

AGENDA
METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE
Wednesday, August 6, 2014
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 July 2, 2014 Meeting
(Attachment A)

ACTION ITEMS

4. *Move to direct DRCOG staff on criteria to be used for the selection 2016-2021 TIP projects in second phase
(Attachment B) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations
5. *Move to provide staff direction regarding the urban centers element of Metro Vision 2040
(Attachment C) Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning & Operations

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

6. Other Matters
7. Next Meeting – September 3, 2014
8. Adjournment

***Motion Requested**

Persons in need of auxiliary aids or services, such as interpretation services or assisted listening devices, are asked to contact DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (303) 480-6701



METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
July 2, 2014

MVIC Members Present: Elise Jones – Boulder County; Bill Holen – Arapahoe County; Sue Horn – Bennett; Tim Plass – Boulder; George Teal – Castle Rock; Cathy Noon – Centennial; Doug Tisdale – Cherry Hills Village; Rick Teter – Commerce City; Robin Kniech, Anthony Graves – Denver; Todd Riddle – Edgewater; Marjorie Sloan – Golden; Ron Rakowsky – Greenwood Village; Don Rosier – Jefferson County; Shakti – Lakewood; Phil Cernanec – Littleton; Jackie Millet – Lone Tree; John Diak – Parker; Beth Martinez-Humenik – Thornton; Herb Atchison - Westminster.

Others present: Mac Callison – Aurora; Travis Greiman – Centennial; Joe Fowler, Eugene Howard – Douglas County; Kent Moorman – Thornton; Ted Heyd – Bicycle Colorado; Darcie White - Clarion; Dace West – Mile High Connects; Karly Malpiede – Urban Land Conservancy; and DRCOG staff.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m.; a quorum was present.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Summary of June 4, 2014 Meeting

The summary was accepted as submitted.

Move to designate Regional Transportation Committee members (2) and alternates (at least 4)

The Chair listed those who expressed interest in serving on the RTC: Ron Rakowsky, Robin Kniech, George Teal, Herb Atchison, Shakti, Doug Tisdale and Sue Horn.

Doug Tisdale **moved** to appoint Ron Rakowsky and Robin Kniech as members of the Regional Transportation Committee, and appoint all others who expressed interest as alternates. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.

The new members and alternates were informed that due to a scheduling conflict for the Transportation Commissioners, the July RTC meeting will be rescheduled from July 15 to July 22.

Move to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee and the DRCOG Board the Draft Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation, Procedures for Preparing the 2016-2021 TIP

The Chair noted that there are a couple outstanding issues to be addressed, first is a calculation for person hours of travel. Doug Rex provided an overview of the methodology. Cathy Noon asked if the transit

Ron Rakowsky **moved** to adopt the person hours of travel methodology as presented. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.

First phase selection targets were discussed. The funding targets are shown by project type instead of funding source, as has been done previously. Doug Rex noted the dollar totals reported do include the commitment to I-70 made by the Board in June. A question was asked if discussions between DRCOG and CDOT on swapping state funds for federal for projects have progressed. Debra Perkins-Smith and Jennifer Schaufele noted that discussions had not come to a conclusion. Cathy Noon asked if the Transportation Alternatives Project funds are in addition to the other funding. Staff noted they are. Cathy Noon noted that perhaps the bike/ped percentage may have been lower had that been known. It was pointed out that while TAP program funds will be used in the metro area, they are not DRCOG's funds to control.

Jackie Millet **moved** to approve the first phase total funding targets as presented by staff. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** with four opposed.

Jackie Millet **moved** to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee and the DRCOG Board the Draft *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation, Procedures for Preparing the 2016-2021 TIP*. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.

Discussion of the second phase project selection process will begin in August.

Move to recommend to the Board of Directors (1) establish an ad hoc group of Board members and alternates to explore integrating housing into Metro Vision 2040 and (2) establish an ad hoc group of Board members and alternates to explore the integration of economic vitality into Metro Vision 2040

The Chair noted that the committee is being asked to recommend establishing two ad hoc groups of Board Members and Board Alternates on two issues that have surfaced during the Metro Vision 2040 process. Staff provided highlights from interviews, surveys and data analysis. The Board's adopted work plan directs staff to develop plan implementation strategies to eliminate gaps relative to access to housing choices and economic opportunity. Members discussed the two topics (housing and economic development).

Doug Tisdale **moved** to recommend to the Board of Directors to establish ad hoc groups of Board Members and Board Alternates to explore integrating housing and economic vitality into Metro Vision 2040. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.

Managed Lanes Policy Discussion

Steve Cook provided information gathered by staff on managed lane policies in various metropolitan areas. Members noted that information was requested specifically on High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) policies, not managed lanes. Staff was asked to research HOV policies further and bring additional information back to the group.

