

**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**  
**METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, April 3, 2013**  
**4:00 p.m.**  
**1290 Broadway**  
**First Floor Boardroom**



1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment  
The chair requests that there be no public comment on issues for which a prior public hearing has been held before the Board of Directors.
3. Summary of December 5, 2012 Meeting  
(Attachment A)

**ACTION ITEMS**

4. \*Motion to designate Regional Transportation Committee Members (2) and Alternates (at least 4)  
(Attachment B) Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
5. Motion to provide recommendations to the Board and/or direction to staff to prepare for CDOT's RAMP program  
(Attachment C) Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
6. Motion to provide recommendation to the DRCOG Board of Directors concerning expiration of the CDOT/DRCOG Funding Equity MOU  
(Attachment D) Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

**INFORMATIONAL ITEM**

7. Regional Transportation Planning Implications of MAP-21 (if time allows)  
(Attachment E) Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager

**\*Motion Requested**

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



**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

8. Other Matters
9. **Next Meeting – May 1, 2013**
10. Adjournment



SUMMARY OF METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING  
December 5, 2012

MVIC Members Present: Jack Hilbert – Douglas County; Erik Hansen – Adams County; Nancy Sharpe – Arapahoe County; Rachel Zenzinger – Arvada; Bob Broom – Aurora; Sue Horn – Bennett; KC Becker – Boulder; Cindy Domenico – Boulder County; Dennis McCloskey – Broomfield; Cathy Noon – Centennial; Jim Benson – Commerce City; Robin Kniech – Denver; 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; Mac Callison – Aurora; Travis Greiman – Centennial; Joe Fowler – Douglas County; Phil Cernanec – Littleton; Darin Stavish, 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 4:10 p.m.; a quorum was present.

Public Comment

No public comment was offered.

Summary of November 7, 2012 Meeting

The summary was accepted as presented.

Motion to identify potential scenario analysis outcomes (important regional attributes) and direct the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee to (1) further analyze the value and feasibility of modeling these outcomes and refine the list of outcomes accordingly, and (2) recommend to the Metro Vision Issues Committee the data and information most necessary to model the refined list of outcomes

Brad Calvert presented information about potential scenario analysis outcomes. Discussion focused on the Category 3 list of outcomes, and the committee's feedback on the list of items was requested. Members were asked to weigh in on each of the items to inform staff what the priorities are. Staff will pass on the information derived from the voting to the MVPAC for further analysis. Feedback will be provided to MVIC at appropriate milestones of the process.

Cindy Domenico **moved, seconded** by Dennis McCloskey, to direct the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee to further analyze the value and feasibility of modeling these outcomes, refine the list of outcomes accordingly, and provide a recommendation to the Metro Vision Issues Committee, including the cost of supporting infrastructure. The motion **passed unanimously**.

Proposed changes to the Federal Functional Classification Principal Arterials of the National Highway System

Steve Cook distributed a revised map, showing changes received since the agenda was published. Members asked about receiving the revised map. Staff noted it can be emailed to the members.

Metro Vision Issues Committee Summary

December 5, 2012

Page 2

Other Matters

No other matters were discussed.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for January 2, 2013

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

# ATTACH B

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

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

Subject: **Designation of Members and Alternates to Serve on the Regional Transportation Committee**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 3, 2013	Action	4

**REQUESTED ACTION**

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

**SUMMARY**

- In 1977 when Governor Lamm designated DRCOG as the region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), he stipulated CDOT, RTD, and DRCOG were to agree as to how all of the organizations would participate in the transportation planning process. The agreement that was reached culminated in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and established the Regional Transportation Committee (RTC). The MOA stipulates the RTC is comprised of representatives of all 3 agencies. Further, the MOA stipulates both the RTC and the DRCOG Board of Directors must concur on transportation planning and funding decisions.
- The RTC description states DRCOG membership on RTC is designated as follows: *“Board Chairman and Vice Chairman, and two designees from the Metro Vision Issues Committee, and the Executive Director.”* The use of alternates is also guided by the Committee description, and states *“Each agency shall designate annually, in writing to the chairman, standing alternates (board members/commissioners and staff).”*
- Annually, MVIC appoints 2 MVIC members to serve on the RTC. MVIC also appoints at least 4 of its members to serve as alternates on the RTC. MVIC is requested to designate its representatives to the RTC in accordance with the Committee description.
- The RTC meets the Tuesday of each month immediately prior to the Board meeting (this is usually the third Tuesday) at 8:30 a.m., with a DRCOG member/attending alternate briefing at 8 a.m. in the Executive Director’s office.
- Current members of RTC designated from MVIC are:
  - Ron Rakowsky—may be retained.
  - Sharon Richardson—may be retained.
- Current alternates of RTC designated from MVIC are:
  - Jim Taylor—may be retained
  - Jackie Millet—may be retained
  - Rachel Zenzinger—may be retained
  - Val Vigil—may be retained

**PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTION**

N/A

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

N/A

**ALTERNATIVES**

MVIC may retain all current members and alternates; retain some current members and alternates; elect a new slate of members and alternates.

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff doesn't recommend any particular alternative but suggest the MVIC representatives on RTC be engaged and have good attendance at MVIC to help assure DRCOG's position on matters before the RTC are fully understood and members are able to participate in informed discussion.

**BACKUP INFORMATION**

Attachments:

1. Regional Transportation Committee description
2. MVIC member list



## REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

**Type:** Standing Committee

**Authority:** Memorandum of Agreement between DRCOG, the Colorado Department of Transportation, and the Regional Transportation District, dated July 10, 2001.  
Modified by the three agencies June 17, 2008.

### MEMBERSHIP

Sixteen members as follows:

Denver Regional Council of Governments - Board chair and vice chair, and two designees from the Metro Vision Issues Committee, and the Executive Director.

Colorado Department of Transportation - Three metro area Transportation Commissioners and the Executive Director

Regional Transportation District - Three Board members and the General Manager

Other Members - Three members appointed annually by the committee chair upon unanimous recommendation of the Executive Directors of DRCOG, CDOT and the General Manager of RTD. The DRCOG Executive Director will consult with the committee chair prior to the three agency executives forming a recommendation.

### USE OF ALTERNATES

It is the clear goal of the committee to minimize use of alternates. However, recognizing that there will be times when it is inevitable that members cannot attend, alternates will be allowed on the following basis:

- Each agency shall designate annually, in writing to the chair, standing alternates (board members/commissioners and staff).
- No more than two staff (members or designated alternates) from each agency can vote on any given issue.
- The appropriate level of staff that can be designated as alternates are:
  - DRCOG: Division Directors
  - CDOT: Regional Transportation Directors or equivalent or above
  - RTD: Senior Managers of planning and development or above
- No alternates are permitted for the Other Members
- No proxies are permitted
- The new immediate past chair of DRCOG shall serve as an alternate until the Metro Vision Issues Committee acts to designate new alternates after the February Board elections.

## **QUORUM/VOTING**

Twelve members, or designated alternates. Twelve votes are required to carry any action.

## **RESPONSIBILITIES**

Through the Regional Transportation Committee, DRCOG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), administers the urban transportation planning process for the region in accordance with the Prospectus and applicable federal regulations. Accordingly, the responsibilities of the Regional Transportation Committee shall include:

- Overall direction of current work activities established by the Unified Planning Work Program.
- Review and approval of items to be submitted to the DRCOG Board of Directors, as the MPO policy body, for adoption.
- Approval of plans, programs, documents and annual endorsements related to surface transportation as outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement. Should the DRCOG Board approve a policy action that differs from the Regional Transportation Committee's recommendation, the action shall be referred back to the Committee for reconsideration.

## **OTHER**

DRCOG representatives will attend a briefing with the DRCOG Executive Director immediately prior to the regularly scheduled RTC meeting.

The Metro Vision Issues Committee meets the 1st Wednesday of each month from 4 – 6 p.m.

