

Board Officers

Sue Horn, Chair
Jack Hilbert, Vice Chair
Rachel Zenzinger, Secretary
Jackie Millet, Treasurer
Dennis McCloskey, Immediate Past Chair
Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
→ WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 2013 ←
6:30 P.M.
1290 Broadway
First Floor Independence Pass Conference Room

1. 6:30 Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call and Introduction of New Members and Alternates
4. *Motion to Approve Agenda
5. 6:35 Report of the Chair
 - Briefing on Regional Transportation Committee
6. 6:40 Report of the Executive Director
7. 6:50 Public Comment

A total of 45 minutes is allocated at this time for public comment and each speaker will be limited to 3 minutes. If there are additional requests from the public to address the Board, time will be allocated at the end of the meeting to complete public comment. The chair requests that there be no public comment on issues for which a prior public hearing has been held before this Board.
8. 7:35 Presentation on Peak Performance Academy
Brian Elms, City and County of Denver

CONSENT AGENDA

9. 7:40 *Motion to Approve Consent Agenda
 - Minutes of March 20, 2013
(Attachment A)

***Motion Requested**

**IT IS REQUESTED THAT ALL PAGERS AND CELL PHONES BE SILENCED
DURING THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING. THANK YOU**

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!



ACTION AGENDA

10. 7:45 *Discussion of State Legislative Issues
 - A. Bills on Which Positions Have Previously Been Taken
(Attachment B) Presentation by Rich Mauro, Senior Legislative Analyst
Rich Mauro will respond to questions and current status, if requested. These bills require no additional action by the Board unless individual bills are pulled from the package for reconsideration of the Board-adopted position. **To change the Board's position on specific legislative bills requires affirmative action by 2/3 of those present and voting.**
 - B. New Bills for Consideration and Action
(Attachment C) Presentation by Rich Mauro, Senior Legislative Analyst
Rich Mauro will present a recommended position on any new bills based on the Board's legislative policies. If a bill requires additional discussion it may be pulled from the package and action will be taken separately. **Positions on specific legislative bills require affirmative action by 2/3 of those present and voting.**
11. 8:00 *Motion to adopt a resolution approving the proposed Cycle 2, 2012 wildfire amendment to the Metro Vision 2035 Plan
(Attachment D) Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning & Operations
12. 8:05 *Motion to approve the process for selecting FY 2014 and FY 2015 FTA Section 5310 projects in the Denver-Aurora Urbanized Area
(Attachment E) Jacob Riger, Senior Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning & Operations
13. 8:10 *Motion to approve the Regional TDM Pool process for fiscal years 2014 and 2015
(Attachment F) Melina Dempsey, Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning & Operations
14. 8:15 *Motion to provide direction to staff regarding CDOT's RAMP Program
(Attachment G) Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager, Transportation Planning & Operations
15. 8:30 *Motion to adopt the MVIC recommendation to allow the current CDOT/DRCOG funding equity Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to expire and begin a process to formulate a new funding agreement with CDOT, the outcome of which will be determined at a later date
(Attachment H) Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
16. 8:45 *Motion to adopt amendments to the Articles of Association to add language related to non-voting members and change the number of Governor's appointees
(Attachment I) Pat Cronenberger, Board and Legislative Liaison

***Motion Requested**

INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS

17. 9:00 Presentation on Statewide CMAQ Funding Status for Fiscal Year 2014
(Attachment J) Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager, Transportation Planning & Operations
18. 9:05 Committee Reports
- A. Report on State Transportation Advisory Committee – Beth Humenik
 - B. Report from Metro Mayors Caucus – Doug Tisdale (**Attachment K**)
 - C. Report from Metro Area County Commissioners– Don Rosier
 - D. Report from Advisory Committee on Aging – Cliff Mueller
 - E. Report from Regional Air Quality Council – Joyce Thomas/Jackie Millet
 - F. Report on Metro Vision Implementation Task Force – Jim Taylor
 - G. Report on E-470 Authority – Ron Rakowsky

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

19. Draft minutes of the March 20, 2013 Administrative Committee meeting
(Attachment L)
20. Draft summary of the April 3, 2013 Metro Vision Issues Committee meeting
(Attachment M)
21. Relevant clippings and other communications of interest
(Attachment N)
Included in this section of the agenda packet are news clippings which specifically mention DRCOG. Also included are selected communications that have been received about DRCOG staff members.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

22. Next Meeting – May 15, 2013
23. Other Matters by Members
24. 9:15 Adjournment

SPECIAL DATES TO NOTE

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| April 17 | Local Government Leadership in an Energy-Efficiency Economy |
| April 24 | Live Work Play |

CALENDAR OF FUTURE MEETINGS

April 2013

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| 16 | Regional Transportation Committee | CANCELLED |
| 17 | Administrative Committee | 5:30 p.m. |
| | Board of Directors | 6:30 p.m. |
| 19 | Advisory Committee on Aging | Noon – 3 p.m. |
| 22 | Transportation Advisory Committee | 1:30 p.m. |

May 2013

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| 1 | Metro Vision Issues Committee | 4 p.m. |
| 14 | Regional Transportation Committee | 8:30 a.m. |
| 15 | Administrative Committee | 5:30 p.m. |
| | Board of Directors | 6:30 p.m. |
| 17 | Advisory Committee on Aging | Noon – 3 p.m. |
| 20 | Transportation Advisory Committee | 1:30 p.m. |

June 2013

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| 5 | Metro Vision Issues Committee | 4 p.m. |
| 14 | Regional Transportation Committee | 8:30 a.m. |
| TBD | Administrative Committee | 5:30 p.m. |
| | Board of Directors | 6:30 p.m. |
| 17 | Advisory Committee on Aging | Noon – 3 p.m. |
| 20 | Transportation Advisory Committee | 1:30 p.m. |

Acronym List

* Denotes DRCOG Program, Committee or Report

AAA	Area Agency on Aging	MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials	MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization*
ADA	Americans with Disability Act of 1990	MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area
AMPO	Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations	MVIC	Metro Vision Issues Committee*
APA	American Planning Association	MVITF	Metro Vision Implementation Task Force
APCD	Air Pollution Control Division	MVPAC	Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee
AQCC	Air Quality Control Commission	NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	NARC	National Association of Regional Councils
BMPs	Best Management Practices	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments	NFRMPO	North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization
CAC	Citizens Advisory Committee	NFRQPA	North Front Range Water Quality Planning Association
CARO	Colorado Association of Regional Organizations	NHS	National Highway System
CBD	Central Business District	NOx	Nitrogen oxides
CCI	Colorado Counties, Inc.	NWCCOG	Northwest Colorado Council of Governments
CDPHE	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment	O&M	Operations and Maintenance
CDOT	Colorado Department of Transportation	O ₃	Ozone
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations	PM _{2.5}	Particulates or fine dust less than 2.5 microns in size
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality	PM ₁₀	Particulates or fine dust less than 10 microns in size
CMAQ	Coalition for Mobility and Air Quality	PnR	park-n-Ride
CML	Colorado Municipal League	PPACG	Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments
CMS	Congestion Management System	RAQC	Regional Air Quality Council
CO	Carbon monoxide	RFP	Request for Proposal
CWA	Clean Water Act	RFQ	Request for Qualifications
CWP	Clean Water Plan*	RMRA	Rocky Mountain Rail Authority
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise	ROD	Record of Decision
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement	ROW	Right-of-way
DMCC	Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce	RPP	Regional Priorities Program
DoLA	Colorado Department of Local Affairs and Development	RSA	Regional Statistical Area*
DOT	Department of Transportation (U.S.)	RTC	Regional Transportation Committee*
DRCOG	Denver Regional Council of Governments	RTD	Regional Transportation District
DRMAC	Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council	RTP	Regional Transportation Plan*
DUS	Denver Union Station	SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
E&D	Elderly and Disabled	SB	Senate Bill
EA	Environmental Assessment	SCI	Sustainable Communities Initiative
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	SIP	State Implementation Plan for Air Quality
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	SOV	Single-occupant Vehicle
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration	STAC	State Transportation Advisory Committee
FCC	Federal Communications Commission	STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement	STP	Surface Transportation Project (STP-Metro, STP-Enhancement)
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	TAC	Transportation Advisory Committee*
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration	TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zone
FIRE	Firefighter Intra-regional Recruitment & Employment*	TCM	Transportation Control Measures
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact	TDM	Transportation Demand Management
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration	TEA-21	1998 Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century
FTA	Federal Transit Administration	TIP	Transportation Improvement Program*
FY	Fiscal Year – DRCOG (Jan. 1 to Dec. 31) (Colorado Jul. 1 to Jun. 30)	TLRC	Transportation Legislative Review Committee
GIS	Geographic Information System	TMA	Transportation Management Area
HB	House Bill	TMO/TMA	Transportation Management Organization/Transportation Management Agency
HC	Hydrocarbons	TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
HOT Lanes	High-occupancy Toll Lanes	TOD	Transit Oriented Development
HOV	High-occupancy Vehicle	TPR	Transportation Planning Region
HUTF	Highway Users Trust Fund	TSM	Transportation System Management
IGA	Intergovernmental Agreement	TSSIP	Traffic Signal System Improvement Program
ICMA	International City Management Association	UGB/A	Urban Growth Boundary/Area
ISDS	Individual Sewage Disposal System	UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program
IPA	Integrated Plan Assessment*	V/C	Volume-to-capacity ratio
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act	VMT	Vehicle Miles of Travel
ITE	Institute of Traffic Engineers	VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System	WHSRA	Western High Speed Rail Authority
JARC	Job Access/Reverse Commute	WQCC	Water Quality Control Commission
LOS	Level of Service	WQCD	Water Quality Control Division (CDPHE)
LRT	Light Rail Transit		
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century		
MIS	Major Investment Study		
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement		

ATTACH A

MINUTES
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 2013

Members/Alternates Present

Sue Horn, Chair	Town of Bennett
Eva Henry	Adams County
Bill Holen	Arapahoe County
Elise Jones	Boulder County
Dennis McCloskey	City & County of Broomfield
Tim Mauck	Clear Creek County
Paul Ryan	City & County of Denver
Chris Nevitt	City & County of Denver
Jack Hilbert	Douglas County
Don Rosier	Jefferson County
Rachel Zenzinger	City of Arvada
Bob Roth	City of Aurora
KC Becker	City of Boulder
Anne Justen	Town of Bow Mar
Cynthia Martinez	City of Brighton
Cathy Noon	City of Centennial
Doug Tisdale	City of Cherry Hills Village
Gale Christy	Town of Columbine Valley
Jim Benson	City of Commerce City
Randy Penn	City of Englewood
Mark Gruber	Town of Erie
Joyce Thomas	City of Federal Heights
Amy Schiers	Town of Frederick
Bob Vermeulen (Alternate)	City of Golden
Ron Rakowsky	City of Greenwood Village
Adam Paul	City of Lakewood
Jim Taylor	City of Littleton
Jackie Millet	City of Lone Tree
Katie Witt	City of Longmont
Hank Dalton	City of Louisville
Julie Van Domelen	Town of Lyons
Joe Gierlach	Town of Nederland
Joyce Downing	City of Northglenn
John Diak	Town of Parker
Cliff Mueller	City of Sheridan
Debra Williams	Town of Superior
Val Vigil	City of Thornton
Joyce Jay	City of Wheat Ridge
Debra Perkins Smith	Colorado Department of Transportation

Others Present: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, Connie Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Coordinator, DRCOG; Jeanne Shreve, Adams County; Mac Callison, Aurora; Suzanne Jones, Boulder; Sharon Richardson, Federal Heights; Dan Hermann, CDOT; Danny Tomlinson, George Dibble, Tomlinson & Assoc.; and DRCOG staff.

Chair Sue Horn called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present.

Motion to Approve Agenda

Doug Tisdale **moved, seconded** by Dennis McCloskey, to approve the agenda. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Report of the Chair

The Chair recognized that this is the last meeting for Steve Rudy, DRCOG's Transportation Planning & Operations Director. He is retiring after 24 years with DRCOG.

Report of the Executive Director

- Jennifer Schaufele directed members' attention to a flyer at their seats about the Live Work Play event. The event is scheduled for April 24 at the McNichols building in Civic Center Park, beginning at 6 p.m.
- DRCOG is a co-sponsor of a workshop on Public/Private Partnerships. A flyer was provided with additional information.
- Ms. Schaufele reported that CDOT will provide a RAMP presentation to the DRCOG Transportation Advisory Committee after their meeting on March 25, beginning at approximately 3:30. Interested members were encouraged to attend. She noted that there may also be a presentation at the April 3 Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) meeting.
- Follow-up information on the Board Workshop will be presented at the April 17 meeting. Items of interest include an examination of the structure and value of MVIC, how to help the Board stay current, and the soon-to-expire Memorandum of Understanding with CDOT.
- Ms. Schaufele noted that the Chair has made appointments to the Citizens Advisory Committee; they are reported in Attachment I of the agenda.
- Ms. Schaufele expressed her thanks to Steve Rudy for his many years of service. Steve Rudy provided brief comments.

Public comment

No public comment was received.

Motion to approve consent agenda

Doug Tisdale **moved, seconded** by Bill Holen, approval of the consent agenda. Items on the consent agenda included:

- Minutes of February 20, 2013

The motion **passed unanimously**.

Discussion of State Legislative Issues

Rich Mauro provided a brief overview of bills introduced since the session began. No new bills of interest to DRCOG were introduced.

- SB 48 – authorizes cities and counties to use HUTF funds for transit. The bill passed out of the House transportation committee. An amendment was added capping the amount that could be used for transportation operations at 15 percent.
- SB 27 – RTD park-n-Rides. The bill is in the House Transportation Committee. Mr. Mauro noted he heard there may be two amendments: one, to state the intent of the legislature is that revenue derived in a corridor would remain in the corridor, and the other, to put in a 30-day window during which a local government could object to a contract that RTD has worked out with a private party to construct or operate a parking facility.
- SB 127 – handouts were distributed to members on this bill (*a part of and filed with the official copy of this summary*). Rich Mauro noted that the most recent quarterly revenue forecast for general fund revenues was released on Monday. The estimate is approximately \$200 million higher than in December. This kicks off the long bill budget process; it is anticipated that the long bill will be introduced in the Senate on March 25. SB-127 is anticipated to be introduced shortly thereafter. Contact information for members of the Senate Appropriations Committee was included with the handouts. Members were encouraged to contact the members to express their support.

Jim Taylor reported that it is anticipated that a Marketplace Fairness Act rider will be attached to the budget bill before Congress. A yes vote by the legislature would allow the Act to move forward as a bill. The bill would allow cities, counties, and states to collect sales tax on internet and catalog sales.

Jim Taylor **moved, seconded by Gale Christy** to send a letter to the Colorado Congressional Delegation asking for their support of the Marketplace Fairness Act. There was discussion.

Bill Holen stated that the Act would allow parity between online purchases and local businesses. Dennis McCloskey noted that many people go to local stores to locate items, and then order them online to avoid paying tax. Jack Hilbert expressed his opposition to taking a position at this time. It was noted that a vote in Congress is expected to take place soon. Val Vigil noted that the National League of Cities is supportive of the legislation. He reported that the tax will be collected at the State level. Joe Gierlach and Doug Tisdale noted that the budget amendment will be voted on early tomorrow. Jim Benson stated he is in favor of the motion. Jennifer Schaufele suggested that the motion be framed so that the issue is germane to the business of DRCOG. Cathy Noon reported that Metro Mayors sent a letter of support.

After discussion, the motion **passed** with 9 opposed.

Motion to delay member requests for additional urban growth boundary/area (UGB/A) until after Metro Vision 2040 has been adopted by the DRCOG Board of Directors

Bill Holen **moved, seconded** by Paul Ryan, to delay member requests for additional urban growth boundary/area (UGB/A) until after Metro Vision 2040 has been adopted by the DRCOG Board of Directors. There was discussion.

Jack Hilbert asked if any community had applied for additional UGB/A. Staff replied that no community has applied but a process in place for accommodating emergency requests.

After discussion, the motion **passed unanimously**.

Motion to adopt a resolution to strongly urge DRCOG member governments to supply available data in a timely manner so as to best inform regional initiatives such as the Land Use and Travel Demand Models, Metro Vision 204, the Development Type Model, and continuing evaluation of the Urban growth Boundary and Urban Centers

Rachel Zenzinger **moved, seconded** by Jim Benson, Alternative 3, take no action. There was discussion.

Ashley Summers, DRCOG staff, explained that data is very important to the work of DRCOG's modeling and GIS team, and receiving the data in a timely manner assists staff with providing accurate products for the members. Jennifer Schaufele asked if members could share the reason for objections. Several members expressed they did not feel that provision of data should be "legislated" by the Board members through a resolution. Members stated if DRCOG staff was experiencing difficulty or delays with member jurisdictions providing information in a timely manner, the Board member should be contacted for assistance with obtaining the information.

