needs to be factored in, not just transit facilities, etc. Steve Glueck summarized “Could adjustment of the cost of housing be a possible input into scenario?”
 - Brad noted the cost of housing isn’t part of the land use modeling process, but perhaps could adjust the overall population forecast lower. Brad said this topic will be covered better in the Regional Housing strategy.
 - Dan Jerrett, DRCOG’s Regional Economist, note there are no price signals in the current land use model, and proxies would have to be used (there are over a dozen utility factors used to define ‘attractiveness’).
- How realistic it is to start Scenario D now and do adjustments later?
 - Brad suggested that, as the committee mentioned, the results of B and C could inform Scenario D.
- Steve Glueck commented that, as an economic developer, he thinks there is an overestimate of the number of primary jobs wanting to go into big campuses (as developers focus on primary jobs), but for total jobs there is more that could easily go into urban centers. He asked “What if, land use-wise, we use a 50/50 percentage in urban centers (and defined infill corridors), and ‘fiddle’ with multimodal elements in the next few weeks.”
- Another alternative (instead of coming up with a percentage) would be to use local jurisdictional plans which are a lower amount than 50/75, even if those plans may be outdated.
 - Steve Glueck said local figures typically have overestimated jobs and underestimated housing.
 - It was requested staff provide local jurisdictions figures at the September meeting.
- There should be a scenario that allocates growth to centers and corridors based on some attractiveness factor that relates to frequency of service, transit convenience, and those types of variables. Allocating growth based on percentages is not likely to give an accurate sense of where growth is likely to occur. Infill and redevelopment factors are important as well.
 - Brad agreed, saying more conversation is needed.
- Steve Glueck summarized committee recommendations to the Transportation Advisory Committee:
 - order of magnitude costs for transportation investments in the scenario outcomes.
 - proceed with the staff-recommended Scenario C.
- Other committee suggestions include:
 - Need to understand more about the existing local aspirations for urban centers.
 - The committee is very interested in overall urban centers goal – and how scenario analysis and other information can inform a conversation on revisiting the goal.
- Steve Glueck said committee would be discussing Scenario D at next MVPAC on September 18. Brad added that MVPAC may need to be flexible about the next meeting date, including a potential joint meeting with TAC on September 23rd if more time is needed (MVPAC’s September meeting is currently scheduled for September 18th).
- Steve Glueck said the modeling would not start for Scenario D (“what will it take”) until the committee has talked about it again.
- Several committee members echoed that future scenarios (including Scenario D) should build-off of the multimodal scenario and increase density in areas with high frequency service or low headways or increasing station area growth, even if those stations areas aren’t urban centers.

Brad asked if the desire of the committee is to have staff walk in with initial thoughts for D, based on Scenarios A, B, and C, at the September 18 meeting. The committee agreed.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Brad noted:

- the contract for the Regional Economic Strategy will be executed in the next few weeks. The Administrative Committee will act today (August 21) on selection of the Regional Housing Strategy consultant.
- twenty-five local governments have said they would participate in the Local Government Survey. DRCOG has received ten survey responses so far. Closing of survey will be in late August, early September.
- the DRCOG Board will act on funding recommendations for FY14-15 Urban Center/Station Area planning studies in September.
 - Steve Glueck said, in the next few months, the committee will see new and revised urban centers.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Next Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 a.m. Next month's meeting is scheduled for September 18 at 9:30 a.m.

ATTACH B

ATTACHMENT B

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
October 16, 2013	Action	4

SUBJECT

This agenda item concerns Scenario E in the Metro Vision 2040 scenario analysis process and provides requested information about the land use build out of Scenario C (e.g., job and household density).

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Given previous scenario results staff recommends the following assumptions be considered for Scenario E:

1. Land use assumptions to prioritize infill development in urban centers and transit corridors
2. Adjustments to the following transportation variables (in addition to previous assumptions in Scenario B):
 - a. Increase auto operating costs
 - b. Increase teleworking
 - c. Lower auto availability rates in urban centers and zones with high transit accessibility

ACTION BY OTHERS

TAC - [August 26, 2013](#) – Scenarios C, D, and E

SUMMARY

Regional scenarios contain a package of “what-if” factors that represent a change from our Base 2040 assumptions (2040 Base). Scenarios are modeled to produce transportation, air quality, population, and other outcome measures.

Scenario results are just one of several factors for the Board to consider in policy decision-making for the 2040 process. Scenarios do not test “projects” or “project packages.” Rather, they represent distinct “what if” concepts to compare broad regional trends.

