AGENDA
Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee
Wednesday November 20, 2013

****2:30 p.m.****

1290 Broadway
Independence Pass Board Room

1. Call to Order

2. Public Comment

3. October 16, 2013 Meeting Summary
   (Attachment A)

ACTION ITEM

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

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

5. Metro Vision 2040 Local Government Survey
   (Attachment C)
   Brad Calvert

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

6. Updates
   - MVPAC Issues Tracking November 2013

7. Member Comment/Other Matters

8. Next Meeting - January 15, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.
   – ***Please note the December meeting is cancelled (smaller focus group meetings will be held in December)***

9. Adjournment

Disabled attendees are asked to notify DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of the need for auxiliary aids or services

ATTACH A

ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY
Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC)
Wednesday, October 16, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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
Patrick Horvath	The Denver Foundation
Glenda Lainis	City of Thornton
Kyle Legleiter	The Colorado Health Foundation
Lynn Merwin	City and County of Broomfield
Anne Miller	Colorado Dept. of Local Affairs
Susan Motika	Colorado Dept. of Public Health & Environment
Katherine (Kati) Rider	Douglas County
Frederick Rollenhagen	Clear Creek County
Will Toor	Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Glen Van Nimwegen	City of Littleton
Brad Weinig	Enterprise Community Partners

DRCOG staff: Brad Calvert, Nicole Klepadlo, Ashley Kaade, Jacob Riger, Gabby Voeller, Dan Jerrett, Scott Ramming

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 August 21, 2013 Meeting
The summary was accepted.

ACTION ITEM

Scenario Planning Discussion

Brad Calvert presented information on the status of the Metro Vision scenario analysis.

Scenario B – Brad Calvert noted Scenario B was completed in August (after MVPAC last met on August 21) and presented to the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) on August 26.

Key findings and observations from Scenario B:

- VMT and PMT hold steady
- Several measures of congestion increase
    - Total vehicle of delay increases ~ 15%
- System-wide transit boardings increase (~15%)
- Non-transit work trips increase (~4%)
- Share of pop. w/good transit-jobs accessibility:
    - Increase ~ 21% for the region
    - Increase ~ 8% for low-income/minority areas

Scenario C - Brad reviewed the modeling results (Table 1), noting that the August 26 TAC recommended proceeding with modeling a variant of the version MVPAC recommended previously.

Scenario C Assumptions (TAC recommendations)

Land Use

- Meet Metro Vision goal for urban centers (50% of new housing; 75% of new employment in urban centers)

Transportation (same network as Scenario B)

- Complete FasTracks
- Additional 200 lane miles of managed lanes (same as Scenarios A and B)
- Decrease of 400 lane miles of arterials (future widenings and new facilities)
- Increased bus service on routes with greater than 20 minute headways
- Additional arterial BRT (Colfax, US 287, SH-7)
- Reduced transit fares (50%)
- Double pedestrian and bicycle attractiveness factor

Key findings and observations from Scenario C:

- VMT per capita decreases (-3.8%)
- Several measures of congestion decrease
  - Total vehicle of delay decreases ~ 6%
- Decrease in percent of SOV work trips
- Nearly 95% of population in low-income /minority areas with good transit-job accessibility

In response to a previous MVPAC request for jobs and household densities in urban centers in Scenario C, Brad said modeling results indicated:

- Average job density is 30.8 jobs/acre. (12 urban centers had densities above average, and 92 had below (27.2% change from 2040 base)
- Average household density is 18.2 households/acre. (99 urban centers had densities below average, and 5 had above (227.3% change from 2040 base)

JOBS					
2040 Base	Base Density	Scenario C	C Density	C Job Additions	% Density 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	% Density Chg
204,284	5.6 (HH/ac)	668,555	18.2 (HH/ac)	464,271	227.3%

Member Comments on Scenario C:

- Question to staff on the low 2040 base density household number (5.6 HH/ac). Brad noted that base estimates from local governments can be over a decade old. Brad clarified that the number is gross acreage density within the entire urban centers, rather than a net density.
- Member request: which urban centers actually reach the 50/75 density goal?