Doug Tisdale **called the question**. The motion to stop debate was seconded and **passed** with 1 opposed.

After discussion the motion **passed** with 2 opposed.

Motion directing how DRCOG will review RTD's requested 2013 Cycle 1 FasTracks amendments to the fiscally constrained 2035 MVRTP

Jacob Riger briefly described the proposed action. Staff requests direction on what level of information should be required of RTD.

Bill Holen **moved, seconded** by Cathy Noon, Alternative 1, staff review information already submitted and augmented by responses to DRCOG staff information requests. The motion **passed unanimously**.

Presentation on Metro Vision Implementation Task Force Update

Teri Whitmore provided an update on activities of the Metro Vision Implementation Task Force. Four major projects were approved by the Board to move forward, as outlined in the agenda attachment. KC Becker asked what is meant by the term "under-performing" as it relates to for-sale multi-family developments. Ms. Whitmore stated under-performing relates to the numbers of permits granted for this type of housing now as opposed to pre-legislation. Ms. Whitmore noted that the goal of the Construction Defects study is to determine what effect, if any, state legislation may be having on the construction of for-sale multi-family housing. Provision of this type of housing is essential to the DRCOG region meeting its stated goals related to density. Jim Taylor noted that this item came out of discussions with the

Home Builders Association. He noted that most municipalities are issuing permits for for-rent multi-family housing. Dennis McCloskey noted that there is multi-family housing being built, however it's not for-sale units. Councilmember Becker noted that she feels the way the memo is written makes it sound as though the outcome is predetermined. Jennifer Schaufele noted that the analysis is broader than what is worded here. The purpose is to determine if there are state laws in place that are impacting the region's ability to meet its density and TOD goals in Metro Vision. Ms. Whitmore reported next on the Coordination of Land Use and Economic Development and the Transportation Station projects. Bill Holen noted that the Transportation Station project is of interest to veterans, as there is concern regarding the inaccessibility of the I-225 station that will serve the VA Hospital on the Anschutz Campus.

Committee Reports

- State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
 - Steve Rudy reported that the STAC discussed the Federal Lands Access Program. This program is new to MAP-21 and funds roads, trails, and transit access to and within federal lands. Staffs of the local jurisdictions were sent information on the program; including how to access application forms that are now available. If there are questions, please contact DCOG staff.
 - The STAC was also briefed on CDOT staff recommendations for FY 2014 for the types of dollars that DRCOG allocates to the jurisdictions through the TIP. The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) took the place of the Enhancement program. CDOT will fund at the previously estimated level for 2014. As previously reported, a shortfall in the TAP program which would normally be spread across all recipients (approximately \$300,000) was absorbed by DRCOG with the approval of the Transportation Commission; DRCOG will be backfilled these funds from CMAQ.
 - Steve Rudy noted that MAP-21 brought more CMAQ dollars to the state than was previously estimated for 2014. CDOT staff proposes to deliver the previously estimated amounts. This leaves \$13 million on the table for now, in anticipation of a Compressed Natural Gas infrastructure study to come from the Colorado Energy Office. Once the study is finished, a determination will be made as to the disposition of the \$13 million. No decision has been made to give the money to the Colorado Energy Office. The \$300,000 to backfill DRCOG (as noted previously) is also included in this \$13 million.
 - STP-Metro funds will be allocated to MPOs per the specific language of MAP-21, which will bring a little more to the DRCOG area than previously estimated. DRCOG will hold a RAMP workshop on Monday at 3:30 p.m. to work with sponsors who might have projects. Board members were invited to attend if they wished. The focus of the workshop will be the RAMP pre-application process.
 - Long range plan revenue projections will be the topic of a Transportation Commission workshop tomorrow. CDOT staff looked at numerous scenarios; the scenario recommended has several features: Funds derived from SB 09-228 are assumed in the scenario, as well as a level of federal general fund transfer. More conservative assumptions were made as well. The projection shows the CDOT budget to be flat from 2023-2040, at approximately \$1.35 billion per year.
 - The STAC was briefed on two CDOT efforts underway: (1) State Freight Plan-a freight advisory council will be reformed and membership will include two local government members from each CDOT region; and (2) Regional Commuter Bus study that CDOT is trying to move forward. This would include commuter bus service from Colorado

Springs, Fort Collins, Vail, and other outlying areas into Denver. There will be public meetings in the future.

- Metro Mayors Caucus – Doug Tisdale reported the Metro Mayors Caucus did not meet.
- Metro Area Commissioners Council (MACC) – Don Rosier reported that the MACC met in Adams County. They received a presentation from Maria Garcia-Berry on transportation poll results that CRL put together; they held a discussion of construction defect legislation and a discussion on the “Incompetent to Stand Trial” Task Force.
- Advisory Committee on Aging – Cliff Mueller reported that the ACA received a report about the Community Care Transition Program and the effects of sequestration on aging programs.
- Regional Air Quality Council – Joyce Thomas reported that the RAQC reviewed legislation of interest: one related to collector vehicle emission requirements. Some cars carrying these plates are just old cars in poor repair; the legislation will specify that only classic cars may carry these plates, and will require emissions every five years on these cars (HB 1071). The other is HB 1091, diesel emissions testing revisions. This bill makes it easier for diesel vehicle owners to get emissions tests. They also received a report oil and gas activities. An update on the Ozone Aware program was provided.
- Metro Vision Implementation Task Force – This item was covered in Teri Whitmore’s report, Attachment F. Council Member Taylor reported that the Sustainable Communities Initiative full consortium will meet on Friday March 22 at 8 a.m. at the Tivoli Center.
- E-470 Authority – Ron Rakowsky reported that the State Patrol provided a report on accidents and traffic enforcement on E-470, as well as a report on the increase in auto theft in Colorado. Mayor Rakowsky noted that efforts are underway to lessen the number of wrong-way drivers on E-470.

Next meeting – April 17, 2013

Sue Horn noted she will be absent for the April 17 meeting, Jack Hilbert will chair.

Other Matters by members

No other matters were discussed.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Dennis McCloskey, Chair
Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

ATTACH B

To: Chair and Members of the DRCOG Board

From: Rich Mauro, Senior Policy and Legislative Analyst
303-480-6778 or rmauro@drcog.org

Subject: **Update on Bills Acted Upon at March 20 Board Meeting**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 17, 2013	Action	10

REQUESTED ACTION

No action requested. For information only.

SUMMARY

- This memo updates the status of all bills previously acted upon by the Board as of April 10.
- The bills are presented in a matrix with staff comments and the Board's position.
- Staff can provide more detailed updates on the bills as requested by the Board.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

- The Board took positions on these bills presented by the DRCOG staff at the January, February and March Board meetings.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

NA

ALTERNATIVES

NA

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

NA

BACKUP INFORMATION

Attachment: Status of Bills Presented at Previous Board Meetings

DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STATUS REPORT--2013 SESSION
As of 4-10-13

Bill No.	Sponsor	Short Title/Summary	Status	Position	Staff Comments	Legislative Policy
TRANSPORATATION BILLS						
HB 1030	Priola/ S. King	<i>Transportation Commission Members-</i> Transportation Legislation Review Committee Bill. The transportation commission currently consists of 11 members appointed by the governor, each of whom represents a single transportation district. The bill adds 2 at-large members appointed by the governor, each of whom represents the entire state. One of the at-large members must reside on the western slope and the other must reside on the eastern slope. The at-large members serve 4 year terms; except that the at-large member who resides on the western slope serves an initial term of 2 years in order to stagger the timing of future appointments.	Postponed Indefinitely Senate Transportation	Monitor (with concerns noted in Comments section)	The DRCOG Board has been concerned for a long time that the metro area is not adequately represented on the Transportation Commission. Currently, 44% of the seats on the commission are held by members appointed to represent a district wholly within the metro area, although the metro area is home to nearly 60% of the state's population. If this bill passes, those metro area seats would amount to 31% of the total. The bill also raises the practical and philosophical issue of what is the best way to represent the people of Colorado on a board or commission - by districts, at-large, or some combination. By directing that two of the members of the Transportation Commission be appointed explicitly to represent the whole state, the bill takes the combination approach. It is DRCOG's observation that the Transportation Commission has done a good job of taking into consideration the interests of the whole state in making its decisions.	DRCOG supports legislation to ensure that representation on the Transportation Commission reflects approximately equal populations based on the most recent population census.
HB 1110	Fischer/ Jones	<i>Special Fuel Tax & Electric Vehicle Fee-</i> Repeals the annual fee that is charged in lieu of the special fuel tax and the related decal system, so that liquefied petroleum gas and natural gas are subject to the special fuel tax. As amended, requires county clerks and recorders to annually collect a \$50 fee at the time of registration on every motor vehicle that is propelled by plug-in electricity. \$30 of the fee is credited to the Highway Users Tax Fund. \$20 is credited to an Electric Vehicle grant Fund.	Senate Transportation	Support	The revenues collected pursuant to the electric vehicle fee are to be deposited in the HUTF and allocated according to the 60% state, 22% counties, 40% municipalities formula.	DRCOG supports increased funding for transportation to preserve the system, address congestion and safety, and provide multimodal options for people of all ages, incomes and abilities.

DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STATUS REPORT--2013 SESSION
As of 4-10-13

Bill No.	Sponsor	Short Title/Summary	Status	Position	Staff Comments	Legislative Policy
HB 1128	Saine Lundberg	<i>Exclude Clean Counties From Enhanced Emission Area</i> -Allows a board of county commissioners for a particular county to exclude, by resolution, any or all parts of the county from the enhanced motor vehicle emissions program area if the excluded part of the county does not violate any national ambient air quality standard for carbon monoxide or ozone as established by the environmental protection agency.	Postponed Indefinitely House Transportation	Oppose	DRCOG has opposed similar bills the last two years. The issue with regard to the national air quality standards is basically, we all are in this together. The EPA sets air quality non-attainment areas, which may include all or portions of counties. Individual pollution readings are effected by emissions that occur throughout the region. Emissions in one county may effect readings at monitors elsewhere in the region. This is why the AIR program in Larimer/Weld is part of the Ozone Action Plan approved by the state legislature in 2009.	DRCOG supports efforts to reduce emissions from all sources sufficient to meet federal air quality standards.
SB 27	Todd/ Priola	<i>RTD Mass Transit Station Parking Facilities</i> - Authorizes any public or private entity to lease, own, or operate a public parking lot or structure at or near a Regional Transportation District (RTD) mass transit station. Such a lot or structure is only an RTD facility, as defined in existing law, if it is operated under a contract with RTD that specifies the terms of its use and operation and provides RTD with a share of its parking revenues. Amended to add: "Other local governments and RTD shall consult with each other prior to the establishment of zoning, other authorization by a governmental body, or contracts required for privately owned or managed parking facilities intended for users of the district's mass transportation system." Also, the Legislative Declaration now says RTD should use any moneys realized from any related contract first to complete the portion of the FasTracks projects that are currently not under construction.	Passed Both Houses	Support (with concerns noted in Comments section)	The bill modifies the current law, which provides RTD with limited authority to charge for parking at a "district parking facility." Its intent is to make it possible for a "public or private entity" (a developer or a local government) to build or operate a parking lot or structure at or near a RTD mass transit station and possibly operate it under a revenue sharing contract with RTD. The intent of such a contract would be to incorporate RTD parking into the lot or structure. A number of interested parties, including DRCOG Board members, have raised questions as to whether this would allow the operators to charge a parking fee to everyone (RTD patron or not) who uses the structure. Board members raised concerns about the need for local government input on these projects and directed staff to seek stronger local involvement.	DRCOG supports legislation that promotes efforts to create and fund a multimodal transportation system. DRCOG supports legislative initiatives that foster transit-oriented development, including but not limited to: a) providing RTD with the ability to manage its park and ride facilities using best practices that help the region reduce VMT; b) expanding the ability of RTD and local governments to enter into joint-development agreements; and c) protecting local authority to use tax-increment financing to leverage development in areas around transit stations.

DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STATUS REPORT--2013 SESSION
As of 4-10-13

Bill No.	Sponsor	Short Title/Summary	Status	Position	Staff Comments	Legislative Policy
SB48	Todd/ Tyler & Labuda	<i>Authorize Local Government Use Of HUTF For Transit</i> - Authorizes counties and municipalities to spend moneys that they receive from the HUTF on transit-related projects. Amended to limit such expenditures to no more than fifteen percent of the total amount for transit-related operational purposes.	Passed Both Houses	Support	This bill extends the ability of counties and municipalities to use their allocation of most HUTF funds for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects. This authority is permissive. Current law authorizes CDOT to spend \$10 million per year of its HUTF moneys received from the road safety surcharges and fees established in the FASTER bill on transit-related projects. As with FASTER, SB 48 establishes this authority based on a legislative finding that such projects constitute maintenance and supervision of public highways because it will help to reduce traffic on state highways, thereby reducing wear and tear on state highways and bridges and increasing their reliability, safety, efficient performance, and expected useful life.	DRCOG supports increasing funding for transportation to preserve the system, address congestion and safety, and provide multimodal options for people of all ages, incomes and abilities. DRCOG supports legislation that promotes efforts to create and fund a multimodal transportation system.
SB 68	Baumgardner	<i>Modify Late Vehicle Registration Fee</i> - Effective July 1, 2013, the bill changes the fee for late registration of a vehicle from a fee of \$25 per month to a flat fee of \$20 and repeals an exemption from the late fee for a vehicle that has expired temporary registration number plates, tags, or certificates.	Postponed Indefinitely House Transportation	Oppose	DRCOG supported SB 09-108 (FASTER). This bill, one of several introduced in recent session, is similar to a bill Rep. Baumgardner carried last year to modify the FASTER late registration fee. DRCOG opposed that bill, which was estimated to reduce HUTF revenue by about \$12 million.	DRCOG supports increased funding for transportation to preserve the system, address congestion and safety, and provide multimodal options for people of all ages, incomes and abilities.

DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STATUS REPORT--2013 SESSION
As of 4-10-13

Bill No.	Sponsor	Short Title/Summary	Status	Position	Staff Comments	Legislative Policy
AGING BILLS						
SB 111	Hudak/ Schafer & Stephens	<i>Require Reports Of Elder Abuse And Exploitation</i> - Expands the number of professionals required to report abuse or exploitation of a person who is 70 years of age or older. The bill lists 17 mostly medical, social work, clergy, and financial professionals required to report. Failure to report is a class 3 misdemeanor. The bill also provides for training of these professionals and liability protection.	Senate Floor	Support	This bill is the latest attempt over more than a decade to establish mandatory reporting. DRCOG has supported those past efforts. Although Colorado is one of only three states without mandatory reporting, the legislature so far has failed to pass it because of the increased costs to the state and counties, with no identified funding source. This bill is the result of a task force (created by SB 12-078) that met last summer (staffed by CCI). Also, the governor has requested \$5 million for the current fiscal year to help fund the bill. As operator of an Area Agency on Aging and Long Term Care Ombudsman program, DRCOG is mandated to advocate for older adults, particularly those living in long-term care facilities.	DRCOG supports increases in consumer protections for older adults and their caregivers and, in particular, legislation strengthening the role of the long-term care ombudsman as a resident/consumer advocate.
SB 127	Guzman/ Primavera	<i>Sales Tax Revenue To Older Coloradans Cash Fund</i> - The state constitution requires 85% of sales and use taxes be credited to the Old Age Pension Fund. The remaining 15% currently is split between the General Fund minus \$8 million to the Older Coloradans Cash Fund (OCF). As introduced, the bill increased the OCF by \$4 million for each of the next three fiscal year to \$20 million. As amended, it increases the OCF to \$10 million for FY 13-14 and each state fiscal year thereafter.	House Finance	Support	The Older Coloradans Cash Fund currently provides \$8 million annually to the 16 Area Agencies on Aging (including DRCOG and Boulder) to fund community services at the local level. DRCOG has supported several similar bills over the last decade. The aging of the population, the growing need for services, and the cost effectiveness of these services, argue for a larger appropriation and for that appropriation to be ongoing. The governor included a one-time \$2 million in his budget request for which DRCOG is grateful. We also appreciate the General Assembly approved that request in the Long Bill. Assuming SB 127 passes, there will be an additional \$4 million for AAA services in FY 13-14.	DRCOG supports increasing the continuing appropriation to the State Funding for Senior Services line item. This includes restoration of cuts in the appropriation to the Older Coloradan's Fund, as well as any additional state General Fund monies that might become available.

**DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STATUS REPORT--2013 SESSION
As of 4-10-13**

Bill No.	Sponsor	Short Title/Summary	Status	Position	Staff Comments	Legislative Policy
OTHER BILLS						
SB 52	Scheffel/ DelGrosso	<p><i>Transit-oriented Development Claims</i> - With respect to construction defect actions involving transit-oriented development, the bill makes the following changes to the law: Institutes a "right to repair" for construction professionals that receive a notice of claim with respect to a construction defect in a transit-oriented development. Institutes a binding arbitration requirement for claims against construction professionals with respect to transit-oriented development. Makes construction professionals immune to suit for environmental conditions including noise, odors, light, temperatures, humidity, vibrations, and smoke or fumes causally related to transit, commercial, public, or retail use. With respect to construction defect actions in general: clarifies the statute of repose for the 6-year statute of limitations for actions against architects, contractors, builders, builder vendors, engineers, or inspectors involved in improvements to real property.</p>	Senate Judiciary	Monitor	<p>Last year, DRCOG's Metro Vision Implementation Steering Group recommended and the DRCOG Board (at the Board's May 2012 meeting) approved three projects related to Metro Vision implementation. One of those recommendations was to study the impact, if any, construction defects legislation is having on the diversity of housing stock in the metro area, specifically the construction of for-sale, multifamily residential units. DRCOG recently selected Economic and Planning Systems to conduct the study. The contracting process with EPS has just been completed and they should begin the study soon. The study results are not expected for four months.</p>	<p>Metro Vision establishes several regional goals, including "locate 50% of new housing and 75% of new employment between 2005 and 2035 in designated urban centers throughout the region," and DRCOG may support or oppose legislative proposals based on consistency with these goals.</p>

ATTACH C

To: Chair and Members of the DRCOG Board

From: Rich Mauro, Senior Policy and Legislative Analyst
303-480-6778 or rmauro@drcog.org

Subject: **New Bills Introduced Since March Board Meeting**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 17, 2013	Action	10

REQUESTED ACTION

Motions for positions on presented bills

SUMMARY

- The attached spreadsheet provides a list of new bills of interest that have been introduced since the January Board meeting through March 20.
- The bills are presented with staff comments and staff recommended positions.
- Any bills of interest introduced after April 11 will be emailed to Board members by the Monday before the meeting with staff recommendations for review at the meeting (per current Board policy).

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

N/A

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

NA

ALTERNATIVES

1. If the Board agrees with the staff recommendations, the bill list can be treated as a consent agenda and approved with one motion.
2. However, any Board member may move a change to the position for any bill and that bill will be voted on separately.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

- NA

BACKUP INFORMATION

Attachment: New Bills – 2013 Session

DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
NEW BILLS--2013 SESSION
As of 4-10-13

Bill No.	Sponsor	Short Title/Summary	Status	Recommended Position	Staff Comments	Legislative Policy
TRANSPORATATION BILLS						
HB 1272	Hullinghorst/ Steadman	<i>RTD & SCFD Sales & Use Tax Base Same As State</i> - Currently, some items that are exempt from the state sales and use tax are subject to the Scientific and Cultural Facilities District (SCFD) and Regional Transportation District's (RTD) sales and use taxes, and vice versa. For example, RTD and SCFD may tax the sales of low emitting motor vehicles, but the state may not. The state may tax the sale of candy and soft drinks, but RTD and SCFD may not. The bill changes RTD and SCFD's sales and use tax bases to be the same as the state's sales and use tax base by eliminating some of the districts' exemptions and creating other new exemptions for them.	Passed House	Support	Currently, some items that are exempt from the RTD and SCFD sales and use tax are taxable for state purposes, and vice versa. As amended in the House Finance committee, the effective date for this bill is January 1, 2014. The Legislative Council Staff estimates these changes in the tax base will lead to an estimated net increase of about 0.6 percent in sales and use tax revenue for RTD and SCFD.	DRCOG supports legislation that promotes efforts to create and fund a multimodal transportation system. DRCOG also supports actions to increase funding for transportation to preserve the system, address congestion and safety, and provide multimodal options for people of all ages, incomes and abilities.
SB 257	King & Tochtrop/ Ryden	<i>Auto Inspection Section Program</i> - The bill extends the exemption period from 4 years to 7 years. The air quality control commission is directed to implement the extension of the exemption for current model year vehicles from 4 to 7 years in rules by January 1, 2014. The commission also is directed to adopt rules that allow for the use of on-board diagnostic testing equipment by the same date. Currently, a motor vehicle that is being registered in the emissions program area for the first time is exempt from the requirement to get an emissions control inspection if the motor vehicle is in its fourth model year or newer.	Seante Transportation	Monitor	DRCOG has supported or opposed bills modifying the Automobile Inspection and Readjustment Program based on whether they may negatively impact the state's ability to meet and maintain National Air Quality Standards and our mandate to demonstrate conformity of the regional transportation plan with the State Implementation Plan. This bill does not appear to negatively impact DRCOG's ability to demonstrate conformity but staff recommends monitoring the legislation in case that assessment changes.	DRCOG supports efforts to reduce emissions from all sources sufficient to meet federal air quality standards.

DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
 NEW BILLS--2013 SESSION
 As of 4-10-13

Bill No.	Sponsor	Short Title/Summary	Status	Recommended Position	Staff Comments	Legislative Policy
AGING BILLS						
SB 209	Tochtrop Schafer & Stephens	<i>Personal Needs Allowance Nursing Care Facilities</i> - The bill changes the personal needs allowance by increasing the minimum amount payable to a resident of a nursing facility or an intermediate care facility for persons with mental retardation from \$50 to \$75 per month	Senate Health & Human Services	Support	A personal needs allowance for residents of Medicaid nursing facilities was enacted by federal law in 1987, at which time the minimum allowance was set at \$30. The purpose is to allow for the purchase of clothing and other goods and services that are not reimbursed by any state or federal program. States have the option to set the allowance at a higher rate. The most recent adjustment to the Colorado allowance occurred in 1999, when the allowance was increased to the current \$50 from \$34.	As an advocate for older adults and their caregivers, DRCOG works with various groups and individuals to support state legislation, regulations and programs to meet the needs of older adults. As the Long-Term Care Ombudsman for the region, DRCOG is an advocate for the rights of residents in long-term care communities and for improvement in the quality of care in such facilities.

ATTACH D

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee
From: Teri Whitmore, Director, Regional Planning and Operations
Subject: **Proposed amendments to the Metro Vision 2035 Plan, Cycle 2 2012**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 17, 2013	Action	11

REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to adopt a resolution approving the proposed Cycle 2, 2012 wildfire amendment to the Metro Vision 2035 Plan.

SUMMARY

- DRCOG initiated the 2012 Cycle 2 Metro Vision Plan Assessment Process on July 2, 2012. Proposed plan amendments were due on August 3 (urban centers) and August 17 (all other amendments).
- In February 2013, the DRCOG Board adopted a resolution approving proposed urban center amendments. However, after significant discussion on the proposed wildfire amendment (partly due to confusion over which language was before the Board) the amendment was tabled.
- Several Board members volunteered to further discuss the proposed policy amendment and offered to bring revised language back for the Board's consideration.
- The attached document provides the original proposed amendment (sponsored by Boulder County), MVIC's recommendation to the Board (September 2012), and the preferred language developed by volunteer Board members.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

N/A

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the revised amendment
2. Do not approve the proposed amendment at this time

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

DRCOG staff recommends approving the amendment.

BACKGROUND

Attachments:

- Summary of proposed amendment language
- Draft resolution

Links:

[Summary of proposed Cycle 2, 2012 amendments:](#)

[Summary of public comment:](#)

Summary of Proposed 2012 Cycle 2 Wildfire Amendment to the *Metro Vision 2035 Plan*

Original proposed amendment:

13. Wildfire Hazard. Development is discouraged in areas designated as high wildfire hazard zones in community wildfire protection plans and/or county comprehensive land use plans, unless Colorado State Forest Service Firewise guidelines are followed and incorporated into the land development and building permit approval process.

MVIC recommendation to Board – approved September 2012:

13. Wildfire Hazard. Development is discouraged in areas designated as high wildfire hazard zones in community wildfire protection plans and/or county comprehensive land use plans. Development in areas designated as high wildfire hazard zones, should at a minimum follow the Colorado State Forest Service Firewise guidelines, or local wildfire mitigation regulations.

Amendment for Board consideration (April 2013):

13. Wildfire Hazard: Development in areas designated as high wildfire hazard zones in community wildfire protection plans and/or county comprehensive land use plans should follow the most recent Colorado State Forest Service Firewise construction guidelines or local wildfire mitigation regulations. Where practical, local governments should guide new development away from high wildfire hazard zones.

DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

STATE OF COLORADO

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION NO. _____, 2013

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AN AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE A NEW WILDFIRE
HAZARD POLICY IN THE METRO VISION 2035 PLAN.

WHEREAS, it is a function and duty of the Denver Regional Council of Governments, as a regional planning commission under the laws of the State of Colorado, to make and adopt an advisory regional plan for the physical development of the territory within its jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the Denver Regional Council of Governments in 2011 adopted a document titled the *Metro Vision 2035 Plan* that established broad policies to guide growth and development, transportation, and environmental quality in the Denver region through the year 2035; and

WHEREAS, the Denver Regional Council of Governments held a public hearing on January 16, 2013 to consider amendments proposed to the *Metro Vision 2035 Plan*; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Vision Issues Committee has recommended that the Board of Directors of the Denver Regional Council of Governments adopt the proposed amendment to the *Metro Vision 2035 Plan*

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that pursuant to its Articles of Association, and the authority granted under Section 30-28-106 of the Colorado Statutes the Board of Directors of the Denver Regional Council of Governments hereby adopts the proposed amendment to the *Metro Vision 2035 Plan*.

RESOLVED, PASSED AND ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 2013 at Denver, Colorado.

Sue Horn, Chair
Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

Jennifer Schauffele, Executive Director

ATTACHE

To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Jacob Riger, Senior Transportation Planner
(303-480-6751 or jriger@drcog.org)

Through: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
(303-480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org)

Subject: **FTA Section 5310 (*Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities*) Project Evaluation and Selection Process**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 17, 2013	Action	12

REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to approve the process for selecting FY 2014 and FY 2015 FTA Section 5310 projects in the Denver region.

SUMMARY

- DRCOG is initiating the process to solicit, evaluate, and select projects for FY 2014 and FY 2015 funding under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 program within the Denver-Aurora Urbanized Area.
- The 5310 program can be used to pay for capital, operating, and other activities that enhance mobility for the elderly and those with disabilities.
- The 5310 program's objectives are to fill the geographic and service gaps of RTD's Access-a-Ride program, providing "door-to/through-door" service, more service hours, and other mobility options for the elderly and individuals with disabilities.
- Approximately \$2.9 million is available in the program for the DRCOG region for the FY 2014 and 2015.
- Key process milestones (2013):
 - Mid-April: Issue call for Section 5310 applications
 - Early June: Applications due
 - Early July: Peer Review Panel develops project funding recommendations
 - July-August: Final DRCOG committee and Board action on funding recommendations
 - Fall: RTD initiates contracts for DRCOG-selected projects
- DRCOG staff is seeking Board approval of the proposed 5310 process:
 - Project type categories
 - Evaluation criteria
 - PRP application scoring and selection process
 - Peer Review Panel (PRP) composition
- Members of the Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council (DRMAC) reviewed the process on March 25, 2013 and via a subsequent open comment period. DRMAC members are supportive of the proposed selection process and provided valuable input to help refine the process materials. The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended approval at its March 25, 2013 meeting.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

- January 16, 2013 DRCOG Board recommended RTD as the designated recipient for Section 5310 funds and approved RTD's request for DRCOG to solicit, evaluate, and select applications for funding.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1 - Concur with proposed 5310 process.

Alternative 2 - Modify the proposed 5310 process.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

- DRCOG staff, the Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council (DRMAC) and the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) recommend Alternative 1.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Attachments:
 1. FY 2014/15 DRCOG 5310 Project Selection Process (Proposed)
 2. Proposed Project *Evaluation and Scoring Criteria* matrix

ATTACHMENT 1

FY 2014/15 DRCOG 5310 Project Selection Process (Proposed)

FTA Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities)

April 4, 2013

1. Section 5310 Project Type Categories

- A. Capital
- B. Mobility Management
- C. Operating
- D. Regional Brokerage – proposed pilot category to coordinate/broker and/or directly provide trips for multiple populations with multiple funding types

Background: The FTA Section 5310 program requires that **at least 55%** of total funding be allocated to public transportation “capital” projects that are “planned, designed, and carried out to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities when public transportation is insufficient, inappropriate, or unavailable.” Such projects primarily include vehicle and equipment purchases and mobility management activities. Category A and Category B together must comprise at least 55% of total 5310 funding awarded.

DRCOG staff is proposing Category D as a new pilot category that would comprise **no more than 10%** of total funding, meaning Category C operating projects could comprise **no more than 35%** of total funding. These are targets, and actual funding will depend on the types of project applications received and their requested funding amounts.

2. Project Evaluation, Scoring Criteria, and Points per Project Type

- See attached matrix (Attachment 3)

3. Project Application Scoring and Selection Process

Step 1: Prepare application form and announce call for projects with an established deadline.

Step 2: DRCOG staff will screen all project funding applications for **applicant eligibility, project/activity eligibility, and completeness**. Applications will be given a brief “cure” period to respond to issues raised.

Step 3: The Peer Review Panel (PRP) will score and rank Category A and Category B projects together based on total points received in those categories. The highest-ranked projects summing to the 55% threshold (~\$1.6 million) will be noted. Remaining Category A and B projects will be addressed in Step 6. If there are not enough Category A and B projects to meet the 55% threshold, the amount of funds available to Category C and D projects must be proportionally reduced.

Step 4: The PRP will score and rank Category C projects based on total points received in that category, noting where the 35% ceiling is reached. If there are additional Category C projects, see Step 6.

ATTACHMENT 1

Step 5: The PRP will then score and rank Category D projects based on total points received in that category, noting where the 10% target is reached. If there are additional or not enough Category D projects, see Step 6.

Step 6: The PRP will prepare a recommended list of projects to be funded for TAC, RTC, and Board action.

4. Peer Review Panel (PRP)

The PRP is proposed to be comprised of at least five non-applicant stakeholders' staff: DRCOG (MPO Planning Section and Area Agency on Aging), CDOT, FTA, State Coordinating Council, Veterans Affairs, Department of Health and Human Services, local govt. staff, etc. If there are not enough participants, an alternate PRP composition could be non-applicants plus regional applicants (RTD and DRMAC, who would not score their own project submittals).