Rachel Zenzinger –Chair  
Jackie Millet – Vice Chair

DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE  
MARCH 2013 MEMBERSHIP LIST

Member

Erik Hansen  
Commissioner  
4430 S. Adams Co. Pkwy, Ste. C5000A  
Brighton, CO 80601  
(720) 523-6100  
(720) 523-6045 FAX  
ehansen@co.adams.co.us

Nancy N. Sharpe  
Commissioner  
5334 S. Prince St.  
Littleton, CO 80166  
(303) 795-4630 (ch)  
(303) 738-7894 FAX  
nsharpe@co.arapahoe.co.us

Rachel Zenzinger  
Council Member  
P.O. Box 8101  
Arvada, CO 80001  
(720) 898-7000  
rzenzinger@arvada.org

Sue Horn  
Mayor  
355 4<sup>th</sup> St.  
Bennett, CO 80102-7806  
(303) 644-3249  
swfhorn@aol.com

KC Becker  
Council Member  
3141 9th St  
Boulder, CO 80304  
720-318-6023 cell  
beckerk@bouldercolorado.gov

Alternate

Eva Henry  
Commissioner  
4430 S. Adams Co. Pkwy, Ste. C5000A  
Brighton, CO 80601  
(720) 523-6100  
(720) 523-6045 FAX  
ehenry@co.adams.co.us

Bill Holen  
Commissioner  
5334 South Prince  
Littleton, CO 80166  
(303) 795-4630 (ch)  
(303) 738-7894 FAX  
bholen@co.arapahoe.co.us

Marc Williams  
Council Member  
P.O. Box 8101  
Arvada, CO 80001  
(720) 898-7000  
mwilliams@arvada.org

Suzanne Jones  
Council Member  
714 Marine St.  
Boulder, CO 80302  
(720) 633-7388  
joness@bouldercolorado.gov

Metro Vision Issues Committee

Page 2

Member

Cindy Domenico  
County Commissioner  
P.O. Box 471  
Boulder, CO 80306  
(303) 441-3500  
(303) 441-4525  
commissioners@co.boulder.co.us

Dennis McCloskey  
Council Member  
436 Hickory Street  
Broomfield, CO 80020  
(303) 489-0132  
(303) 438-6296 FAX  
Mick4Uward2@mac.com

Cathy Noon  
Mayor  
13133 E. Arapahoe Rd.  
Centennial, CO 80112  
(303) 754-3341  
cnoon@centennialcolorado.com

Tim Mauck  
Commissioner  
410 Soda Creek Rd.  
Idaho Springs, CO 80452  
(720) 425-7840  
(303) 679-2440  
tim@timmauck.com

Jim Benson  
Council Member  
7887 E. 60<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Commerce City, CO 80022  
(303) 288-0660  
jrbenson@c3gov.com

Robin Kniech  
Council Member  
City & County Bldg, Rm 432  
1437 Bannock  
Denver, CO 80202  
(303) 337-7712  
Robin.kniech@denvergov.org

Alternate

Elise Jones  
County Commissioner  
P. O. Box 471  
Boulder, CO 80306  
(303) 441-3500 (ch)  
(303) 441-4525 FAX  
eljones@co.boulder.co.us

Wayne Anderson  
Council Member  
2907 Star Creek Dr.  
Broomfield, CO 80023  
(303) 324-4566  
wanderson@broomfieldcitycouncil.org

Ron Weidmann  
Council Member  
13133 E. Arapahoe Rd.  
Centennial, CO 80112  
(303) 754-3343  
rweidmann@centennialcolorado.com

Kevin O'Malley  
Chair, Board of Commissioners  
P.O. Box 2000  
Georgetown, CO 80444  
(303) 679-2312  
(303) 679-2440  
Komal102@msn.com

Jason McEldowney  
Council Member  
7887 E. 60<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Commerce City, CO 80022  
(303) 808-9105  
jmceldowney@c3gov.com

Chris Nevitt  
Council Member  
City & County Bldg., Rm. 451  
1457 Bannock  
Denver, CO 80202  
(720) 865-8900  
Chris.nevitt@denvergov.org

Metro Vision Issues Committee  
Page 3

Member

Jack Hilbert  
Commissioner  
100 Third St.  
Castle Rock, CO 80104  
(303) 660-7401  
bocc@douglas.co.us

Sharon Richardson  
Council Member  
2380 W. 90<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Federal Heights, CO 80260  
(303) 427-4086  
srichardson@ci.federal-heights.co.us

Marjorie Sloan  
Mayor  
911 10<sup>th</sup> St.  
Golden, CO 80401  
(303) 279-7603  
msloan@ci.golden.co.us

Ron Rakowsky  
Mayor  
41 Coral Place  
Greenwood Village, CO 80111  
(303) 770-7121  
(303) 850-0020 FAX  
rrakowsky@greenwoodvillage.com