Other Matters

No other matters were discussed

Metro Vision Issues Committee Summary

July 2, 2014

Page 3

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **August 6, 2014**.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00p.m.

ATTACH B

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
August 6, 2014	Action	4

SUBJECT

Second phase selection for 2016-2021 TIP projects.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Provide direction to DRCOG staff on criteria to be used for the selection of 2016-2021 TIP projects in second phase.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

At its July meeting, the Board approved the Policy on Transportation Improvement Program Preparation (aka TIP Policy) which will be used as the basis for selecting projects for the 2016-2021 TIP. As part of its deliberations, staff informed the Board that second phase criteria was not part of their action and will be amended into the TIP Policy document later this fall per MVIC and Board actions.

Second Phase Criteria

TIP projects will be selected in two phases. In the first phase, projects are selected directly from the score-ranked lists of funding requests by project type. A maximum of 75 percent of available funds will be programmed in first phase. The remaining 25 percent of funds are programmed in second phase and will consider other criteria in addition to project score. In the last TIP, the following criteria were considered:

- Financial equity of past expenditures within the counties of DRCOG
- Projects in very small communities
- Estimates of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reductions for specific project types
- Projects in strategic corridors

Attachment 1 provides the description used in the 2012-2017 TIP Policy document for second phase selection. Very small communities has been redefined for the 2016-2021 TIP to include any community with less than \$10 million in annual net sales tax value (based on the most recent Colorado Department of Revenue statistics). Strategic corridors criterion was removed from consideration in the new TIP Policy as a result of a previous MVIC action, and GHG reduction is no longer calculated for TIP project applications.

At the August meeting, staff requests direction as to whether MVIC wishes to retain the existing applicable criteria and if there are other criteria that the group would like to consider.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

July 2, 2014 MVIC Meeting

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to direct DRCOG staff on criteria to be used for selection of second phase 2016-2021 TIP projects.

ATTACHMENT

Attachment 1: Excerpt from the 2013-2017 TIP Policy document describing second phase selection

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or jschuafele@drcoq.org; or Doug Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcoq.org

Attachment 1

Excerpt from the 2012-2017 TIP Policy

Second Phase Selection

The remaining 25 percent of not-yet-programmed funding will be programmed in this second phase of selection, considering not only score, but the following criteria as well:

Financial equity of project awards among DRCOG members at the county level.

Projects in strategic corridors (see Section II.B and Appendix F).

Projects in very small communities (less than 12,500 population or employment per Table 3).

Greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions from projects in specific project types.

Financial equity shall be calculated by totaling the federal dollars programmed by county for the past nine years (FY03 through FY11 in current and previous TIPs), proposed for projects in the 2012-2017 TIP from the CDOT and RTD selection processes, and recommended for projects in the 2012-2017 TIP from the first phase selection. Those totals shall be compared to the percent contribution from each county to the region, based on three weighted factors: population (40 percent), gross vehicle miles of travel (40 percent), and transportation-related sales tax revenues (20 percent). A county shall be considered “even” if its estimated percentage of programmed expenditures is within 10 percentage points of its computed percentage of contributions. Given that DRCOG does not have comprehensive expenditure information for SW Weld County prior to FY08, Weld County will be defined as “even” for 2012-2017 TIP.

Greenhouse gas reduction project types include the following: Roadway Operational Improvements, Rapid Transit, Transit Passenger Facilities, New or Expanded Bus Service, Bicycle/Pedestrian (new only), and Air Quality Improvement Projects. Projects in those categories to be considered in the second phase will report 1) an approximate calculated daily reduction in GHG, and 2) for roadway operational projects only, the percentage of the 15 multimodal points the project received.

While funding request scoring within each project type category will not be the primary consideration for the second selection phase, no submittals scoring below 50 points will be considered except for projects in very small communities (which must score a minimum of 40 points). All remaining eligible submittals will be considered during second phase selection, including submittals in project types with a 0% target in the first phase, for all relevant categories of funds. If the “next meaningful phase” of the roadway capacity projects selected in the 2008-2013 TIP cannot be accommodated within the roadway capacity funding target for first phase selection, it shall be explicitly considered during the second phase process. The Metro Vision Issues Committee will make funding request selection recommendations in the second phase.

For roadway capacity projects, this may include recommendations to continue funding the next phase of previously-selected projects or to fund the study phase or initial implementation phase of new submittals.

ATTACH C

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
August 6, 2014	Action	5

SUBJECT

Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) direction on the urban centers element of the *Metro Vision 2040* plan.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Provide direction to staff regarding the urban centers element of the *Metro Vision 2040* plan.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

DRCOG staff will provide an overall project update on the development of Metro Vision 2040 and will specifically seek guidance from MVIC on the urban centers element of Metro Vision 2040.