ATTACHMENT 2

FTA Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities) Proposed Project Evaluation and Scoring Criteria for FY 2014/15 DRCOG Project Selection for RTD

Project Types	Example Activities (Not Exhaustive)	Proposed 2-Year Federal Funding Targets	
A. Capital Activities	Purchase vehicles and equipment; contract for transportation service; mobility management (see below)	At least	\$1,595,000
B. Mobility Management	Short-range planning and management activities/projects to improve coordination; travel training	55%	
C. Operating Activities	Service beyond ADA requirements, feeder service, service enhancements, voucher programs	35%	\$1,015,000
D. Coordinated Brokerage	Pilot category for operations to coordinate/broker or provide <u>trips</u> for multiple populations with multiple funding types	10%	\$290,000
		100%	\$2,900,000

Peer Review Panel Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Methodology		Project Type & Criteria Points per Project Type			
		A. Capital	B. Mobility Management	C. Operating	D. Coord. Brokerage
Evaluation Criteria	Explanation - How Evaluation Criteria are Scored				
1. Relation to Transit Element	Qualitative: Scoring based on the responsiveness of the project to Transit Element goals, strategies, and policies. How many does the project address and how well does it address them? (Figure 3 policies and Chapter 9 goals and strategies)	0-15	0-20	0-15	0-10
2. Coordination & Commitment	Qualitative: Extent to which the project demonstrates coordination with and commitment from participating entities. Support letters from participating entities will be considered in the scoring.	0-10	0-20	0-10	0-15
3. Capital Evaluation (Vehicles & Equipment)	Qualitative: Scoring based on documentation of capital priorities and need.	0-5	N/A	N/A	N/A
4. Service Needs/Availability	Qualitative: Scoring based on project responsiveness in identifying and addressing unmet needs of the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	0-10	0-10	0-20	0-10
5. Ridership	Qualitative/Quantitative: Scoring based on project's anticipated annual new ridership of seniors and individuals with disabilities relative to project cost. Reliability of the projected ridership value may be considered.	0-15	0-5	0-15	0-5 (See #12 Below)
6. Accessibility Improvements	Qualitative: Infrastructure, service, or other capital or operating investments to improve access to fixed route service, paratransit service, or to other service alternatives enhancing mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities.	0-10	0-10	0-15	0-5
7. Project Readiness & Implementation	Qualitative: Reasonableness of project's work plan; applicant's ability (staff and resources) to complete the project on time and within budget; and how quickly project can begin in relation to the fiscal year of funding to be used.	0-10	0-10	0-10	0-5
8. Marketing & Outreach	Qualitative: Scoring based on a reasonable marketing/outreach plan to reach the project's target populations.	0-5	0-10	0-5	0-5
9. Project Performance Metrics	Qualitative: How well project identifies and applies meaningful performance measures <i>above and beyond the following, which must be included at a minimum:</i> Increase available transportation service for seniors and individuals with disabilities through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • modifications to the geographic coverage of proposed transportation service • quality of service (frequency, reliability); increased hours of service 	0-10	0-10	0-10	0-5 (See #12 Below)
10. Cash Overmatch (Capital)	Quantitative: 1 point earned for each full 5% of cash overmatch above the 20% minimum match requirement.	0-5	N/A	N/A	N/A
11. Multiple Funding Sources	Quantitative: At least one additional funding type (10 points); at least two (15 points); three or more (20 points). Eligible funding types include Older Americans Act, DD Mill Levy, Medicaid NEMT, Veterans, or other human service transportation-oriented funding. Each non-Section 5310 funding type must be at least 10% of the total Section 5310 funding request to qualify for points.	N/A	N/A	N/A	0-20
12. Regional Service Coordination Performance Metrics	Quantitative/Qualitative: Demonstrate ability to achieve at least one of the following three metrics (up to 10 points); at least two metrics (up to 15 points); all three metrics (up to 20 points): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cost savings: net reduction in unit costs (cost per trip/rider, cost per hour, or cost per mile) reinvested to increase service quantity/quality • service quantity: increase service (number of trips, riders per vehicle service hour, service span, geographic coverage, service types) • service quality: increase service quality as measured by customer satisfaction surveys, crash rates, reliability 	N/A	N/A	N/A	0-20
13. Regional Brokerage/Coordination	Proposed project/funding request directly supports regional brokerage/coordination structure for providing trips/service (up to 5 points)	0-5	0-5	N/A	N/A
Total Points Possible		100	100	100	100

ATTACH F

To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Melina Dempsey, Transportation Planner
(303 480-5628 or mdempsey@drcog.org)

Through: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
(303 480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org)

Subject: **Regional TDM Pool Process for fiscal years 2014 and 2015**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 17, 2013	Action	13

REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to approve the Regional TDM Pool Process for fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

SUMMARY

- Over the course of several meetings, DRCOG staff and the DRCOG Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) drafted a process for selecting projects to be funded from the Regional Travel Demand Management Program Pool (TDM Pool) for FY2014 and 2015.
- TAC established three topic areas for developing processes and policies:
 - TDM Pool eligibility and rules
 - Project evaluation criteria
 - Process for selection
- DRCOG staff identified several issues in each topic area for TAC consideration in a workshop environment. With one exception (discussed below), the attached documents reflect what TAC characterizes as a “sense of the committee.”
- The following represents the TDM Pool Process and Policies subject to Board action tonight:

1. TDM Pool Eligibility and Rules (Attachment 1)

- The attachment describes proposed eligibility rules for sponsors and projects. Some rules are based on federal guidance and others on adopted Board policies.
- The TAC was unable to reach consensus on one topic area: **Should minor infrastructure projects be eligible for the TDM Pool funds?**
 - TDM funding has traditionally gone to marketing and promotional-type projects to reduce the use of single occupancy vehicles.
 - Over the past four years, a small amount of funds was allocated to constructing/installing minor infrastructure components (e.g., bicycle parking facilities). Some projects faced significant hurdles or were canceled because they couldn't attend to the federal environmental and right-of-way rules.
 - Despite the hurdles, several stakeholders and communities want TDM Pool funds for small infrastructure projects since they can't qualify for TIP funds, which require a minimum request of \$300,000. Without TDM Pool funds, these projects “fall through the cracks.”
 - CDOT (and DRCOG to a lesser extent), hasn't supported investing federal funds into small infrastructure projects because once they are ‘federalized’,

the time and effort administering and implementing them is disproportionate to their costs (TDM Pool projects range from \$50,000 to \$300,000).

- The TDM Pool eligibility rules in the attachment reflect the DRCOG staff position. To better address this conundrum, staff encourages project sponsors to consider larger projects (e.g., “first/last mile” bicycle, pedestrian, and transit station area improvements) which may be submitted in 2014 for the next TIP.

2. Proposed TDM Evaluation Criteria for the FYs 2014-2015 TDM Pool (Table 1)

- The attached table describes the proposed evaluation criteria to score project applications.
- The evaluation criteria will serve as a guide for the Project Review Panel (see Attachment 2) to score projects.

3. Proposed TDM Project Recommendation Process and Schedule (Attachment 2)

- This attachment describes the proposed process to score and develop a recommended list of projects to fund.
- A schedule is also included. It is anticipated the DRCOG Board will take action on the recommended list in August 2013.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

July 21, 2010 – DRCOG Board established the Regional TDM Pool for the 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (~\$1.2 million per year)

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

- Alternative 1 - Approve Regional TDM Pool Process as outlined, including the DRCOG staff recommendation to not fund infrastructure projects.
- Alternative 2 - Approve Regional TDM Pool Process as outlined but make infrastructure projects eligible.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends Alternative 1 for the reasons stated above.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Attachments:

1. Proposed TDM Pool Eligibility and Rules (Attachment 1)
2. Proposed TDM Project Recommendation Process and Schedule (Attachment 2)
3. Proposed TDM Evaluation Criteria for the FYs 2014-2015 TDM Pool (Table 1)

ATTACHMENT 1

TDM Pool Eligibility and Rules April 5, 2013

Eligibility Requirements:

- Project sponsors must be eligible to be direct sub-recipients of federal CMAQ funds. These include local governments, governmental agencies, and non-profits. Private, for-profit companies (e.g. contractors, suppliers, or consultants) are not eligible as sponsors/direct sub-recipients of CMAQ funds.
- All applications and scopes of work must adhere to the federal CMAQ Final Program Guidelines (2008). A link to these guidelines can be found at: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/policy_and_guidance/cmaq08gm.cfm
- Applications must be for new projects or activities which implement TDM strategies that reduce single occupant vehicle (SOV) travel and ultimately improve regional air quality and/or reduce traffic congestion. If a proposed project is an expansion of a previous project, the applicant must demonstrate how the proposal is distinctly different (i.e. targeted geographic area, population, etc).
- Rolling stock (e.g., bikes for bikeshare, cars for carshare (per FHWA “Buy America” approval), mobile bike parking) is eligible.
- Carshare capital purchases (vehicles) are eligible.
 - Sponsors must show that the newly requested vehicles serve distinctly new locations and members.
 - Funds will not be programmed until FY 2015 and applicable FHWA Buy America waiver(s) to purchase vehicles must be secured by October 1, 2014. Otherwise the funds will be rescinded.
- Marketing-related projects are mandated to utilize or promise a direct working relationship link to the Way to Go campaign. **Note:** Way to Go staff is drafting a comprehensive list of options and ways to collaborate on TDM marketing efforts, and will work one-on-one with each applicant.
- Reduced or free transit fare programs (subsidies) are eligible and should adhere to federal guidance:
 - targeted to distribution during or just prior to the ozone monitoring season and preferably should be associated with the peaks of the ozone season (the “ozone monitoring season” has been designated by EPA to be March 01 through September 30),
 - for a limited (short-term) duration for any person (multiple years for individuals does not meet the intent),
 - targeted to non-transit-using (SOV-prevalent) individuals, part of, linked to or partnered with a comprehensive area-wide air quality program
 - Projects consistent with this guidance are eligible to be submitted.

- **Limited and Ineligible Project Types**

- Fixed infrastructure projects or sub-elements of projects are ineligible. This includes “permanent” installations that require a “categorical exclusion”, environmental review or acquiring right-of-way. Examples include: any type of

ATTACHMENT 1

fixed bicycle parking/shelters, bike share docking stations, constructing or striping bicycle lanes and crosswalks. **(Note: See memo item #1. Contingent on Board approval)**

- Direct cash payment incentive programs are ineligible, except as a minor element within a larger project (less than 5% of the federal funding request).
- Stand-alone studies and plans are ineligible. This does not apply to minor studies within larger projects.
- Funding provided to local government sponsors should not significantly replace existing local funding for staff.
- Applicants should not request funding for projects or services that are currently performed by other agencies or government entities.
- Existing TMAs/TMOs participating in the Regional TDM Program may not submit project elements that duplicate activities outlined in the Regional TDM Program master agreement.

New TMOs:

- Start-up funding assistance for a new Transportation Management Organization (TMO) cannot exceed two years. A minimum 20 percent of matching funds are required the first year, and 50 percent match in the second year. Additionally, the application must show a commitment of 100% locally derived funds to support the operation of the TMO for a third year.
- Any new TMO seeking funds to start operations must capture a new market not currently served by other TMOs.

Funding Requirements:

- Applicants may request funding for up to two years for federal Fiscal Years (FY) 2014 and 2015.
 - Federal FY 2014 is from October 2013 to September 2014
 - Federal FY 2015 is from October 2014 to September 2015.
- Projects to purchase carshare vehicles will only be programmed for FY 2015.
- The minimum project request must be for no less than **\$80,000** of federal funds, which can be spread across two years. This minimum reduces the administrative burden of managing numerous small projects. The recommended target maximum project request is **\$300,000** over two years (with a target maximum of \$150,000 per year) to any one organization.
- A local match of at least 17.21% of the total project cost is required (federal TDM Pool = 82.79%). It may be a cash or an approved in-kind match contribution; however a cash match is encouraged. Applicants proposing a 100% cash match will be awarded additional scoring points. CDOT does not track overmatch (cash or in-kind). If a sponsor wants to overmatch the project on their own, they may do so, but without point incentives.

ATTACHMENT 1

Application process:

- Interested applicants will be required to attend a half day of application training sponsored by DRCOG and CDOT tentatively scheduled the morning of **May 9, 2013**.

Award Conditions:

- Each organizations awarded funds will sign an IGA enter into a contract with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) to complete their projects. CDOT serves as the steward of these federal funds. .
- Awardees will be required to spend 5-10% of their budget on surveys and/or tracking mechanisms to determine project results. Final project evaluations (reported results) will be due to DRCOG and CDOT upon project completion.
- Reported results must clearly articulate the estimated trips and VMT reduced due to the project. Final reimbursements are contingent upon receiving final project results.
- Additionally, CDOT requires status reports to be submitted at the end of each fiscal year documenting project progress and status.

ATTACHMENT 2

Proposed TDM Project Recommendation Process and Schedule

April 4, 2013

Proposed process for FY 2014-15 TDM Program Pool

- Create a **Project Review Panel** (the Panel) of non-applicants comprised of staff from the following:
 - DRCOG
 - CDOT
 - Colorado APCD
 - Colorado CDPHE
 - FHWA
 - RTD (if they are a non-applicant)
 - Felsburg, Holt & Ullevig (FHU) – Consultants led and facilitated the NFRMPO CMAQ project selection process. Their participation is contingent upon not acting as consultants for TDM Pool applicants.
 - University of Colorado, Denver
 - Urban Land Institute(ULI)
- *Participation is contingent upon acceptance of an invitation by DRCOG staff to serve on the Panel.*
 - a) Each member of the Panel will review the applications and assign points to the criteria based on information contained in the project application forms.
 - b) The Panel will convene to discuss the applications and reach consensus on the final criteria points and total score for each project.
 - c) The Panel will recommend a list of projects to be funded by the Regional TDM Pool.
- If deemed to be beneficial, sponsor presentations of projects to the review panel after applications are submitted will be considered.
- Bring the Panel recommended list of projects through DRCOG committees for review and final approval by the Board.

Proposed schedule for FY 2014-15 TDM Program Pool

- DRCOG Board approves the TDM Process and Rules (April 17)
- Call for projects (late April)
- Mandatory applicant training (May 9)
- Applications due (1st week in June)
- Project Review Panel recommendations (by July 10)
- TAC (July 22)
- RTC (August 20)
- Board Action (August 21)

Table 1

**Proposed TDM Evaluation Criteria for the FY 2014-15 TDM Pool
(Assumes No Infrastructure Projects)**

3-Apr-13

Evaluation Criteria	Max Pts	Further Clarification: Example Traits to Receive Max Pts	Further Clarification: Example Traits: Minimal Pts
Scored by Project Review Panel			
<p>Level of Innovation and Uniqueness (uniqueness of market geographic area and market population/demographics)</p> <p>1 Totally new (market/connections/project type) and extremely unique, seed funding to test concept is critical = 15 pts; Does not reach new market or is continuation of existing service/project/campaign = 1 pt</p>	15	<p>1) Marketing/incentive type program reaches completely new area. 2) Project serves or targets a totally new demographic population or type of trips to reduce. 3) Project is unlike anything tried in the Denver region in recent past. Concept has shown success in other cities.</p>	<p>1) Serves area with current/recent/long-standing service. 2) Serves a population comparable to those that have been served by the sponsor for a long period of time. 3) Very similar to past endeavors, or continuation (maybe just with a new name) of an existing program.</p>
<p>Project Readiness:</p> <p>2 Sponsor is ready to go = 5 pts; Sponsor just getting started, extensive additional coordination required = 1 pt</p>	5	Experienced sponsor of TDM projects.	
<p>Timing/Synergy of Project:</p> <p>3 Immediate benefits/links to major roadway/rapid transit project = 5 pts; Benefits several years out, undeveloped area, no link to roadway/rapid transit project = 1 pt</p>	5	Project coincides with an immediate major construction project (traffic congestion) or opening of new rapid transit line/segment	
<p>Motor Vehicle Trip Reduction potential:</p> <p>4 High (e.g. over 150,000 trips/year) = 15 pts; Low (e.g. under 20,000 trips/year) = 1 pt</p>	15	Project Review Panel will consider reliability & realism of assumptions used in the calculations.	
<p>VMT Reduction potential:</p> <p>5 High (e.g. over 1.5 million miles/year) = 15 pts; Low (e.g. under 100,000 miles/year) = 1 pt</p>	15	Project Review Panel will consider reliability & realism of assumptions used in the calculations.	
<p>Cost Effectiveness (cost/VMT reduced) potential:</p> <p>6 High results/Lower cost = 5 pts; Low results/Higher cost = 1 pt</p>	5	Project Review Panel will consider reliability & realism of assumptions used in the calculation of results.	
<p>Other Factors and Intangibles: Quality/Performance of Past Projects, Linkage/Cooperation with Regional TDM Program:</p> <p>7 No concerns, good products, work well w/ WayTo Go = 7 pts; Poor products, poor coordination, poorly prepared application = 1 pt</p>	7		
Below Measured/Scored by DRCOG Staff:			
<p>8 User Base - Population or/and Employment to be reached directly through this project in the specific project area</p>	5	Points allocated based on results of all projects submitted.	
<p>Environmental Justice Area:</p> <p>9 Entirely in EJ area = 5 pts; Partially in, or serves defined population away from project = 3 pts; Does not serve any EJ area = 1 pt</p>	5		
<p>Congestion Level in Project Area:</p> <p>10 High (>) = 10 pts Low (<) = 1 pts</p>	10	Points allocated based on results of all projects submitted.	
<p>Serves DRCOG Designated Urban Centers (UCs):</p> <p>11 Strongly serve/focused on established UCs = 5 pts; No UCs = 1 pt</p>	5		
<p>12 Jurisdiction's TIP Metro Vision Points</p>	5	Pulled directly from 2012-2017 TIP Policy Document	
<p>13 Type of Local Match - All cash = 3 pts, Any "in-kind" = 0 pts</p>	3		
100			

ATTACH G

To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Steve Cook, Manager, MPO Planning Program
(303) 480-6749 or scook@drcog.org

Through: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
(303) 480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org

Subject: **CDOT RAMP Funding and Budgetary Program**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 17, 2013	Action	5

REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to provide direction to staff regarding CDOT's RAMP program.

SUMMARY

- In December 2012, CDOT announced a new funding program known as RAMP (Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships) which is estimated to make \$300 million available for project construction over the next 5 years.
- With very few published details about RAMP, DRCOG asked Debra Perkins-Smith (CDOT staff and DRCOG Board member), to update the Board at its February meeting:
 - Ms. Perkins-Smith explained CDOT envisioned a two-step application process: a pre-application to determine eligibility then a call for detailed applications for eligible projects. She said CDOT anticipated accepting applications the first of May. And a handout was also provided and Ms. Perkins-Smith noted the process would continue to evolve.
- Of late, CDOT refers parties interested in RAMP to a routinely updated website and urges stakeholders to monitor it for new information. With information emerging rapidly from late February to early March, CDOT conducted a workshop at DRCOG on March 25 and Ms. Perkins-Smith was asked to provide another RAMP update at the April MVIC meeting.
 - Ms. Perkins-Smith addressed several questions specific to DRCOG's role as MPO (please refer to the [MVIC agenda](#) and the [draft meeting summary](#)).
- Following Ms. Perkins-Smith's update, MVIC discussed DRCOG's response to the RAMP process and schedule. Specifically this related to providing letters of support for RAMP applications, prioritizing projects, and adjusting, as necessary, DRCOG's adopted 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) amendment schedule.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

The following questions were posed to MVIC. Please refer to the [draft meeting summary](#) for additional information on the MVIC discussions on these questions.