Don Rosier  
Commissioner  
100 Jefferson County Pkwy.  
Golden, CO 80419  
(303) 271-8525  
(303) 271-8941 FAX  
Commish3@jeffco.us

James A. Taylor  
Council Member  
2778 W. Riverwalk Circle #B  
Littleton, CO 80123  
(303) 795-6161 (h)  
(303) 794-2131 FAX  
jataylor@comcast.net

Alternate

Roger Partridge  
Commissioner  
100 Third St.  
Castle Rock, CO 80104  
(303) 660-7401  
bocc@douglas.co.us

Joyce Thomas  
Mayor  
2380 W. 90<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Federal Heights, CO 80260  
(303) 428-3526  
jthomas@ci.federal-heights.co.us

Bob Vermeulen  
Councilor  
911 10<sup>th</sup> St.  
Golden, CO 80401  
(303) 278-3825  
bvermeulen@cityofgolden.net

Jerry Presley  
Council Member  
6060 S. Quebec St.  
Greenwood Village, CO 80111  
(303) 804-4138  
(303) 290-0631  
jpresley@greenwoodvillage.com

Casey Tighe  
Commissioner  
100 Jefferson County Pkwy.  
Golden, CO 80419  
(303) 271-8525  
(303) 271-8941  
Commish2@jeffco.us

Phil Cernanec  
Council Member  
2255 W. Berry Ave.  
Littleton, CO 80265  
(303) 798-3594  
pjcernanec@aol.com

Metro Vision Issues Committee

Page 4

Member

Jackie Millet  
Council Member  
9220 Kimmer Dr., Ste. 100  
Lone Tree, CO 80124  
(303) 748-2383  
(303) 225-4949 FAX  
Jackie.millet@cityoflonetree.com

Katie Witt  
Council Member  
1615 Budd Ct.  
Longmont, CO 80501  
(303) 775-5151  
Katie.witt@ci.longmont.co.us

Hank Dalton  
Council Member  
749 Main St.  
Louisville, CO 80027  
(303) 335-4533  
(303) 335-4534  
hankd@louisvilleco.gov

Val Vigil  
Council Member  
9500 Civic Center Dr.  
Thornton, CO 80229  
(303) 538-7200  
val.vigil@cityofthornton.net

Alternate

Jim Gunning  
Mayor  
9220 Kimmer Dr., Ste 100  
Lone Tree, CO 80124  
(303) 708-1818  
(303) 225-4949 FAX  
Jim.gunning@cityoflonetree.com

Alex Sammoury  
Council Member  
428 Pratt St.  
Longmont, CO 80501  
(303) 579-6752  
Alex.sammoury@ci.longmont.co.us

Susan Loo  
Council Member  
749 Main St.  
Louisville, CO 80027  
(303) 335-4533  
(303) 335-4534  
susanl@louisvilleco.gov

Beth Humenik  
Council Member  
9500 Civic Center Dr.  
Thornton, CO 80229  
(303) 538-7200  
beth.humenik@cityofthornton.net

# ATTACH C

To: Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

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

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

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 3, 2013	Action	5

#### REQUESTED ACTION

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

#### SUMMARY

- In the [Transportation Planning: A Foundational Overview](#) presentation at the October 2012 Board meeting, Director Schaufele reviewed the responsibilities of DRCOG as MPO; the purpose, development and updates to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and some of the primary issues the Plan and TIP must accommodate. The purpose of today's item is to 1) provide information about CDOT's [RAMP \(Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships\)](#) program and 2) get direction from MVIC concerning RAMP's impact on DRCOG as MPO.
- In December 2012, CDOT announced a new funding program and budgetary process known as RAMP, which is estimated to make \$300 million available for construction projects over the next 5 years.
- While CDOT refers interested parties to a routinely updated CDOT RAMP website and urges stakeholders to monitor it for new information, they conducted a RAMP workshop at DRCOG on March 25. Debra Perkins-Smith (CDOT staff and DRCOG Board member) will provide an overview of RAMP for MVIC. Ms. Perkins-Smith will also address several specific questions:
  - *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?*  
**Relevance to DRCOG:** USDOT requires the MPO (DRCOG) to maintain a fiscally constrained RTP. RAMP eligibility criteria for public-private partnership projects lists several example corridors not fully funded in the RTP and CDOT staff mentioned having met with potential applicants about projects not in the RTP. If RAMP funds projects not in the RTP or, if RAMP funds projects already in the Plan that were anticipated to be funded by 100% locally-derived funds, DRCOG will need to amend the Plan while maintaining fiscal constraint.