In August staff provided MVPAC initial results for Scenario A. On August 26, 2013 the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) provided [direction](#) to staff to model additional scenarios (including Scenario C which is now complete). MVPAC members were sent the TAC-recommended scenarios via email on August 29, 2013. See [Table 1](#) for draft outcome measures for three completed scenarios (Scenarios A-C) and the 2040 Base.

Included in the TAC-recommended scenarios was Scenario E—also referred to as the “what would it take to reach our goals” scenario. In August, MVPAC asked staff to propose assumptions for future scenarios, including Scenario E. DRCOG staff anticipates a Scenario E with the following assumptions:

- Multimodal network assumptions from Scenario B (including transit fare reductions)

- Land use: ~50% of housing and ~75% of employment growth in urban centers and zones with high transit accessibility
- Increase auto operating costs
- Increase share of telework
- Lower auto availability rates in urban centers and transit-enabled zones

Scenario C – Land Use Implications

MVPAC and TAC questioned if existing urban centers are sufficient to accommodate the projected build out in Scenario C. The committees expressed interest in seeing the resulting densities in urban centers in Scenario C. The table below summarizes overall urban center densities (jobs and households) in the 2040 Base and Scenario C.

- Average **job** density in urban centers in Scenario C is 30.8 jobs/acre (12 urban centers had densities above this average and 92 had densities below this average in 2040 Base).
- Average **household** density in urban centers in Scenario C is 18.2 households/acre (99 urban centers had densities above this average and 5 had densities below this average in 2040 Base).

JOBS					
2040 Base	Base Density	Scenario C	C Density	C Job Additions	% Dens Chg
822,978	22.4 (jobs/ac)	1,129,956	30.8 (jobs/ac)	306,978	27.2%
HOUSEHOLDS					
2040 Base	Base Density	Scenario C	C Density	C HH Additions	% Dens Chg
204,284	5.6 (HH/ac)	668,555	18.2 (HH/ac)	464,271	227.3%

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

- MVPAC
 - [January 23, 2013](#) – Overview presentation (Discussion)
 - [February 20, 2013](#) – Outcome measures (Discussion)
 - [April 24, 2013](#) – Crafting regional scenarios – scenario factors (Discussion)
 - [May 15, 2013](#) - Recommend to the Board of Directors two initial scenarios (Action)
 - [August 21, 2013](#) – Recommend to TAC up to 3 additional scenarios (Action)
- TAC
 - [January 28, 2013](#) – Measures for Metro Vision 2040 Scenario Analysis
 - [March 25, 2013](#) – Crafting regional scenarios (Discussion)
 - [April 22, 2013](#) – Crafting regional scenarios (Discussion)
 - [May 20, 2013](#) – Recommendations to staff on 2040 network changes to incorporate into the scenario models (Action)
 - [August 26, 2013](#) – Recommend up to 3 additional scenarios (Action)
- MVIC
 - [December 5, 2012](#) – Outcome measures (Action)
 - [May 1, 2013](#) – Direction to staff on scenario analysis (Action)

Board of Directors

- [August 15, 2012](#) – Approach to scenario analysis in Metro Vision 2040 (Action)

[May 15, 2013](#) – Direction to staff to initiate scenario analysis (Action)

PROPOSED MOTION

Motion to move forward with Scenario E as recommended by DRCOG staff.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org.

ATTACH C

ATTACHMENT C

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
October 16, 2013	Informational	5

SUBJECT

This item provides an update on Metro Vision 2040.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

No action requested. This item is for information.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

In June 2013, MVPAC members helped select, clarify, and prioritize additional planning topics for the DRCOG Board's consideration during the Metro Vision 2040 planning process. DRCOG staff will provide a brief update on the Metro Vision 2040 project, including progress since June and upcoming activities.

Housing and Economic Development

- In [August](#), MVPAC received a memo detailing recent efforts to expand the regional conversation on housing and economic development.
- BBC Research & Consulting was selected by DRCOG's Administrative Committee to complete the Comprehensive Regional Housing Strategy.
- Staff is working with BBC to finalize scope and an executed contract.

Local Government Survey

- On two occasions in 2013, MVPAC provided guidance to DRCOG staff on a proposed survey of local governments.
- 27 local governments completed the survey in August and September.

Development Type Mapping

- Development type mapping released for local government review in September.
- All local jurisdictions are being asked to review the development type classification information prepared by DRCOG staff and verify any changes that have occurred since 2006 (e.g., land consumed for urban use since 2006).

Metro Vision 2040 Scenario Analysis

- See agenda item 4 for details.

Stakeholder Engagement

- The Fall 2013 Transit Alliance Citizens' Academy is focused on Metro Vision 2040.
- The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was trained in September to facilitate regional issue conversations with their networks. CAC members are currently involved in outreach activities.