- *Will DRCOG provide applicants with letters of support for either pre- or detailed RAMP applications?*
 - **MVIC Recommendation:**
 - Remain neutral on all projects; do not prepare individual letters of support.

- *After CDOT has identified eligible RAMP projects, will DRCOG prioritize them?*
 - **MVIC Recommendation:**
 - Identify all RAMP-eligible projects included in the adopted 2035 RTP and indicate for CDOT the Board's full support for funding those projects.
 - If there are RAMP-eligible projects which are not in the RTP:
 - Do not prioritize those projects but rather, review them for consistency with the goals, policies, and action strategies in the RTP (attached). MVIC further recommends holding additional meetings to establish which goals, policies, and strategies are important in making this determination of consistency.
 - Identify and indicate for CDOT those projects having the Board's support. In the additional meetings noted above, the Board would also determine what if anything to say about the projects which are deemed inconsistent with the RTP.
 - Staff explained to MVIC CDOT may still select project(s) not in the 2035 RTP and which were viewed as inconsistent with the RTP. Should that occur, the Board would then decide whether or not to amend the project(s) into the RTP.
 - A schedule of key dates associated with RAMP and addressing this proposed review by DRCOG is attached.
- **Additional MVIC Recommendations:**
 - Adjust the Board's RTP amendment schedule as needed to accommodate any RAMP amendments to the 2035 RTP.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Attachments:
 - RAMP Project Selection Process (rev. March 11, 2013)
 - RAMP Calendar & Draft DRCOG Review Process
 - Handout from February 20, 2013 Board meeting
 - 2035 MVRTP Goals, Policies, and Action Strategies
- Links:
 - [RAMP Workshop \(PowerPoint presentation\) March 25, 2013](#)
 - [RAMP Website \(Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships\)](#)

RAMP Project Selection Process – Revised March 11, 2013

This process is applicable for the RAMP Partnership and Operations projects. Asset Management projects will be selected through the engineering based Asset Management processes and will not require an application. The process for certain large complex Public-Private Toll Partnership projects will be coordinated by the High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) and may vary from the general process.

The process for the RAMP Partnership and Operations projects will consist of an initial Pre-Application Phase designed to make sure that the proposed projects meet the minimum requirements before the work to complete the Application is done and the Application Phase. During the Pre-Application period, CDOT will hold numerous meetings with local officials and potential private partners to discuss the process. The Regions will be the primary point of contact with local governments concerning the RAMP projects.

Depending on the responses to this first call for project proposals, there may be additional calls in the future.

<u>Target Date</u>	<u>PRE-APPLICATION PROCESS</u>
May 1, 2013	<u>PRE-APPLICATIONS DUE TO CDOT REGIONS.</u>
May 10, 2013	<u>REGIONS AND OPERATIONS COMPLETE VETTING OF PRE-APPLICATIONS.</u> <i>The purpose is to screen proposed project to determine if they meet eligibility criteria. The Region Transportation Directors will sign the most of the pre-applications after vetting. The Director of Operations or of HPTE will sign pre-applications submitted through their offices.</i>
May 17, 2013	<u>OFMB COMPLETES VETTING OF PRE-APPLICATIONS.</u> <i>Projects that the Regions determine meet the eligibility criteria will then be vetted by OFMB.</i>
May 24, 2013	<u>CHIEF ENGINEER AND CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SIGN APPLICATIONS THAT MEET MINIMUM CRITERIA.</u>
May 31, 2013	<u>REGIONS INFORM APPLICANTS WHETHER THEIR PROPOSALS WERE SELECTED FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION.</u>

<u>Target Date</u>	<u>APPLICATION PROCESS</u>
March 29, 2013	<u>APPLICATION FORM POSTED FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION.</u>
July 1, 2013	<u>APPLICATIONS DUE TO REGIONS.</u>

Safety People Integrity Customer Service Excellence Respect

July 12, 2013	<p><u>REGIONS AND OPERATIONS COMPLETE VETTING OF APPLICATIONS.</u></p> <p><i>The purpose is to provide the Regions an opportunity to comment on the proposed projects. The Region Transportation Directors will sign most of the applications after vetting. The Director of Operations or of HPTE will sign applications submitted through their offices.</i></p>
August 2, 2013	<p><u>TECHNICAL REVIEW COMPLETE.</u></p> <p><i>A panel of subject matter experts will review all applications. Having the same panel members review all applications provides a more consistent review. Subject matter experts may include but are not limited to bridge, traffic, planning, environmental, and project delivery. The panel of subject matter experts will categorize the applications as "highly recommended," "recommended," or "not recommended." All applications will go on to be ranked.</i></p>
August 9, 2013	<p><u>PROJECT RANKING.</u></p> <p><i>The Director of Operations will lead a team to rank the operations projects. The DTD Director will lead the team ranking the Public-Public Partnership projects and the HPTE Director will lead the team ranking the Public-Private Partnership projects. The teams will consider the information obtained during prior vetting and reviews and may meet with the panel of subject matter experts and the RTD's.</i></p>
August 30, 2013	<p><u>PROGRAM OF PROJECTS DEVELOPED.</u></p> <p><i>Subject to the final review by the Executive Director, the RAMP Sponsor Coalition (Deputy Executive Director, Chief Engineer, Chief Financial Officer, Director of the High Performance Transportation Enterprise, OFMB Manager, Director of the Division of Transportation Development, Director of Operations, and the Director of the Office of Policy and Government Relations) will develop overall program recommendations based on project ranking and consideration of non-technical factors such as geographic and urban/rural equity and ability to fund the project.</i></p> <p><i>RTDs and other will have an opportunity to review and identify any potential issues. Staff recommendations will be presented to STAC.</i></p>
September 19, 2013	<p><u>TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION CONSIDERS RECOMMENDATIONS.</u></p>

CRITERIA FOR RAMP PROJECT SELECTION (2/21/13)

All Programs and Projects Eligibility Criteria

To be submitted for consideration as a potential project, the following eligibility criteria must be met:

- Project can be constructed/implemented within 5 years (December 2017).
- Project is consistent with Long-Range Statewide Transportation Plan and CDOT Policies.
- On-system improvement projects only or integrated with state highway system (not applicable to Asset Categories: Facilities and Roadway Equipment).
- Must be able to provide sufficient information on the additional eligibility and evaluation criteria identified below.

Program Specific Eligibility Criteria and Evaluation/Selection Criteria

Program and Category	Goal	Additional Eligibility Criteria	Evaluation Criteria
Program 1: Asset Management and Operational Improvements			
Surface Treatment, Bridge (non-Enterprise), Culverts, Tunnel, Rockfall Mitigation	Lowest life-cycle cost	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project selection is based on the asset management model or plan. • For surface treatment, adhere to the Practical Design Guide, avoiding reconstruction and requiring thin treatments on very low and low volume roads (<4000 ADT), unless approved by the Chief Engineer. • Project selection based on Enterprise Bridge Plan
Enterprise Bridge	Goal of Enterprise Bridge Program	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project selection is based on the asset management plan or model.
Roadway Equipment Fleet, ITS, Buildings	Lowest life-cycle cost	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project selection is based on the asset management plan or model.
Operational Improvements	High benefit to cost, improved safety	None	<p>Primary Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantify mobility benefit based on appropriate measure (i.e., reduction in delay, travel time or number of stops; reduction in frequency of queues or queue length; improvement in LOS) • Quantify reliability when reliability measure is developed in 2015. • Quantify safety benefit • Quantify cost (include study and implementation cost) <p>Secondary Criteria – quantify or list additional benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits (i.e. noise reduction, air quality-reduced emissions) • For signals, the number of warrants met • Other benefits

Program and Category	Goal	Additional Eligibility Criteria	Evaluation Criteria
Program 2: Transportation Partnership Fund Public-Private Partnerships	Leverage funds to address critical needs of the state highway system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate local support • Projects with the potential to be funded with tolls and/or significant private contribution or investment. • Examples of such projects include projects in or integrated with the following corridors: US 36, I-70 East, I-70 West, I-270, I-25 North of Denver, C-470, SH93/US 6 (Jefferson County), US 85, and Powers Blvd in Colorado Springs. 	Primary Criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical need: quantify benefit of improvement addressing “critical need” for asset condition, safety, mobility/operations, capacity • Identify total project cost and financing plan Secondary Criteria – quantify or list additional benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates potential for innovative financing • Local government contribution • Other benefits
Public-Public Partnerships	Leverage state/federal funds with local funds to provide a high benefit to cost for critical need projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment of local match for a target minimum of 20% (non-federal highway sources of cash, ROW, or design costs) 	Primary Criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical Need: quantify benefit of improvement addressing “critical need” for asset condition, safety, mobility/operations • Identify total project cost and funding plan Secondary Criteria – quantify or list additional benefits (for example) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leveraging of funds: additional match beyond the 20% targeted minimum • Completes a project that has an earlier phase in the STIP • Hierarchy of state highway system: Interstate, NHS, other • Economic benefits (i.e. job creation) • Other benefits Informational – provide estimated funding requirements by year
Public-Public Partnerships Devolution	Aligns function of sections of state highway system with CDOT’s mission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate local support and willingness for local maintenance responsibility. 	Informational – provide estimated funding requirements by year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functionality – functions as a local road; lacks connectivity • Demonstrable net present value of savings over 20 years • Maintenance difficulty for CDOT • Other benefits (for example: community has improved opportunity to support economic development because roadway is not subject to CDOT access control)



Policy Brief

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Office of Policy & Government Relations
4201 East Arkansas Avenue, Room 275
Denver, Colorado 80222
(303) 757-9772

February 25, 2013

UPDATE: RESPONSIBLE ACCELERATION OF MAINTENANCE AND PARTNERSHIPS (RAMP)

Summary

In December 2012, the Colorado Department of Transportation announced it was changing how it budgets and expends funds for transportation projects resulting in a \$300 million per year increase in project construction for five years. On February 21, 2013 the Transportation Commission approved project selection criteria as well as the two primary program categories.

Background

The RAMP Policy Brief issued on December 14, 2012 summarizes how CDOT is changing its budget practices and included staff recommendations for types of projects eligible for RAMP funding. Since then, the RAMP program areas, funding allocation and project criteria has been further refined with Transportation Commission approval occurring at its February 2013 meeting.

RAMP Program Areas and Funding Allocation

- *Asset Management and Operational Improvements (\$175 Million)* - dedicated to slowing the deterioration and improving the safety of state's highways, bridges and tunnels.
- *Transportation Partnerships (\$125 Million)* - dedicated to leveraging state transportation dollars by creating Public Private Partnerships (P3s) with industry and Public Public Partnerships with local government to provide improvements on corridors where partnership opportunities exist. This fund will provide an opportunity for local governments and CDOT to potentially move forward with projects that CDOT would not be able to fund alone.

Project Eligibility Criteria for Both Programs

- Project can be constructed/implemented with 5 years (December 2017)
- Project is consistent with Long Range Statewide Transportation Plan and CDOT Policies
- On-System Improvement projects only or integrated with state highway system
- Must be able to provide sufficient information on the additional eligibility and evaluation criteria

More detailed program eligibility, project categories and evaluation criteria are attached.

Project Selection Process

In the Asset Management and Operational Improvements Program, most categories of projects will be selected by utilizing existing asset management plans or models. Projects falling into the Operational Improvements category and Transportation Partnership Program are required to go through a project application selection process.

Transportation Planning Regions will be asked to identify possible operational and partnership projects in consultations with CDOT Regions in March and April. Pre-applications for these projects are expected to be due in May with detailed applications due in early summer (specific dates to be determined). The pre-application form will be made available by March 1st. Each application will go through a technical review and ranking by a panel of CDOT Senior Management. The resulting recommended Program of

CDOT Policy Brief
UPDATE: RAMP
February 25, 2013
Page 2

Projects will be presented to STAC with ultimate approval by the Transportation Commission by mid-summer.

How to Get More Information

To sign up for email updates on RAMP, visit www.coloradodot.info and click on the cell phone icon in the upper right corner. Then choose RAMP under Programs from the list of topics to receive updates.

Additionally, please visit CDOT's RAMP webpage at <https://www.coloradodot.info/programs/RAMP> to get program information, including the pre-application and application when available.

This and other Policy Briefs can be found at:

<http://www.coloradodot.info/about/governmentrelations/news-publications/policy-briefs>

Attachments:

Criteria for RAMP Project Selection (02/21/13)

RAMP Calendar & Draft DRCOG Review Process

4/5/13

CDOT Key Dates

Possible DRCOG Activities and Actions

May 1	Pre-Applications due			
May 31	Eligible applicants named	May 15 Board	Discuss "RTP Consistency" review factors; e.g. MVRTP goals, policies, and action strategies	
		June 5 MVIC	Summary of eligible projects, Recom. review factors	
		June 19 Board	Approve review factors	
July 1	Final application due	July 10 "MVIC"	Hold Review "work session" Make Recommendations?	} Push out a month if no consensus
		July 17 Board	Recommendations?	
		July 18	Submit review results to CDOT i.e. Projects inconsistent w/RTP	
August 9	Project ranking completed	August 21 Board	Further review ?	
August 30	Program of Projects released			
		Sept 4 MVIC	Comment on Project List ? To inform STAC rep.	
Sept. 13	STAC review and input	Sept 18 Board	Comment on Project List ?	
Sept. 19	Transportation Commission acts			

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Chief Engineer's Office
4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Room 262
Denver, CO 80222
(303) 757-9204
(303) 757-9656 - FAX



Date: February 12, 2013

To: Colorado Transportation Commission

From: Timothy J. Harris, Chief Engineer

Subject: RAMP Workshop Topics

This month's workshop on the Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnership program (RAMP) will ask for your approval of two critical items in the timely progress of the program.

The first request for approval is on the allocation of total annual fund amounts for the two primary programs. My recommendation is:

- \$175 million per year for Asset Management projects including \$15 million for Operations projects.
- \$125 million per year for Partnership program projects with a targeted split of 50% Public-Private and 50% Public-Public projects.

The second request for approval is on the criteria to be used for selection of projects. The attached table shows both the "eligibility" criteria which will be the first screen and the "evaluation" criteria which will be used for project selection in the various categories of potential projects.

I will also review the process we're developing for selection of projects in the Partnership Program.

Then, we will also review staff's recommendation on allocation of the funds among the various programs in the Asset Management category (Surface Treatment, Bridge, Culverts, Rockfall, etc.).

I look forward to the discussions this month and continued progress in this important and exciting program.

CRITERIA FOR RAMP PROJECT SELECTION (2/21/13)

All Programs and Projects Eligibility Criteria

To be submitted for consideration as a potential project, the following eligibility criteria must be met:

- Project can be constructed/implemented within 5 years (December 2017).
- Project is consistent with Long-Range Statewide Transportation Plan and CDOT Policies.
- On-system improvement projects only or integrated with state highway system (not applicable to Asset Categories: Facilities and Roadway Equipment).
- Must be able to provide sufficient information on the additional eligibility and evaluation criteria identified below.