Scenario D - Brad noted land use modeling (using local government population estimates, rather than 50/75 goal) is complete, while transportation modeling is underway. Brad noted local government jobs estimates (for both C and D) for urban centers are relatively close to the total jobs in 2040 that the region would achieve with the 75% goal, but the household estimates are much lower than the assumptions in Scenario C.

Scenario D Assumptions (TAC recommendations)

Land Use

- Use local estimates for population and employment for urban centers ("middle ground" between Base and C)

Transportation

- Complete FasTracks
- Additional 200 lane miles of managed lanes (same as Scenarios A and B)
- Increased bus service on routes with greater than 20 minute headways
- Additional arterial BRT (Colfax, US 287, SH-7)
- Reduced transit fares (50%)
- Double pedestrian and bicycle attractiveness factor

Member Comments on Scenario D:

- Clarification needed on where the households are being placed – where is the model relocating households?
- Is the population being taken from the fringes and brought into urban centers? Brad noted all manual reallocations have been proportional. An equal share is taken from zones and also added to zones – this also maintains the relationships between urban centers, i.e., the most intensely developed centers remain so.
- A spatial depiction of the scenarios was requested.
- It was suggested that the local government data supplied in their applications for urban centers may be dated, and also, their estimates may have been too optimistic.
- Net household residential densities were requested.
- How do the results in VMT from Table 1 factor in recent national and regional trends toward declining VMT? Does the model reflect this declining trend? Dan Jerrett, DRCOG's Regional Economist, said the model is a long term model, not designed to capture business cycles.
- Some more recent trends should be reflected in the model and more discussion on this issue may be warranted. Brad noted that the staff-recommended Scenario E is an attempt to bring some of the recent trends into the analysis.

Scenario E - Brad presented staff's proposed assumptions to use in modeling Scenario E (*"what would it take to reach our goals"*) and asked for MVPAC feedback:

Scenario E Assumptions (for MVPAC consideration)

Transportation

- Scenario B multimodal networks, attractiveness, and transit fare reductions
- Increase auto operating costs (proxy for parking)
- Increase percentage of persons that telework
- No increase from 2010 in 2040 Base (~7.5%)
- Lower auto availability rates in urban centers, rapid transit, and high transit access zones (reflect more households choosing less cars)

Land Use

- Accommodate 50% of new housing and 75% of new employment in urban centers, rapid transit zones, other zones with high transit-access to jobs
  - Job distribution assumptions would remain the same as 2040 Base (less than 0.5% difference)

  - Households: Half of needed households to reach 50% present in these areas in 2040 Base
- Scenario E would "force" the other half (~225K households) in these areas (vs. Scenario C which "forced" an additional ~460K into only urban centers)

Scenario E – Details on 50/75 Areas

Brad displayed a map that included the urban centers, rapid transit zones, and other zones with high-transit access. These areas would be the focus of the land use assumptions in Scenario E. The high-transit access zones are the "next 100" zones, not captured in urban centers or rapid transit areas with the highest transit accessibility.

Member Comments:

- Clarification is needed on the residential and job assumptions in the rapid transit areas. Brad said analysis noted no job movement would need to happen – the base assumptions capture a similar number of jobs. Only households would need to be increased relative to base. As with other scenarios, land use adjustments will be made on a proportional basis.
- What constitutes adjacency to transit line? Brad said zones that intersect the line. It was further noted by the committee that some other geographical limitations may be needed, because some of the zones in the Scenario E concept are large and may not be appropriate for intense development.
- Gabby Voeller, DRCOG Data Modeling Professional, explained that the large zones that appear on the map may include parks or protected areas. The process to allocate jobs and households ("points") recognizes those limitations and does not allocate future growth to those specific areas.
- Staff further noted that in addressing these allocation issues, staff favors a methodology that is consistent and equitably applied across the region – hence focusing on proportional allocations. Staff will not manually adjust individual zones.
- The committee again requested visuals to help understand the density implications of the various scenarios.
- Is redevelopment assumed? Brad said yes.
- Steve Glueck summarized that the concept is to emphasize infill development in transit corridors and urban centers – roughly half of the households in urban centers and half in the other infill areas (i.e., rapid transit zones and zones with high transit access). (Half of households in urban centers and half in high-density/transit accessible areas).
- Suggestion to also think about including Park-N-Ride lots as areas to focus development.
- Scenario E feels aggressive but plausible. Areas around Denver International Airport (DIA) do not allow residential development and should not be areas where households are added in Scenario E.
- Scenario E is a good approach and staff should consider taking a closer look at these corridors and centers to understand what is allowed by local governments.