- *With regard to public-private partnership projects (P3), what level of “financial information” will CDOT request in the detailed application?*  
**Relevance to DRCOG:** In collaboration with CDOT, the DRCOG Board developed documentation requirements for submitting toll highway amendments to the regional transportation plan ([DRCOG Board-adopted requirements](#)). These requirements are intended to help the Board assess such projects.
- *RAMP is described as a 5-year program. Is this a “one time” opportunity or will there be additional future opportunities?*  
**Relevance to DRCOG:** DRCOG member governments are asking if this is their only chance to compete. Related to this, applicants are asking what happens after RAMP.
- *Will RAMP necessitate air quality conformity modeling by DRCOG?*  
**Relevance to DRCOG:** As MPO, DRCOG is required to show air quality conformity of its fiscally constrained RTP and TIP before these documents are amended.
- *How will CDOT RAMP project selection address long-standing equity issues that led to the CDOT/DRCOG funding MOU?*  
**Relevance to DRCOG:** Funding equity is a concern throughout the state and the Transportation Commission is focused foremost with “need.” CDOT’s definition of “need” is important to the region as the Denver metro area comprises more than half the state’s population and about two-thirds of the state’s economy. What certainty does the Board have *its* needs will be considered?
- *Has the “scoring methodology” for RAMP partnership projects been established?*  
**Relevance to DRCOG:** Applicants can craft better submittals with this information and this information would aid the Board in understanding if and how it would prioritize projects (by federal law, MPOs are expected to identify and prioritize projects).
- *How will RAMP accommodate public involvement?*  
**Relevance to DRCOG:** It is a certainty the TIP, and likely the RTP, will be amended to accommodate the RAMP program. The DRCOG Board has adopted a process to give the public opportunity to provide input on amendments to both the RTP and TIP; this is a requirement of all MPOs by the federal government.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION
--------------------

N/A

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS
--------------------------

N/A

ALTERNATIVES
--------------

N/A

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Following Ms. Perkins-Smith's presentation, MVIC is asked to provide direction on the following:

- *Will DRCOG provide applicants with letters of support for either pre- or detailed RAMP applications?*
  - **Recommendation:** Support all applications or no applications. Without additional Board/Committee meetings, and/or a very simple evaluation methodology and/or use of prior criteria/evaluation tools, there is insufficient time in the RAMP schedule for assessing RAMP applications.
  
- *After CDOT has identified eligible RAMP projects, will DRCOG prioritize them?*
  - **Recommendation:** Prioritizing projects for funding is part of the regional transportation planning process and a responsibility of MPOs. The Board could establish a simple methodology to prioritize projects but to accomplish this, the Board and/or Committees must commit to additional meetings between now and DRCOG's August Board meeting. Otherwise, CDOT will create a list of recommended projects for consideration by the Transportation Commission without the MPO's input.
  
- **Additional Recommendations:**
  - Adjust the Board's normal RTP update schedule as needed to accommodate any RAMP amendments to the Fiscally Constrained 2035 RTP. The normal date for submittal of amendments to the RTP is late August. If RAMP decisions are made in September, as outlined in the current RAMP schedule, the DRCOG deadline would be missed.
  - Any other recommendations based on information provided by Ms. Perkins-Smith or ensuing MVIC discussion.

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Attachments:
  - RAMP Project Selection Process (rev. March 11, 2013)
  
- Links:
  - [RAMP Workshop \(PowerPoint presentation\)](#)
  - [RAMP \(Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships\)](#)

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><b><u>REGIONS AND OPERATIONS COMPLETE VETTING OF APPLICATIONS.</u></b></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><b><u>TECHNICAL REVIEW COMPLETE.</u></b></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><b><u>PROJECT RANKING.</u></b></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><b><u>PROGRAM OF PROJECTS DEVELOPED.</u></b></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><b><u>TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION CONSIDERS RECOMMENDATIONS.</u></b></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**