Program Specific Eligibility Criteria and Evaluation/Selection Criteria

Program and Category	Goal	Additional Eligibility Criteria	Evaluation Criteria
Program 1: Asset Management and Operational Improvements			
Surface Treatment, Bridge (non-Enterprise), Culverts, Tunnel, Rockfall Mitigation	Lowest life-cycle cost	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project selection is based on the asset management model or plan. • For surface treatment, adhere to the Practical Design Guide, avoiding reconstruction and requiring thin treatments on very low and low volume roads (<4000 ADT), unless approved by the Chief Engineer. • Project selection based on Enterprise Bridge Plan
Enterprise Bridge	Goal of Enterprise Bridge Program	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project selection is based on the asset management plan or model.
Roadway Equipment Fleet, ITS, Buildings	Lowest life-cycle cost	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project selection is based on the asset management plan or model.
Operational Improvements	High benefit to cost, improved safety	None	<p>Primary Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantify mobility benefit based on appropriate measure (i.e., reduction in delay, travel time or number of stops; reduction in frequency of queues or queue length; improvement in LOS) • Quantify reliability when reliability measure is developed in 2015. • Quantify safety benefit • Quantify cost (include study and implementation cost) <p>Secondary Criteria – quantify or list additional benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental benefits (i.e. noise reduction, air quality-reduced emissions) • For signals, the number of warrants met • Other benefits

Program and Category	Goal	Additional Eligibility Criteria	Evaluation Criteria
Program 2: Transportation Partnership Fund			
Public-Private Partnerships	Leverage funds to address critical needs of the state highway system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate local support • Projects with the potential to be funded with tolls and/or significant private contribution or investment. • Examples of such projects include projects in or integrated with the following corridors: US 36, I-70 East, I-70 West, I-270, I-25 North of Denver, C-470, SH93/US 6 (Jefferson County), US 85, and Powers Blvd in Colorado Springs. 	<p>Primary Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical need: quantify benefit of improvement addressing “critical need” for asset condition, safety, mobility/operations, capacity • Identify total project cost and financing plan <p>Secondary Criteria – quantify or list additional benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates potential for innovative financing • Local government contribution • Other benefits
Public-Public Partnerships	Leverage state/federal funds with local funds to provide a high benefit to cost for critical need projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment of local match for a target minimum of 20% (non-federal highway sources of cash, ROW, or design costs) 	<p>Primary Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical Need: quantify benefit of improvement addressing “critical need” for asset condition, safety, mobility/operations • Identify total project cost and funding plan <p>Secondary Criteria – quantify or list additional benefits (for example)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leveraging of funds: additional match beyond the 20% targeted minimum • Completes a project that has an earlier phase in the STIP • Hierarchy of state highway system: Interstate, NHS, other • Economic benefits (i.e. job creation) • Other benefits <p>Informational – provide estimated funding requirements by year</p>
Public-Public Partnerships Devolution	Aligns function of sections of state highway system with CDOT’s mission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate local support and willingness for local maintenance responsibility. 	<p>Informational – provide estimated funding requirements by year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functionality – functions as a local road; lacks connectivity • Demonstrable net present value of savings over 20 years • Maintenance difficulty for CDOT • Other benefits (for example: community has improved opportunity to support economic development because roadway is not subject to CDOT access control)

2035 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan Vision, Goals, Policies and Action Strategies

September 1, 2010

Metro Vision Transportation Vision:

A balanced sustainable multimodal transportation system will include rapid transit, a regional bus system, a regional roadway system, local streets, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and associated system and travel demand management services. The integrated components of this system will provide reliable mobility choices to all users: residents and visitors of all ages, incomes, and physical abilities, as well as businesses that provide services and produce or sell goods. Users will find the transportation system easy to access, safe, and secure, and it will permit efficient state and nationwide connections for people and freight.

Metro Vision Transportation Goals:

Provide safe, environmentally sensitive, efficient, and sustainable mobility choices for people and goods; and integrate with and support the social, economic, and physical land use development of the region and state while supporting the following Metro Vision goals:

- Urban Centers will accommodate 50% of new housing and 75% of new employment between 2005 and 2035;
- Increase the rate of construction of alternative transportation facilities;
- Reduce the percent of trips to work by SOV to 65% by 2035 (per US Census);
- Reduce the regional per capita VMT by 10% by 2035; and
- Reduce the annual per capita greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector by 60% by 2035.

Metro Vision Transportation Policies:

Policy #1: System Preservation. Assure existing and future transportation facilities are maintained and preserved.

Action Strategies:

- Allocate transportation funds to cost-effectively maintain existing and future transportation infrastructure so as to protect the serviceability of previous investments.
- Develop and apply asset management principles and techniques for maintaining existing transportation infrastructure.

Policy #2: Transit. Provide increased transit service and facilities that can accommodate an increasing share of daily travel, encourage transit-oriented development, and provide mobility options.

Action Strategies:

- Develop an expanded metropolitan rapid transit system comprised of rail and bus/BRT/HOV/HOT facilities that provide regional connectivity for passengers traveling throughout the region and to and from other regions.
- Provide a fixed-route bus service system that includes high frequency bus corridors, regional bus service, feeder routes to rapid transit lines, and other local route service.
- Provide demand responsive bus or van service in appropriate circumstances, such as for elderly and disabled persons, travelers in less densely developed or smaller market areas, or feeder service to rapid transit lines.
- Encourage and support pricing structures that keep transit service affordable.
- Encourage the use of private transit services to major attractions not served by public transit, such as gaming communities or ski resorts.

Policy #3: Roadways. Provide a sustainable roadway system that enables safe and efficient travel by automobiles, trucks, buses, and bicycles.

Action Strategies:

- Maintain and enhance a regional roadway system comprised of existing, expanded, or new freeways, major regional arterials and principal arterials that provide regional and statewide multimodal connectivity for the movement of people and goods.
- Expand the capacity of existing regional roadways in the most critically congested corridors and at key traffic bottlenecks, after considering demand management strategies and operational efficiencies.
- Implement multimodal facilities and system management improvements when constructing new or retrofitting existing major travel corridors.
- Support local streets and roadways that provide vehicular, local transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access to and from residential and non-residential areas throughout the region.
- Prioritize roadway capacity funds for projects that address gaps in the existing roadway system and eliminate bottlenecks consistent with findings of the congestion management planning process.
- Develop opportunities for implementing congestion pricing and other tolling techniques on existing freeways, and implement a tolling component (price-management) on new freeway lane-addition projects, where feasible, with all impacted communities included in the tolling decision and surplus revenue directed to multimodal investment or system preservation.

- Support legislation that would implement VMT-based fees, pay-as-you-drive insurance, and other pricing strategies that more directly and immediately reflect the cost of vehicle travel to the user.

Policy #4: Management and Operations. Make the best use of existing and future transportation facilities by implementing measures that actively manage and integrate systems to optimize system performance and safety, provide accurate real-time information, reduce the demand for single-occupant motor vehicle travel, and reduce per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Action Strategies:

- Implement transportation systems management (TSM) projects such as intersection improvements, ramp metering, and acceleration/deceleration lanes that improve the flow of motor vehicles and transit.
- Deploy Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) such as vehicle flow treatments and national real-time system information programs, and transit monitoring system to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the transportation system.
- Work with all involved parties to develop strategies for incident management that reduce the impact of incidents such as motor vehicle crashes upon the movement of vehicles on the regional roadway system.
- Implement coordinated traffic signal systems including across jurisdictional lines and integrate transit signal priority techniques for transit and emergency vehicles.
- Implement stand-alone and project-related Travel Demand Management (TDM) strategies, including selective incentives and targeted promotions, that will reduce the demand for single-occupant motor vehicle trips by informing the region's residents and businesses about alternative travel choices and encouraging their use.
- Facilitate and encourage trip and vehicle sharing and teleworking.
- Manage access (curb cuts on arterials or interchanges on freeways) to maintain and restore capacity in accordance with the CDOT State Highway Access Code along state highways, and encourage local governments to develop similar standards for non-state roadways.
- Implement parking pricing mechanisms that better reflect the cost of providing infrastructure for personal vehicles.

Policy #5: Rights-of-way Preservation. Reserve adequate rights-of-way in newly developing and redeveloping areas for pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and roadway facilities.

Policy #6. Denver Central Business District. Improve and maintain efficient transportation access by all modes to downtown Denver.

Policy #7: Safety. Develop and maintain a safe transportation system for all users.

Action Strategies:

- Emphasize projects on existing and future facilities that will reduce the likelihood or severity of crashes involving motor vehicles, trains, bicycles, and pedestrians.
- Support legislation aimed at cost-effectively improving the safety of drivers, passengers, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

Policy #8: Security. Develop and maintain a transportation system that provides increased security for all users.

Action Strategies:

- Assess threats to and vulnerabilities of the transportation system, including consideration of national and regional homeland security initiatives, and establish and implement resolution processes in response.
- Coordinate with federal, state, regional and local agencies to implement elements of the Transportation Systems Sector-Specific Plan (SSP) of the National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP).
- Develop and implement projects and strategies that enhance the security of transportation facilities and users including air and transit passengers, and aid in the efficient movement of people and vehicles during homeland security events.

Policy #9: Bicycle and Pedestrian. Provide robust bicycle and pedestrian accessibility throughout the region.

Action Strategies:

- Require adequate sidewalks or pedestrian accommodations be provided along all roadways and within and between private developments in the region's urbanized area and in densely developed rural communities.
- Develop regional off-street and on-street bicycle corridor facilities and encourage the provision of local facilities throughout the region.
- Prioritize transportation system improvements locally and regionally that support bicycle and pedestrian modes as viable alternative travel choices.
- Encourage bicycle sharing programs.

Policy #10: Interconnections. Provide efficient interconnections of the transportation system within modes, among different modes, and between the metropolitan area and the rest of the state and nation.

Action Strategies:

- Improve transportation linkages to major destinations and attractions outside the region.
- Facilitate the movement of goods throughout the region by reducing obstructions such as congestion, bottlenecks, and disconnections between facilities, while providing sufficient opportunities for intermodal freight connection.
- Provide sufficient and secure automobile parking capacity at park-n-Rides to encourage multimodal commutes and ridesharing.
- Provide safe and convenient access for pedestrians and bicyclists to park-n-Ride lots, rapid transit stations, and bus stops. Also provide bicycle parking and promote the capability of transit vehicles to carry bicycles.
- Develop the Denver Union Station to function as the primary multimodal hub of the regional transportation system. Consider the development of rapid transit hubs in all major communities.
- Consider opportunities for the development of an intercity commuter rail or bus system along the Front Range, and also incorporate, within the region, elements of a statewide intercity rail system.
- Ensure convenient access to Denver International Airport (DIA) for all modes of travel, and maintain DIA's important role in connecting the Denver region to the rest of the nation.
- Maintain the capacity of DIA and support the provision of capacity enhancements in response to air transportation demands, consistent with original DIA development plans.
- Support continuing activities that might eventually enable through rail freight traffic to bypass population centers.
- Support actions to maintain and incrementally improve regional general aviation airport capacity.

Policy #11: Transportation-Efficient Housing and Business Developments. Design new developments within communities to allow the efficient movement of pedestrians, bicyclists, buses, and motor vehicles within, to, and through the area.

Policy #12: Land Use Integration. Implement transportation system components that support Metro Vision's urban growth boundary/area, urban centers, open space, and associated concepts.

Action Strategies:

- Encourage transportation projects that support the growth of housing and employment within designated urban centers.
- Provide roadway capacity increases and new freeway interchanges primarily in areas within the urban growth boundary/area, except for major statewide connections.
- Promote multimodal interaction between streets and adjacent development in the design of new developments, and through the retrofitting of existing streets.
- Encourage open space preservation in conjunction with new major transportation facilities.
- Encourage transportation projects that directly serve the designated freestanding communities.
- Encourage bus, rapid transit, bicycle, pedestrian and other transportation facilities and amenities that enhance transit-oriented developments (TOD).
- Encourage decision makers to consider the mutual effects of airport operations, off-airport activities, and neighboring land uses on each other.
- Provide a transportation system that supports the region's economic vitality, competitiveness, and sustainability.

Policy #13: Transportation for the Disadvantaged. Provide a transportation system that considers the needs of and impacts on minority, low-income, elderly, and disabled persons.

Action Strategies:

- Ensure that minority, low-income, elderly, and disabled households receive a proportionate share of accessibility benefits, travel mode choices, and services from future transportation system improvements, and are not disproportionately affected by negative impacts associated with those improvements.
- Promote coordination between disadvantaged transit service providers to improve the quality of service and increase efficiency.

Policy #14: Environmental Quality. Develop and maintain a sustainable transportation system that protects and enhances air quality, energy efficiency and the overall environment.

Action Strategies:

- Provide a wide variety of transportation facilities, including rapid transit, bus service, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities, that are more energy efficient and less polluting in aggregate than single-occupant vehicles.
- Prioritize transportation system improvements that minimize transportation-related fuel consumption and air pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions.
- Promote improvements in roadway construction and street maintenance activities to reduce dust and particulates; decrease associated energy consumption and pollutant emissions; and minimize and mitigate polluted water running off roadways.
- Encourage use of alternative fuel sources and clean-burning technology and provision of supporting infrastructure and services for alternative fuels.
- Cooperatively develop mitigation strategies with affected regulatory or resource agencies in instances of unavoidable environmental impact.
- Support legislation that would increase fuel economy beyond current Federal Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFÉ) standards, impose fuel economy standards for heavy duty vehicles, incentivize purchasing high fuel economy or alternative fuel vehicles, and provide incentives for accelerated retirement of inefficient and/or high-polluting personal, commercial and fleet vehicles that are beyond repair.
- Support actions or regulations that reduce engine idling.
- Explore the potential of select speed limit reductions.

ATTACH H

To: Chair and Members of the DRCOG Board

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
(jschaufele@drcog.org. or 303-480-6701)

Subject: **CDOT/DRCOG Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Concerning Funding Equity**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 17, 2013	Action	15

REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to adopt MVIC's recommendation to allow the current CDOT/DRCOG funding equity Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to expire and begin a process to renegotiate a new funding agreement, the outcome of which will be determined at a later date.

SUMMARY

- In November 2004, DRCOG and CDOT executed a "Memorandum of Understanding" (MOU) for the purposes of addressing revenue allocation within the DRCOG region.
- The MOU ended several years of escalating conflicts with the Colorado Transportation Commission which was caused by an increasing erosion of state transportation funds allocated to the DRCOG region, as funding dropped from its historic 40+ percent to a proposed new low of 28 percent.
- Then and now, the region is a primary economic engine for the state, encompassing more than 50 percent of the state's population, employment, retail sales and income tax. The region also accounts for about 47 percent of the state's vehicle miles of travel (VMT). Moreover, the region's contribution to gas tax collection subsidizes transportation improvements throughout the state.
- The MOU formulas yielded a "baseline" of ~38 percent of the state's transportation funds to the DRCOG region, promising higher percentages for "incremental revenue" (~40 percent for added revenue from current sources) and an even higher amount, ~48 percent, from new revenue sources such as Referendum C and FASTER.
- The original term of the MOU expired December 2009 and by mutual consent, has been extended twice, and is now scheduled to terminate again June 30, 2013.
- At the January 2013 Board meeting, CDOT Executive Director Don Hunt stated neither he nor the Transportation Commission were "wild about MOUs." He indicated he believed CDOT would be changing how it did resource allocation, focusing more on asset management. Director Hunt also questioned the timing of updating MOUs but added, "I'm not saying yes or no." Additionally, some Transportation Commissioners were clearly opposed to continuing MOUs when discussed at a joint meeting with DRCOG Board members in September of 2012.
- The purpose of this item is to make a recommendation to the DRCOG Board for addressing the expiration of the CDOT/DRCOG MOU.
- Summary of the April 3, 2013 MVIC Discussion:
 - The current MOU includes elements that are no longer applicable.
 - The region is the primary economic engine for the state encompassing more than 50 percent of the state's population, employment, retail sales and income tax. Gas tax collection from the region subsidizes transportation improvements throughout the state.

- Executive Director Don Hunt and the Transportation Commissioners do not view MOUs favorably.
- DRCOG staff explained its belief negotiating a new MOU would be a complicated and politically charged endeavor and recommended allowing the MOU to expire and writing a letter to the state noting the region's importance to the state's economy and in subsidizing transportation improvements statewide and explaining the DRCOG Board would continue to anticipate a satisfactory return on its contribution to the state's transportation funds.
- Debra Perkins-Smith from CDOT noted they have other agreements, specifically referencing the regional planning agreement [Memorandum of Agreement] between CDOT, DRCOG, and RTD which speaks to having a collaborative process [establishing the Regional Transportation Committee (RTC), etc.]. Debra identified MAP-21 as a barrier to developing an MOU because performance measures required by MAP-21 are still in development. Debra went on to say the Commission was not necessarily in favor of it [an equity MOU with DRCOG].
- While some MVIC members felt pursuing an MOU was "an exercise in futility," the majority of MVIC members want DRCOG to move the two planning partners toward another funding agreement.
- MVIC recommends 1) allowing the current MOU to expire and 2) concurrently writing a letter to the state a) addressing the region's significance in the state and, b) proposing CDOT and DRCOG initiate discussions in the near future to formulate a new funding agreement .

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

- November 17, 2004: approved executing the MOU
- November 18, 2009: approved extending the MOU until December 31, 2011
- November 16, 2011: approved extending the MOU until June 30, 2013

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Unknown

ALTERNATIVES

Alternative 1 - Accept the MVIC recommendation regarding the funding MOU with CDOT and advise staff concerning the attached draft letter.

Alternative 2 - Take other action regarding a funding agreement with CDOT.

Alternative 3 - Take no action.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

MVIC recommends Alternative 1.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Attachment: Draft of letter addressed to CDOT Executive Director Don Hunt

Links:

[CDOT/DRCOG Memorandum of Understanding](#)
[MVIC agenda item, April 3, 2013](#)

Board Officers

Sue Horn, Chair
Jack Hilbert, Vice Chair
Rachel Zenzinger, Secretary
Jackie Millet, Treasurer
Dennis McCloskey, Immediate Past Chair
Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

April 9, 2013

Don Hunt
Executive Director
Colorado Department of Transportation
4201 East Arkansas Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80222

Dear Mr. Hunt:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) I would like to convey action the Board took at its April 17 meeting regarding the CDOT/DRCOG funding equity MOU which will expire on June 30, 2013.