  Anne Miller MOVED to recommend the staff-proposed Scenario E for modeling.
  Steve Gordon SECONDED the motion and the MOTION PASSED unanimously.

Steve Glueck summarized additional information that should be provided as the committee and policymakers evaluate scenarios:

- Making sure we have order of magnitude costs for all networks
- Additional analysis of densities – including net and gross densities

Additional committee suggestions for future information included:

- Adding percentage change in the Key Factors in the Scenarios Summary Table.
- More analysis of equity impacts around the transportation network decisions. Brad noted this is required by Fair Housing Equity Assessment.

Brad said the amount of information to be considered by MVPAC in January through June will be very intense. He suggested that MVPAC members consider how the committee can best manage the amount of information it will be asked to consider in early 2014.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

Metro Vision 2040 Project Update

Brad Calvert gave a status overview on 2040 activities.

- BBC Research and Consulting has been selected to complete the Comprehensive Regional Housing Strategy. The scope is final and contracting is underway. Delivery is expected in March 2014.
- The Equity Issues Workgroup will meet again to discuss access to opportunity as part of the Fair Housing Equity Assessment.
- The scope for the Regional Housing Strategy also includes a stakeholder workshop to discuss local and regional best practices.
- Economic & Planning Systems was selected to lead development of a Regional Economic Strategy. A key element of that work will be to develop an understanding the role of DRCOG in regional economic development. Delivery of this product is expected in March 2014.
- The Regional Economic Strategy will include a white paper exploring the potential of a more equity-driven regional growth model.
- It was suggested that MVPAC be provided information about key stakeholders that may be interviewed as part of the process to develop the Regional Economic Strategy.
- A summary of the Local Government Survey is being compiled by staff. Twenty-seven local government members (6 counties, 21 municipalities) participated on the Local Government Survey. Feedback has been positive.
- Local government planning managers were sent an email asking for assistance in understanding how their land use has changed since 2006 (local government review of Development Type Mapping). Responses from local governments were requested by October 30.
- The Transit Alliance Citizens Academy's Fall Academy has focused on Metro Vision. DRCOG staff has provided substantial support to the effort.
- The stakeholder engagement tool, the website Mindmixer, is available at www.drcog.mindmixer.com. Committee members are encouraged to register and share the site with others.
- Other stakeholder activities coming up: Metro Vision Idea Exchanges, Issue Focus Groups, Boomer Bond trainings/workshop in mid-November.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Next Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m. Next month's meeting is scheduled for November 20 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 #
November 20, 2013	Action	4

SUBJECT

This agenda item concerns staff observations from Metro Vision 2040 scenario analysis. MVPAC will review staff observations and supplement as needed.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends forwarding the following observations of the Metro Vision 2040 scenario analysis results to the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC):

- Scenarios C and E demonstrated that the region's goal to accommodate a significant share of future population and employment growth in urban centers will greatly influence the region's ability to lower vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increase travel by other modes.
- Scenario E further demonstrated that accommodating significant growth in areas with existing and planned high-frequency transit is also important in efforts to lower VMT and per capita VMT.
- Transportation cost factors included in C and E (lowering transit fares and doubling auto costs in Scenario E) had a role in reducing VMT, but their individual contribution to VMT reductions difficult to discern.
- While Scenarios C and E resulted in significant progress toward existing regional goals, neither scenario achieved the current goals.
- Scenarios that did not focus housing growth (A, B, and D) in urban centers and/or transit areas had little notable change from 2040 Base on VMT.
- Scenario A provided a degree of congestion relief, but negligible changes in access to employment via transit. Whereas other scenarios (C, D, and E) resulted in decreased congestion, compared to base, and also increased access to employment via transit.
- Scenarios A and B demonstrated the ability of the technical tools (land use and transportation models) to provide valid results. Both scenarios provided a foundation for subsequent scenarios.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

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 October staff provided MVPAC initial results for Scenarios A, B, and C, including requested land use implications associated with Scenario C (i.e. household and employment densities in urban centers). MVPAC directed staff to model a Scenario E that would expand priority growth areas to include existing urban centers and other areas of the region with a high degree of transit access. Additionally, Scenario E adjusted additional assumptions to serve as a proxy for recent, observed decreases in VMT and auto ownership rates.