Urban centers have long been a key element in the region's growth framework dating back to the first Metro Vision adopted in 1992. Quantitative and qualitative analysis of the current and future regional impacts of directing growth into urban centers has been a central element of the development of Metro Vision 2040.

The attached Metro Vision 2040 Issues Summary provides an overview stakeholder feedback and scenario analysis related to urban centers.

Initial Direction from MVIC

In concurrence with stakeholder feedback, the Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC) recommended to DRCOG staff that the concept of accommodating 50 percent of new housing and 75 percent of new employment be carried over to Metro Vision 2040.

Staff and MVPAC have noted that the description of the desired employment outcome will need to be revised in Metro Vision 2040. The current goal aspires for urban centers to accommodate 75 percent of "new" employment in the region between 2005 and 2035. Current data do not allow for staff to isolate whether a job in an urban center is new to the region, or if was a job that changed locations within the region.

Staff is asking for guidance from MVIC on some key points before moving forward with drafting a revised element for MVIC and Board consideration:

- Should staff proceed with the concept of a measurable outcome related to urban centers in Metro Vision 2040?

- What information will MVIC and the Board need to affirm the outcome or create a new outcome?

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to provide staff direction regarding the urban centers element of Metro Vision 2040.

ATTACHMENT

Metro Vision 2040 Issue Update – Urban Centers

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org; Brad Calvert, Metro Vision Manager, Regional Planning and Operations at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org



Urban Centers

Metro Vision 2040 Issue Update – July 22, 2014

For more than two decades since the adoption of the Metro Vision Guiding Vision, Metro Vision has served as the foundation for an ongoing conversation about how to protect the quality of life that makes our region such an attractive place to live, work, play and raise families. Metro Vision 2040 intends to carry forward an integrated, regional framework that builds on the existing plan while also addressing ongoing and emerging issues of importance to the broader region.

Urban centers are a key piece of our region's overall framework for growth and have been since the Guiding Vision was adopted in 1992. On several occasions since the original Metro Vision plan was adopted in 1997 the link between successfully achieving significant growth and urban centers and progress toward other regional goals (e.g. reducing VMT) has been demonstrated through regional scenario modeling. Metro Vision 2035 currently recognizes 104 distinct urban centers across the region.

This Issue Update provides a high-level overview of plan development activities and preliminary issues, opportunities and challenges related to urban centers.

Stakeholder Engagement

Numerous community outreach and stakeholder efforts will inform Metro Vision 2040. Key stakeholder input on the issue of urban centers is summarized below.

Metro Vision 2040 Listening Tour

Twenty-one in-depth interviews, 11 listening groups with more than 190 participants and an online survey completed by 1,177 stakeholders comprised the data collection methods for the Listening Tour. Listening Tour participants described the qualities that would make the Denver region the best place in the country for people of all ages, abilities, and incomes to live.

- With respect to housing and development in the year 2040, Listening Tour Participants visualized a region characterized by dense mixed-use, mixed-income homes located around transit nodes.
- Participants described a region with accessible and affordable housing units along transit lines.
- The findings from the Listening Tour suggested that Metro Vision 2040 should explore how suburban communities and major transportation corridors can become more accessible for walking and bicycling – a key attribute of successful urban centers.

Economic Development Focus Groups

Prior to developing the scope of work for the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) DRCOG staff convened focus groups with economic development professionals around the region. The focus



groups provided input on key areas where the interests of the economic development community and DRCOG overlap. Key takeaways from this initial outreach are described below.

- Nearly 50 percent of economic development professionals were not familiar with the concept of urban centers and the region's desire to accommodate significant population and employment growth in urban centers.
- Over 60 percent indicated that it is important for the region to prioritize areas for future growth.
- Over 80 percent suggested that urban centers have, or can, play a role in their future success and that first- and last-mile challenges are limiting the development potential of areas served by transit.
- A well-planned region (including urban centers, regional trail network, etc.) is critically important to economic development.

Local Government Survey

DRCOG created the Metro Vision 2040 Local Government Survey to gain a better understanding of local growth and development challenges throughout the Denver region. The Local Government Survey was an online, voluntary survey. A diverse cross-section of 27 communities throughout the region participated in the survey – communities ranging in size from 600 to more than 600,000 completed the survey. DRCOG received completed surveys from six counties and 21 municipalities.

The survey did not include specific questions concerning urban centers, but several communities noted the importance of urban center planning in their local initiatives.

- DRCOG's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) offers an opportunity to continue to make needed infrastructure investments in urban centers.
- Local urban centers are a primary focus in meeting numerous challenges – including protecting rural and natural resources.
- Critical to focus on infill development not only in urban centers, but also areas with enhanced transit access – both are opportunities to support future development.