The DRCOG Board supports allowing the current MOU to expire (renewed in 2009 and 2011) as many of its elements are no longer applicable. In addition, the Board would like to initiate discussions with CDOT to formulate a new funding agreement in the near future. Generally, the Board believes the appropriate time for these discussions would be after the Transportation Commission takes action on RAMP recommendations in September.

When the DRCOG Board pursued actions resulting in the original MOU in 2004, the Denver metropolitan region faced an inequitable funding situation. State transportation funds allocated to the region had eroded from a historic 40+ percent to a proposed low of 28 percent. This was an untenable situation given that the region is a primary economic engine for the state, encompassing more than 50 percent of Colorado's population, employment, retail sales and income tax. The region also accounts for about 47 percent of the state's vehicle miles of travel (VMT). Moreover, the region's contribution to gas tax collection subsidizes transportation improvements throughout the state.

DRCOG and CDOT, along with its other partner, RTD, enjoy a cooperative planning process which is governed by the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that directs this partnership. It is in this same spirit of cooperation that the DRCOG Board seeks to pursue a new funding agreement with CDOT. I look forward to meeting with you to discuss next steps for our two agencies.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Schaufele
Executive Director

c: The Honorable John Hickenlooper, Governor
Members of the Colorado Transportation Commission

We make life better!



ATTACH I

To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Pat Cronenberger, Board and Legislative Liaison
(pcronenberger@drcog.org or 303-480-6727)

Subject: **RTD Representation on the DRCOG Board**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 17, 2013	Action	16

REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to revise the Articles of Association to (1) include RTD as a non-voting member of the Board of Directors; (2) clarify non-voting appointments made by the Governor; and (3) determine if non-voting members will be staff, appointed/elected officials, or both.

SUMMARY

- Your Articles of Association allow the Governor to appoint 3 non-voting members to the Board. While those appointees could literally be *anyone*, Governors past and present usually appoint someone from CDOT and 2 cabinet members or policy advisors.
- You will recall from recent discussions at Board meetings, your planning process is defined in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with CDOT and RTD to assure CDOT and RTD are included in transportation policy decisions as established by federal law. This participation formally occurs at your Regional Transportation Committee but as noted above, CDOT typically also has a presence at the DRCOG Board. RTD does not enjoy that same opportunity.
- At your February Board meeting, you directed staff to draft language for the Articles (1) giving CDOT and RTD permanent non-voting membership on the Board, and (2) reducing the Governor's appointments from 3 to 2. In addition, you directed staff to "check in" with the Governor's office about this change.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

Direction to staff during the February 2013 Board meeting

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

Shall the Board specify who serves as non-voting members?

During your deliberations in February, you talked about requiring CDOT and RTD's appointments to be senior management staff but you did not state any preference in the motion. During these discussions, some of you noted concerns about transportation commissioners or elected RTD Board members; it was noted they represent specific geography and this could influence an individual's participation at DRCOG meetings.

RTD representation on the DRCOG Board

April 17, 2013

Page 2

With that in mind, you could specify:

Alternative 1: CDOT and RTD appointees must be staff and members of the agency's senior management.

To allow for changing circumstance and offer more flexibility, you could specify:

Alternative 2: CDOT and RTD may appoint either a staff member who is part of the agency's senior management or a commissioner/board member.

Either alternative supports your desire for partner input. In making this decision, staff recommends you decide based on the nature of input you require from partners and any need you see for future flexibility.

Shall the Board decrease the Governor's appointees from 3 to 2?

We contacted Doug Young, Office of the Governor (a current non-voting Board member) who indicated the Governor prefers to retain all 3 appointments and agrees 1 of those appointments will be from CDOT. In this instance, you would:

Alternative 1: Provide for 4 non-voting Board members: 3 appointed by the Governor, 1 of which must be from CDOT and, the remaining 1 from RTD.

You could also:

Alternative 2: Provide for 4 non-voting Board members: 2 appointed by the Governor; 1 from CDOT and 1 from RTD.

Both alternatives assure membership for CDOT and RTD; Alternative 1 is preferred by the Governor.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

See above

BACKUP INFORMATION

Attachments

- Two examples of draft language, Page 6, DRCOG Articles of Association with track changes.

1 in which their membership was terminated, by payment of all
2 assessments then currently due and owing.

- 3
4 C. Member Representatives. Except as provided herein, only a local elected
5 official of a member may be designated a member representative, and each
6 member representative may have a designated elected alternate, as follows:
7
- 8 1. One county commissioner and an alternate commissioner from each
9 county, designated by the board of county commissioners.
 - 10
11 2. The mayor or one member of the governing body, and a similarly elected
12 alternate, of each municipality and of the City and County of Broomfield,
13 designated by said mayor or governing body, and
14
 - 15 3. Two representatives of Denver:
16
17 a. The mayor or, as the mayor's designee, any officer, elected or
18 appointed, of the City & County of Denver and an alternate
19 similarly designated, and
20
21 b. One city council member of the City and County of Denver and an
22 alternate council member designated by said council or its
23 president.
24
- 25 D. Term of Office. Member representatives shall serve until replaced, but shall
26 hold such office and have Board privileges only during their terms as local
27 elected officials, or an appointed official, if applicable, in the case of the
28 alternate for the mayor of the City and County of Denver.
29
- 30 E. Non-voting Membership. The State of Colorado shall have ~~three (3)~~ two (2)
31 non-voting members on the Board, appointed by the Governor. The Colorado
32 Department of Transportation and the Regional Transportation District shall
33 each have one non-voting member on the Board, to be appointed by the
34 Executive Director/General Manager of the organization. The Executive
35 Director/General Manager of these organizations may appoint themselves to
36 the Board, or they may designate a member of their senior staff.
37
- 38 F. Vacancies. Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as is provided for
39 the original designation.
40
- 41 G. Receipt of Documents. Each member representative shall receive notice and
42 minutes of meetings, a copy of each report and any other information or
43 material issued by the Council.
44
- 45 H. Other Membership Categories. The Council may establish other categories of
46 membership appropriate to carrying out the provisions of this Article.
47

48 ARTICLE VII. Board Officers.
49

1 in which their membership was terminated, by payment of all
2 assessments then currently due and owing.

- 3
4 C. Member Representatives. Except as provided herein, only a local elected
5 official of a member may be designated a member representative, and each
6 member representative may have a designated elected alternate, as follows:
7
- 8 1. One county commissioner and an alternate commissioner from each
9 county, designated by the board of county commissioners.
 - 10
11 2. The mayor or one member of the governing body, and a similarly elected
12 alternate, of each municipality and of the City and County of Broomfield,
13 designated by said mayor or governing body, and
14
 - 15 3. Two representatives of Denver:
16
17 a. The mayor or, as the mayor's designee, any officer, elected or
18 appointed, of the City & County of Denver and an alternate
19 similarly designated, and
20
21 b. One city council member of the City and County of Denver and an
22 alternate council member designated by said council or its
23 president.
24
- 25 D. Term of Office. Member representatives shall serve until replaced, but shall
26 hold such office and have Board privileges only during their terms as local
27 elected officials, or an appointed official, if applicable, in the case of the
28 alternate for the mayor of the City and County of Denver.
29
- 30 E. Non-voting Membership. The State of Colorado shall have three (3) non-voting
31 members on the Board, appointed by the Governor, one of which shall be a
32 representative of the Colorado Department of Transportation (either the
33 Executive Director or a member of senior management). The Regional
34 Transportation District shall have one non-voting member on the Board, to be
35 appointed by the General Manager of the organization. The General Manager
36 may appoint themselves to the Board, or they may designate a member of their
37 senior staff.
38
- 39 F. Vacancies. Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as is provided for
40 the original designation.
41
- 42 G. Receipt of Documents. Each member representative shall receive notice and
43 minutes of meetings, a copy of each report and any other information or
44 material issued by the Council.
45
- 46 H. Other Membership Categories. The Council may establish other categories of
47 membership appropriate to carrying out the provisions of this Article.
48

49 ARTICLE VII. Board Officers.

ATTACH J

To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager
(303-480-6749 or scook@drcoq.org)

Through: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
(303-480-6701 or jschaufele@drcoq.org)

Subject: **Statewide CMAQ Funding Status for Fiscal Year 2014**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 17, 2013	Informational Briefing	17

REQUESTED ACTION

No action requested. This item is for information per the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC).

SUMMARY

At the end of the April MVIC meeting, a question was raised regarding CDOT allocation of CMAQ (Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality) funds. Because the hour was late and members were leaving, the Chair asked staff to provide an informational briefing for the full Board.

- Established in the 1990s, CMAQ dollars support transportation projects and other efforts contributing to air quality improvements and congestion relief in areas not meeting federal air quality standards (aka non-attainment areas). In Colorado, non-attainment areas include DRCOG, the Pikes Peak Area COG, the North Front Range MPO, and five mountain communities.
- CDOT has allocated CMAQ funds to the non-attainment areas for many years and typically, DRCOG receives about 80percent of those dollars.
- Prior to allocation, CDOT estimates the amount of funds available to invest. This process is known as resource allocation.
- In a recent resource allocation, CDOT estimated about \$24 million in CMAQ funds for FY2014 would be available with about ~\$20 million allocated to DRCOG.
- With a clearer budget picture, CDOT has now determined CMAQ funds available for FY2014 is really ~\$37 million, \$13 million more than the resource allocation estimate.
- The \$13 million increase is due to additional funding created by the authorization of MAP-21 and from an "ozone reserve" CDOT created to set aside CMAQ funds in the event more areas in the state fell into non-attainment.
- This additional funding was reviewed during the STAC reports at the February and March Board meetings. In February, Beth Humenik, your State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) representative provided a detailed report explaining CMAQ funding was expected to increase as described above. She further reported CDOT proposed allocating \$24 million in CMAQ as originally planned during resource allocation, but had also recommended retaining the \$13 million additional funds in the event the Colorado Energy Office wanted to make a case for using CMAQ for establishing CNG fueling stations throughout the state. Steve Rudy provided a similar STAC report in March.
- In her report, Ms. Humenik said the State would get \$300,000 less than anticipated in another funding area, resulting in cuts for all the state's MPOs. She explained that

during the STAC meeting, Steve Rudy proposed DRCOG absorb the entire \$300,000 so the other MPOs would remain whole, *with the agreement DRCOG would receive \$300,000 out of the \$13 million in CMAQ the State was holding in reserve.*

- This matter was discussed at the Transportation Commission's March workshop, and they appear supportive of these proposals and are scheduled to approve the FY 2014 budget on April 18.
- Additional important points:
 - Unlike previous transportation bills, MAP-21 allows the expenditure of CMAQ funds for CNG fueling stations and related infrastructure throughout the state, not just within air quality non-attainment/maintenance areas.
 - If CMAQ allocation formulas were applied to the \$13 million in reserve, the DRCOG region would receive approximately \$10 million.
 - Like previous federal transportation bills, there is no requirement in MAP-21 for CDOT to allocate CMAQ funds to the MPOs, but this has always been the norm. This proposed revision in CDOT's approach to fund allocation was referenced specifically by the Executive Director during the Board's February Workshop when she identified activities others were engaging in that were changing the environment in which DRCOG operates.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

N/A

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

N/A

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

N/A

ATTACH K

MINUTES
ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 20, 2013

Present:

Sue Horn, Chair
Eva Henry
Bill Holen
KC Becker
Elise Jones
Dennis McCloskey
Doug Tisdale
Paul Ryan
Chris Nevitt
Jack Hilbert
Ron Rakowsky
Don Rosier
Adam Paul
Jackie Millet
Katie Witt
Val Vigil

Bennett
Adams County
Arapahoe County
Boulder
Boulder County
Broomfield
Cherry Hills Village
Denver
Denver
Douglas County
Greenwood Village
Jefferson County
Lakewood
Lone Tree
Longmont
Thornton

Others Present: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director; Connie Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Coordinator, and DRCOG staff.

Chair Sue Horn called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. with a quorum present.

Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Ron Rakowsky **moved, seconded** by Bill Holen, to elect Jack Hilbert as Chair and Rachel Zenzinger as Vice Chair of the Administrative Committee. The motion **passed unanimously**.

Jack Hilbert chaired the meeting from this point forward.

Motion to Adopt the Consent Agenda

Doug Tisdale **moved, seconded** by Sue Horn, to adopt the consent agenda. The motion **passed** unanimously. Items on the consent agenda included:

- Minutes of February 20, 2013
- Resolution No. 5, 2013, Authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate and execute a contract with the Colorado Department of Transportation to support the Traffic Operations Program
- Resolution No. 6, 2013, Authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate and execute a contract with AECOM Technical Services, Inc. to conduct refinements to the Focus travel demand model to make it more sensitive to priced facilities, including toll roads, managed lanes, and select park-n-Ride lots, in an amount not to exceed \$180,000

- Resolution No. 7, 2013, regarding the deposit and investment of funds of the Denver Regional Council of Governments and use of electronic signatures

Report of the Executive Director

Jennifer Schaufele reported that the National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) has agreed to bow out of participating in the SCI West Corridor catalytic project, citing continuing contracting issues. In a conversation with NREL earlier in the day, Ms. Schaufele reported that NREL will continue to try to sign contracts for the remainder of the SCI work that it was tasked to accomplish through the grant. She noted that Xcel Energy and others will be approached about participating in the West Corridor catalytic project on a pro bono basis, and that perhaps a Request for Proposals may be issued if discussions with Xcel cannot be wrapped up quickly. Jack Hilbert praised staff for their continued work on the grant.

Other Matters by Members

- Ron Rakowsky passed along kudos to DRCOG Area Agency on Aging staff for participation in a Channel 8 panel on aging issues.
- Bill Holen reported that he used DRCOG's sequestration materials in conversations with legislators in Washington DC.
- New members were apprised that quorum for the committee is 7. Also, the rules for participating in meetings via telephone in certain circumstances were discussed. Members will receive a copy of the policy next month.
- Jennifer Schaufele noted that a report will be provided to the Board in April on outcomes from the Board workshop.

The meeting adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Jack Hilbert, Chair
Administrative Committee
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

ATTACH L

SUMMARY OF METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING

April 3, 2013

MVIC Members Present: Rachel Zenzinger – Arvada; Sue Horn – Bennett; KC Becker – Boulder; Elise Jones – Boulder County; Cathy Noon – Centennial; Tim Mauck – Clear Creek County; Jason McEldowney – Commerce City; Robin Kniech – Denver; Jack Hilbert – Douglas County; Sharon Richardson – Federal Heights; Ron Rakowsky – Greenwood Village; Don Rosier – Jefferson County; Jim Taylor – Littleton; Jackie Millet – Lone Tree; Katie Witt – Longmont; Val Vigil – Thornton.

Others present: Jeanne Shreve – Adams County; Julie McKay – Boulder County; Bert Weaver – Clear Creek County; Nathan Batchelder – Denver; Art Griffith – Douglas County; Phil Cernanec – Littleton; Gene Putman – Thornton; Deb Perkins-Smith, Dan Hermann, Amy Schmalz, Jeff Sudmeier – Colorado Department of Transportation; Steve Klausing – Denver South Economic Development Partnership; and DRCOG staff.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m.; a quorum was present.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Summary of December 5, 2012 Meeting

The summary was accepted as presented.

Motion to designate Regional Transportation Committee Members (2) and Alternates (at least 4)

Rachel Zenzinger noted that currently Ron Rakowsky and Sharon Richardson are the members representing the Metro Vision Issues Committee on the Regional Transportation Committee. She noted that Erik Hansen also expressed an interest in serving. Neither Ron Rakowsky nor Erik Hansen were in attendance at the meeting.

Val Vigil **moved, seconded** by Katie Witt, to nominate Erik Hansen and Sharon Richardson as members to represent the Metro Vision Issues Committee on the Regional Transportation Committee. There was discussion.

It was noted that Ron Rakowsky had not been asked of his willingness to continue to serve. The motion was **withdrawn**.

Robin Kniech **moved, seconded** by Cathy Noon, to retain Ron Rakowsky and Sharon Richardson as members. The motion **passed unanimously**.

Rachel Zenzinger noted that she currently serves as an alternate and is not interested in continuing. Jim Taylor noted that he is not interested in continuing as an alternate.