See Table 1 for draft outcome measures for all scenarios and the 2040 Base. The table has been revised from previous versions to make clearer which outcomes related to existing Metro Vision priorities have "improved" or "worsened" compared to base.

Staff will provide the committee with additional information at the meeting in November, including requested information on infrastructure costs, spatial visualization of scenarios, and results from sub-regional/"representative" community analysis.

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)
  October 16, 2013 – Recommend to staff assumptions for Scenario E (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 forward staff observations to MVIC.

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 #
November 20, 2013	Informational	5

SUBJECT

This agenda item provides an update on the Metro Vision Local Government Survey results.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

No action requested. This item is for information.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The purpose of the Metro Vision Local Government survey was to identify key local issues to explore further in updating Metro Vision, recognize local government members' innovative practices and gain an understanding of how DRCOG can best work with its local government members to ensure that Metro Vision recognizes and supports local communities' priorities Results from this survey will be shared with member jurisdictions.

Jurisdiction Planning Directors were asked to complete the survey online in August 2013. Responses were collected through the end of October 2013. A diverse cross-section of 27 communities throughout the region participated ranging in size from 600 to over 600,000. Surveys were completed by 6 counties and 21 municipalities. The survey was divided into four sections:

1. Population Demographics and Housing Trends
2. Multimodal Transportation
3. Growth and Development
4. Emerging Issues and Other Topics

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

- MVPAC

February 20, 2013	Introduction presentation (Discussion)
March 20, 2013	MVPAC assisted with crafting survey questions (Discussion)
April 24, 2013	MVPAC assisted with crafting survey questions (Discussion)
August 21, 2013	Staff provided an update to the MVPAC on survey status
October 16, 2013	Provided an overview of key results to MVPAC

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; 10/13/201; 11/20/2013	Metro Vision 2040 Scenario Analysis	Informational, preliminary input, guidance to Board on initial scenarios (A & B)	**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. MVPAC and TAC provided additional guidance on Scenarios C, D, and E. All scenarios are complete. **Next Steps:** Modeling Scenarios will be shared with MVPAC for input/discussion in November.
1/23/2013		Metro Vision 2040 Listening Tour	Informational	**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. **Next Steps: n/a**
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)	**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. **Next Steps:** DRCOG staff is developing a summary of survey responses.
2/20/2013	8/21/2013	SCI/Metro Vision Housing	Informational	**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. **Next Steps:** DRCOG has finalized a scope of work and contract with BBC Research and Consulting and work has begun.
3/20/2013	8/21/2013	SCI/Metro Vision Economic Development	Informational	**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. **Next Steps:** DRCOG is currently working with the consultants to

MVPAC Introduction Date	MVPAC Further Discussions	Project	MVPAC Action to Date	Status/Next Steps
				finalize the scope of work for Strategy development.
4/24/2013		Recommendations regarding call for projects for FY14/FY15 Station Area Master Plan/Urban Centers studies	Provided recommendations (4/24)	**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. **Next Steps:** The DRCOG Board approved funding for 12 studies on September 18, 2013.
5/15/2013		Initial Urban Centers Analysis	Informational	**Status:** This item was scheduled for the 5/15/2013 MVPAC meeting, but was tabled as the entire meeting was spent on scenario analysis. A webinar was held on June 3rd to cover this material. Staff engaged participants on the call for feedback regarding next steps. **Next Steps:** Additional analysis including Urban Center interviews and case studies will be completed as part of the Metro Vision 2040 update**.**
10/16/13		Metro Vision 2040 Project Update	Informational	**Status:** DRCOG updated MVPAC on recent and upcoming activities. **Next Steps:** Numerous upcoming activities, including: Metro Vision Idea Exchanges, focus groups, Boomer Bond training and workshop, etc.