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

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"> <li>• Demonstrate local support</li> <li>• Projects with the potential to be funded with tolls and/or significant private contribution or investment.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	Primary Criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical need: quantify benefit of improvement addressing “critical need” for asset condition, safety, mobility/operations, capacity</li> <li>• Identify total project cost and financing plan</li> </ul> Secondary Criteria – quantify or list additional benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates potential for innovative financing</li> <li>• Local government contribution</li> <li>• Other benefits</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Commitment of local match for a target minimum of 20% (non-federal highway sources of cash, ROW, or design costs)</li> </ul>	Primary Criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical Need: quantify benefit of improvement addressing “critical need” for asset condition, safety, mobility/operations</li> <li>• Identify total project cost and funding plan</li> </ul> Secondary Criteria – quantify or list additional benefits (for example) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leveraging of funds: additional match beyond the 20% targeted minimum</li> <li>• Completes a project that has an earlier phase in the STIP</li> <li>• Hierarchy of state highway system: Interstate, NHS, other</li> <li>• Economic benefits (i.e. job creation)</li> <li>• Other benefits</li> </ul> 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"> <li>• Demonstrate local support and willingness for local maintenance responsibility.</li> </ul>	Informational – provide estimated funding requirements by year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Functionality – functions as a local road; lacks connectivity</li> <li>• Demonstrable net present value of savings over 20 years</li> <li>• Maintenance difficulty for CDOT</li> <li>• Other benefits (for example: community has improved opportunity to support economic development because roadway is not subject to CDOT access control)</li> </ul>



# 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 1<sup>st</sup>. 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](http://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)



# ATTACH D

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

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

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 3, 2013	Action	6

#### REQUESTED ACTION

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

#### 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 between DRCOG and the Colorado Transportation Commission caused by an increasing erosion of state transportation funds allocated to the DRCOG region 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 DRCOG Board meeting of January 16, 2013, 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.

#### 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

1. Work with CDOT and develop a new agreement to address funding equity that would take effect this summer. [Note: DRCOG staff does not recommend simply extending the current MOU as many specifics in it are no longer applicable.]
2. Let the MOU expire but, write to the Governor, the members of the Transportation Commission and the CDOT Executive Director to reiterate the region's critical importance to the state's economy as well as its role in subsidizing transportation projects throughout the state and make known the Board's expectation CDOT will invest in the Denver metropolitan area commensurate with the region's contributions, fiscal and otherwise.
3. Let the MOU expire and take no further action.

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

DRCOG staff believes it is possible to negotiate a new MOU but it will be a complicated and politically charged endeavor. Moreover, there are several unknowns concerning the future of transportation funding such as CDOT's RAMP program, MAP-21, eventual outcomes from recent state/regional initiatives exploring increasing transportation funding, etc. The DRCOG Board always has the option of taking a loud and public stand should it determine funds invested here are insufficient. Staff recommends alternative 2.

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- Link: [Memorandum of Understanding-DRCOG and CDOT \(Nov. 2004\)](#)

**ATTACHE**

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

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

Subject: **Regional Transportation Planning Implications of MAP-21**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
April 3, 2013	Information	7

#### REQUESTED ACTION

No action requested. This item is for information only.

#### SUMMARY

- MAP-21 (*Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*) was signed into law by the President on July 6, 2012. The most recent of the surface transportation authorization acts, it covers a two-year period that began October 1, 2012.
- In time, MAP-21 will change how State DOTs and MPOs plan. A recent FHWA/FTA webinar describes the planning process under MAP-21 as “performance-driven, outcome based”, with MAP-21’s performance management provisions establishing a “transparent, accountable decision-making framework.”
- Much of MAP-21 will be implemented through federal rule-making processes. For most of the new requirements, federal agencies have until January 2014 to complete the rule-making process. Thus, at this time, what is known about MAP-21 is what is contained in the language of the law, what is contained in websites from federal agencies, and what has been commented on by membership and advocacy organizations.
- DRCOG staff will brief members on current understandings of what MAP-21 performance-based planning will entail for MPOs, and for State DOTs, as relevant to MPO planning activities.

#### PRIOR BOARD ACTION

- N/A

#### FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- N/A

#### ALTERNATIVES

- N/A

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

- N/A

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- You may wish to review the following web links:
  - [MAP-21 as signed](#)
  - [FHWA summary of MAP-21](#)
  - [FHWA Transportation Performance Management](#)
  - [FTA summary of MAP-21](#)