Jack Hilbert **moved, seconded** by KC Becker, to nominate the following MVIC members as alternates to serve on the Regional Transportation Committee: Jackie Millet, Val Vigil, Erik Hansen, and Robin Kniech. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Motion to provide recommendations to the Board and/or direction to staff to prepare for CDOT's RAMP program

Debra Perkins-Smith provided information on the RAMP program. She reviewed the application process and timeline. She noted the main focus of the program is on asset management, as well as public/private and public/public (devolution) partnerships. RAMP is a five-year program, with approximately \$500,000 being spent per year. Several questions were posed by DRCOG and answered by Ms. Perkins-Smith:

1. Will RAMP fund projects not currently in the adopted Fiscally-Constrained 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and, does CDOT have concerns about DRCOG's Plan remaining fiscally constrained with the implementation of RAMP?

CDOT has met with FHWA to address this concern. It was determined that a footnote might be added to the Plan to note CDOT is shifting to a new budgeting process and that these are not new funds. It is anticipated FHWA will agree to this solution.

2. With regard to public-private partnership projects (P3) what level of "financial information" will CDOT request in the detailed application?

CDOT is asking for letters of financial commitment and for project sponsors to work with HPTe. If a project is accepted in the initial application process, it will still have to go through the TIP and RTP amendment process, enabling DRCOG to request additional detail. It was noted that typically P3 projects are large, multi-year projects, and it seems almost impossible to complete a P3 project in five years. Ms. Perkins-Smith explained the goal of the program is to get dollars out on the street. The RAMP language states "the project can be implemented/constructed within five years." Project sponsors should have this discussion with HPTe to ensure that the intent of the program can be met. A question was asked about the RTP amendment process. Ms. Perkins-Smith noted that if a project is not successfully amended into the Plan, the project would not be able to be constructed. Through discussions with MPOs, the question will be asked about at what point input from the MPOs is appropriate.

3. RAMP is described as a five-year program. Is this a "one time" opportunity or will there be additional funding opportunities?

Ms Perkins Smith told MVIC she is unsure if it will be done each year. CDOT will wait to see what projects are submitted this first year.

4. Will RAMP necessitate air quality conformity modeling by DRCOG?

Ms. Perkins-Smith noted that some projects may already be in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and would not need to be modeled, however some projects may necessitate air quality modeling. These could be new projects or projects being advanced into an earlier staging of the Plan.

5. How will CDOT RAMP project selection address long-standing equity issues that led to the CDOT DRCOG funding MOU?

Ms. Perkins-Smith indicated some concern on the part of the outlying areas of the State that the majority of funds will be consumed by the metro area. She reiterated the shift to performance measure-based asset management, which will evaluate projects on a statewide basis and build accordingly.

6. Has the “scoring methodology” for RAMP partnership projects been established?

Ms. Perkins-Smith stated that no scoring methodology has been established. It would be difficult to score different project types using one methodology. Project evaluation will be based on the benefits and merits of each project.

7. How will RAMP accommodate public involvement?

The project list will go to the State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) for their input to the Commission. Also, prior to Transportation Commission meetings there are public comment periods, and through DRCOG as part of the Plan amendment projects.

Jennifer Schaufele asked a question about the asset management model. She noted that there are several other performance measures in MAP-21 besides asset management. How is CDOT addressing performance measures when the rulemaking on performance measures hasn't been accomplished? Ms. Perkins-Smith explained CDOT is working on an update to the Statewide Plan and is working with the Transportation Commission to identify performance measures. CDOT does have asset management measures in place which will continue to be used.

Robin Kniech asked Ms. Perkins-Smith to identify the sources of the funding being advanced. Ms. Perkins-Smith said the funding encompasses all the federal categories, but not those that are local agency-related (like CMAQ).

MVIC members discussed the options and alternatives listed in the proposed action/recommendations section of the agenda memo. Staff pointed out CDOT's schedule has a very short timeline. Detailed applications are due to CDOT by July 1, with ranking of projects taking place by August 9. The final list of projects will go to the Commission for action in September. The schedule was included in the packet. MVIC members agreed it may be necessary to hold special meetings in order to provide input to CDOT on the list of projects. A suggestion was made that the RTP amendment timeframe would also need to be modified to accommodate this schedule. Members discussed whether or not the Board should prioritize projects. Staff noted that the Board can review the list of projects that comes out in July and provide input to CDOT at that time.

Sue Horn **moved, seconded** by Jack Hilbert, to remain neutral on project applications, evaluate the projects not included in the current RTP once a list is finalized by CDOT, recommend those that would be qualified for amending into the RTP to CDOT, including those that are already in the RTP, and move forward with amending the RTP. There was discussion.

Staff noted that once CDOT identifies the final list of projects, the RTP amendment process can begin immediately. A question was asked about what would happen if CDOT selects a project that normally would not qualify for the RTP. Staff noted the Board could signal to CDOT what we value as a region; other MPOs will be doing the same thing. The Board should be able to tell a project sponsor that there may be issues with their project even if CDOT picks it for funding and tell CDOT if there are projects that don't meet our values as well. Some members noted that it may come to pass that CDOT will pick a project that the Board does not want to amend into the RTP, and wanted the members to understand that if DRCOG decides not to amend a project into the RTP, there is no guarantee the RAMP funds for that project will remain in the DRCOG region.

After discussion, the motion **passed** unanimously.

Motion to provide recommendations to the DRCOG Board of Directors concerning expiration of the CDOT/DRCOG Funding Equity MOU

Jennifer Schaufele presented information about the current funding equity MOU between DRCOG and CDOT. She noted that the current MOU is outdated, and is set to expire in June of this year. Alternatives were provided to members for addressing the expiration of the MOU.

Jack Hilbert **moved, seconded** by Hank Dalton, to recommend Alternative 3, let the MOU expire and take no further action. There was discussion.

Several members expressed opposition to Alternative 3. Many expressed that some agreement should exist between CDOT and DRCOG. Some mentioned that since Don Hunt has expressed that neither he nor the Transportation Commission are in favor of an MOU, DRCOG should not pursue it. A suggestion was made to perhaps approach CDOT to discuss a new agreement to address funding equity that doesn't include percentages of funding. Debra Perkins-Smith noted that there will be opportunities for participation in future discussions with the Transportation Commission to look at program allocation. She explained, many things are in flux at CDOT related to funding, making it difficult at best to form a new MOU.

After discussion, the motion **failed** with 3 in favor, 11 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Val Vigil **moved, seconded** by Jason McEldowney, to recommend to the DRCOG Board that DRCOG allow the current MOU with CDOT to expire, and enter into a process to renegotiate a formal agreement that states our intent or expectations around our role in the DRCOG region and how that impacts funding. DRCOG recognizes that it cannot be done according to a timeline, as in this summer, but that DRCOG is interested in finding a resolution which will be determined at a later date.

KC Becker offered a friendly amendment to change "DRCOG region" to "state." The friendly amendment was accepted. There was discussion.

Jack Hilbert noted his opposition to the motion.

After discussion, the motion **passed** with 11 in favor and 4 opposed.

Regional Transportation Planning Implications of MAP-21

This agenda item was deferred to a later meeting.

Other Matters

Robin Kniech asked a question about CMAQ funds that are being held by CDOT for other uses. Steve Cook and Debra Perkins-Smith noted that the CMAQ level has increased from what was put into resource allocation by \$13 million. CDOT is holding the funds until a study is completed by the Colorado Energy Office which may identify potential projects related to Compressed Natural Gas fueling stations. No decision has been made regarding allocation of the CMAQ funds. DRCOG will receive \$300,000 off the top of the \$13 million, as repayment for DRCOG absorbing the entire TAP program shortfall. Additional information will be provided by DRCOG staff on this topic at the April Board meeting.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for May 1, 2013.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

ATTACH M

Spike in Denver's auto-pedestrian cases has officials seeking answers

March 20, 2013
By Joey Bunch
The Denver Post

This year's spike in auto-pedestrian collisions is deadly serious, Denver police say, regardless of whether it's a statistical anomaly or an early sign of a long-term problem.

Denver's auto-pedestrian accidents were up 46 percent for the first eight weeks of 2013 over the previous two years. Another grim statistic also stands out: Last year, the city had 13 hit-and-run fatalities, more than the previous three years combined.

"It's not just a police problem; it's a city problem," said Lt. Matt Murray, chief of staff to Denver Police Chief Robert White. "And the city has to work on a solution."

Murray said the city is working on a public education campaign, "but we're getting to a point where we're going to have to take action on enforcement."

When drugs and alcohol aren't involved, collisions are often caused by distractions — signs, people, bright sunshine — and the popularity of smartphones doesn't help, several experts said.

"We have more distracted walkers and drivers checking their text messages and e-mails, and people are just not paying attention," said Lt. Robert Rock, Denver's head traffic investigator.

The consequences can be tragic, as they were on Feb. 27, when two East High students were struck outside the school within minutes of each other. In one case a student walked into traffic.

In the other, a hit-and-run driver blew through a red light.

After two years of averaging about 31 auto-pedestrian incidents a month, the average jumped to 44 a month in January and February, according to Denver police statistics.

Hit-and-run cases averaged 8.5 a month in January and February — after 4.8 per month in 2011 and 6.1 in 2012.

Collisions in Aurora, however, are down this year, with that city's rate per capita running less than one-third Denver's.

Regardless of statistical spikes and dips, regional authorities consider the clash of cars and people a serious problem.

Over the past decade, about 1,600 accidents involving pedestrians or cyclists were reported every year, according to a study by the **Denver Regional Council of Governments**.

In the 10-county region, 17 percent of all fatalities were pedestrians, and 3 percent were cyclists. Traffic safety officials cite three approaches to curbing collisions: engineering, education and enforcement.

None of them is ideal, Rock said.

Engineering is expensive. Intersections prone to collisions already have lights and crosswalks, he said, and walkover bridges cost about \$1 million apiece. And before Feb. 27, East High hadn't had any problems with cars hitting people, police said at the time.

Education is effective with children, but adults tune it out, Rock said.

"You can watch a kindergarten student always walk to the corner and wait for the light," he said.

"And you can watch adults cut across at mid-block all day long."

That leaves enforcement. Rock said writing a lot of jaywalking tickets sounds like a solution, but it's not practical with hundreds of thousands of residents, workers, students and tourists spread across Denver each weekday, with a limited number of officers to respond to all kinds of calls.

Last year, Denver police started the Medina Alert, an instant-notification system to get information to the media about hit-and-run suspects. Police say media saturation prompted alleged hit-and-run driver Erin Jackson to turn herself in the day after the collision near East High.

The law was named for Jose Medina, the valet killed on Lincoln Street by a hit-and-run driver in 2011.

Also, last June, the state legislature doubled the jail sentence for drivers who hit and run. They now face up to six years in jail, the same as a drunken driver in an auto-pedestrian crash.

Denver District Attorney Mitch Morrissey said the law hasn't come into play since it went into effect last summer. His office has tried 16 cases of vehicular assault, but in each case, the driver stayed at the scene.

He doesn't know whether tougher laws stop people from driving away after an accident. The laws, however, do hold those who do run accountable for that decision.

"It's hard to say what drives someone to make the decision to run, but there has to be suitable punishment for it," Morrissey said.

The tougher law was inspired by Timothy Albo, who was hit near Coors Field in 2010 by Brandon Mondragon, who fled. Mondragon eventually was sentenced to four years probation,

six months in a work-release jail program and 300 hours of community service for two anti-drunken-driving organizations.

Albo continues to suffer from brain damage and can't return to work or retain what he reads or tries to learn, said his older sister, Jennifer Albo.

"It's unfathomable what people do behind the wheel every day — they eat, they text, they talk on the phone, they hand sodas to the back seat.

"Every time they're not paying attention they're taking the opportunity to ruin someone's life. We are blessed to still have my brother. He's alive, and he's breathing, but (Mondragon) killed who he was before."

Joey Bunch: 303-954-1174, jbunch@denverpost.com or twitter.com/joeybunch

Denver

2011 Auto Pedestrian Accidents 378, number of pedestrians = 412 (64 Juveniles)

2012 Auto Pedestrian Accidents 372, number of pedestrians = 390 (55 Juveniles)

Jan 1 - Feb 26, 2013 Auto Pedestrian Accidents 85, number of pedestrians = 88 (16 Juveniles)

Hit & Run Auto/Pedestrian Accidents

2011 Auto Pedestrian Hit & Run Accidents 58, number of pedestrians = 62 (10 Juveniles)

2012 Auto Pedestrian Hit & Run Accidents 74, number of pedestrians = 77 (9 Juveniles)

Jan 1 - Feb 26, 2013 Auto Pedestrian Hit & Run Accidents 16, number of pedestrians = 17 (4 Juveniles)

Aurora

2011 Auto Pedestrian Accidents 156, number of pedestrians = 111 (48 Juveniles)

2012 Auto Pedestrian Accidents 171, number of pedestrians = 120 (57 Juveniles)

Jan 1 - Feb 26, 2013 Auto Pedestrian Accidents 18, number of pedestrians = 14 (5 Juveniles)

Hit & Run Auto/Pedestrian Accidents

2011 Auto Pedestrian Hit & Run Accidents 45, number of pedestrians = 34 (11 Juveniles)

2012 Auto Pedestrian Hit & Run Accidents 43, number of pedestrians = 33 (10 Juveniles)

Jan 1 - Feb 26, 2013 Auto Pedestrian Hit & Run Accidents 6, number of pedestrians = 3 (3 Juveniles)

RidgeGate nominated as model community

Lone Tree development vying with 10 others in metro area

April 2, 2013

By Jane Reuter

Lone Tree Voice

Lone Tree's RidgeGate development is among 10 finalists vying for the title of 2013's most livable metro-area community. The "Live, Work, Play" People's Choice Award is a biannual honor given by the **Denver Area Regional Council of Governments**.

From now to noon April 24, people may vote online for their favorite among the selected communities. DRCOG will announce the winner during an April 24 evening celebration in Denver.

RidgeGate development manager Darryl Jones hopes area residents will get online and cast their vote for the growing community he's helped bring to life.

"I'm biased of course, but clearly it's a great community," he said. "Just look at all the development going on there. It's a place where people want to be. It's really coming into shape, fulfilling the vision we set a number of years ago. And it's just beginning."

The award is designed to honor communities that meet the goals of DRCOG's Metro Vision, which urges protection of rural areas, parks and open space, development of quality urban areas and efforts at environmental protection such as mass transit.

"We are convinced as RidgeGate continues to build out, it is probably the best example in one project of the kinds of things DRCOG's Metro Vision plan tried to advocate for," Lone Tree's Community Development Director Steve Hebert said. "One of the founding principles of RidgeGate is that it's mixed use, and a walkable community. You don't have to get in your car to drive to this or that event."

RidgeGate, annexed into Lone Tree in 2000, is a six-square-mile development that straddles Interstate 25. To date, only the west side has been developed. The Charles Schwab Corp. recently started construction of a corporate campus in RidgeGate, which already is home to the Lone Tree Arts Center, Lone Tree Recreation Center, Super Target and Sky Ridge Medical Center, and an array of housing projects.

Other communities nominated for the award include the Town of Bennett, Olde Town Arvada, Centennial Center Park and Lakewood's 40 West Arts District.

The Vallagio at Inverness won DRCOG's inaugural "Live, Work, Play" award in 2011.

40 West District a people's choice

April 2, 2013
By Clarke Reader
Lakewood Sentinel

The 40 West Arts District is one of 10 finalists for the **Denver Regional Council of Governments** Live Work Play People's Choice Award.

The program is a biennial one from DRCOG that celebrates places, events and projects that improve and contribute to communities' long-term success.

The award gives community members a chance to support their favorite project by voting online through Wednesday, April 24.

"We're really excited about the Live Work Play finalist status for 40 West," said executive director of the Lakewood-West Colfax Business Improvement District, Bill Marino. "It's a great initiative through DRCOG that is all about maintaining and protecting the region's quality of life."

Some of the other finalists include Lone Tree's RidgeGate Community, the Colorado Wedding District and Olde Town Arvada.

Steve Erickson, communications and marketing director with DRCOG said that many people don't realize that DRCOG is heavily involved in regional planning, and helps get local governments together to work on issues facing the area.

"We want to try to make life in these regions as good as can be," he said. "It's all part of our Metro Vision."

The Metro Vision address changes that need to be implemented to accommodate the burgeoning population that is predicted for Colorado. According to Erickson, the population for the Denver metro area is around 2.2 million, but by 2020 it is expected to grow to 3.2 million, and by 2035 it will be close to 4 million people.

Some plans in the Metro Vision plan include protecting open spaces, reducing daily vehicle miles traveled and cutting greenhouse emissions.

"Unless we pay attention to these issues, there will be problems for quality of life," he said.

"These awards are a thank you to the people and businesses that are already working on making their communities a better place to live."

Marino says the recognition is a result of the work the entire Colfax corridor is doing.

“At 40 West we’re all about celebrating community, arts, and working together to make whole corridor a better place,” he said. “People see the progress with businesses and W Rail, and get excited.”

Winners will be announced at the end of the day on April 24. To vote, visit

www.liveorkplay2013.com.