- DRCOG recently launched an interactive web-based platform (<http://drcog.mindmixer.com>) to increase awareness and participation in regional (Metro Vision) and corridor Sustainable Communities Initiative) planning activities.

Metro Vision 2040 Project Support

- DRCOG contracted three consultant firms to assist with regional planning activities, including Metro Vision 2040.
- Recent consultant activities included working closely with DRCOG staff to understand Metro Vision 2040 project outcomes, input received from stakeholders so far, and key deadlines to create a revised schedule and work plan. Key upcoming activities are described below.

Metro Vision 2040 – Upcoming Activities of Note

- Metro Vision Idea Exchanges
 - Infill and Redevelopment (November 2013)
 - Urban Centers and Corridors
 - Parks and Open Space
 - Public Health and the Built Environment
 - Natural Hazards
- Issue Focus Groups (i.e., aviation, UGB, and fiscal impacts)
- Boomer Bond Trainings/Workshops (November 2013)
- FHEA and Regional Housing Strategy development
- Regional Economic Strategy development

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

MVPAC - [June 19, 2013](#) – Additional regional planning topics (Action)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org.



MVPAC Introduction Date	MVPAC Further Discussions	Project	MVPAC Action to Date	Status/Next Steps
1/23/2013	2/20/2013; 4/24/2013; 5/15/2013; 8/21/2013	Metro Vision 2040 Scenario Analysis	Informational, preliminary input, guidance to Board on initial scenarios (A & B)	<p>Status: DRCOG Board agreed with MVIC/MVPAC recommendations on preliminary scenarios (A & B). Staff will finalize 2040 base scenario and begin modeling Scenarios A & B as defined by MVIC and further refined by MVPAC.</p> <p>MVPAC and TAC provided additional guidance on Scenarios C, D, and E. Scenario C is complete and modeling of Scenario D to begin in the near future.</p> <p>Next Steps: Modeling Scenario D and input from MVPAC on staff proposed Scenario E.</p>
1/23/2013		Metro Vision 2040 Listening Tour	Informational	<p>Status: The Listening Tour is complete and available as a final report on the DRCOG website. Process recommendations from the report will be integrated as applicable into the efforts of Metro Vision 2040.</p> <p>Next Steps: n/a</p>
2/20/2013	3/20/2013; 4/24/2013; 8/21/2013	Metro Vision 2040 Local Government Survey	Provided recommendations on crafting questions (3/20)	<p>Status: Local government representatives from MVPAC offered to test the survey before DRCOG administers it to the rest of the jurisdictions. An invitation to participate in the survey was sent to local governments in the region. 27 jurisdictions completed the survey.</p> <p>Next Steps: DRCOG staff is developing a summary of survey responses.</p>
2/20/2013	8/21/2013	SCI/Metro Vision Housing	Informational	<p>Status: DRCOG staff developed and released and RFP to complete the required FHEA and develop a Comprehensive Regional Housing Strategy. BBC Research & Consulting was selected to complete this activity.</p> <p>Next Steps: DRCOG is currently working with BBC to finalize the scope of work for this effort.</p>

MVPAC Introduction Date	MVPAC Further Discussions	Project	MVPAC Action to Date	Status/Next Steps
3/20/2013	8/21/2013	SCI/Metro Vision Economic Development	Informational	<p>Status: DRCOG staff developed and released and RFP to complete a Regional Economic Strategy. After interviewing several firms the team of Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. and Development Research Partner was selected.</p> <p>Next Steps: DRCOG is currently working with the consultants to finalize the scope of work for Strategy development.</p>
4/24/2013		Recommendations regarding call for projects for FY14/FY15 Station Area Master Plan/Urban Centers studies	Provided recommendations (4/24)	<p>Status: Recommendations went to MVIC on 5/1 with further discussion. Items for discussion included “pooling” funds, project eligibility and project evaluation. The Board directed staff to move forward with the call for studies. Applications were due July 19th.</p> <p>Next Steps: The DRCOG Board approved funding for 12 studies on September 18, 2013.</p>
5/15/2013		Initial Urban Centers Analysis	Informational	<p>Status: This item was scheduled for the 5/15/2013 MVPAC meeting, but was tabled as the entire meeting was spent on scenario analysis.</p> <p>Next Steps: A webinar was held on June 3rd to cover this material. Staff engaged participants on the call for feedback regarding next steps. DRCOG is determining the best way to advance this effort – the staff person leading this analysis recently left DRCOG.</p>
10/16/13		Metro Vision 2040 Project Update	Informational	<p>Status: DRCOG will update MVPAC on recent and upcoming activities.</p> <p>Next Steps: Numerous upcoming activities, including: Metro Vision Idea Exchanges, focus groups, Boomer Bond training and workshop, etc.</p>