Urban Centers Survey and Interviews

In the spring of 2014 DRCOG created an online survey including 23 questions covering housing, employment, economic development, transportation, placemaking strategies, and evaluation in urban centers. Eighty-four designated urban centers, 82% of the total, participated in the online survey.

In addition to the survey, directors and staff of planning and public works departments representing ten urban centers were interviewed to gain additional insight into the successes



centers have achieved and the challenges they continue to face. A summary of key findings and observations from the survey and interviews follow.

- Most urban centers are considered to be successful and feel they weathered the recession fairly well compared to other areas – 2/3rds of centers are actively transitioning to more intense land uses.
- Many jurisdictions view their centers as successful, but also see potential for additional positive outcomes.
- The importance of a long-term commitment (staff and elected) cannot be overstated.
- The need for continuous infrastructure investment, particularly multi-modal facilities, is a universal issue across urban centers – many rely on federal transportation funds available through DRCOG.
- Some confusion remains about the “50/75” goal in Metro Vision 2035 – some communities are under the impression that they are expected to capture 50 percent of housing and 75 percent of their local growth in designated centers (vs. the regional nature of the goal).
- Most centers desire or are actively encouraging multi-family development (more than 80 percent of respondents desire apartments, condos, mixed-use w/ residential with apartments most commonly developed) – the vast majority of housing developed recently has been market rate.
- An oversupply of retail and commercially-zoned land within and adjacent to centers is a major barrier to center development.
- Centers with large, undeveloped parcels or well-established business districts have done best in attracting significant development, but other locations struggle with small parcels and fractured ownership in redevelopment areas (consolidating parcels is difficult in both “strong” and “weak” markets).
- Rail stations are critical in attracting employment to centers – last-mile, multi-modal investments are an area of focus.

Metro Vision Idea Exchange – May 14, 2014

DRCOG hosted a Metro Vision Idea Exchange in May 2014 (*Urban Centers: Making it Work in “Not-so-Urban” Places*). Idea Exchanges are an opportunity for member government land use and transportation planners, local elected officials, other local government staff and stakeholders from the private sector to share information and ideas, as well as learn about best practices that support Metro Vision goals. For details on May 2014 Idea Exchange, including presentations please see the link below.

<https://drcog.org/planning-great-region/implementing-metro-vision/metro-vision-idea-exchange>

Key takeaways from the discussion at the Idea Exchange included:



- Parking is a key challenge, but there is no perfect parking ratio, parking must be constantly monitored and adjusted.
- It is critical to program urban centers (e.g. events) so they become destinations for the entire community.
- Flexible design to allow density is critical – beginning a conversation about the vision of a place with desired densities is not an effective method.
- Continuous investments in multi-modal infrastructure are critical – these investments send a signal to the private sector about the type of development products that are desired.
- Education of multiple stakeholders (e.g. elected officials, property owners, residents, businesses) is critical in the long-term success of urban centers.

Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC)

MVPAC is a temporary DRCOG committee charged with advising the DRCOG Board of Directors and Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) on the development and implementation of Metro Vision 2040. MVPAC will work with DRCOG staff to develop policy options and make recommendations to the Board and MVIC.

MVPAC has consistently discussed urban centers since the committee formed in January 2013. Committee discussions have included technical guidance during scenario analysis and initial policy direction for Board consideration. The committee most recently discussed potential revisions to the urban centers element of Metro Vision in June and July 2014. Highlights of MVPAC's discussions in June and July are described below.

- Urban centers should remain central to the region's overall growth framework – the current goal of accommodating 50 percent of new housing and 75 percent of new employment growth in urban centers should carry over to Metro Vision 2040.
- DRCOG may need to revisit how the current goal is described/measured – it is very difficult to measure “new” jobs (jobs may be relocating to urban centers from other areas in the region, therefore they are not new to the region).
- While urban centers should be highly accessible places that provide opportunity (economic, educational, needed services, etc.) to the region's residents, they have not achieved this desired attribute.
- Overall Metro Vision should aim to improve the messaging on urban centers – important to stress these areas are local priority areas for growth and investment, not areas that are designed by DRCOG without local input.
- Metro Vision 2040 should also acknowledge corridors and highly transit-accessible areas – scenario analysis revealed that accommodating growth and development in these areas will contribute to progress on other regional goals (e.g. reducing VMT).
- Some suburban communities are struggling to add urban center-style developments. The development community is interested in these locations, but



unwilling to develop products consistent with the local and regional vision for urban centers.

- While some urban centers are largely built-out there is little interest in differentiating these areas from those centers that expect significant growth.

Metro Vision 2040 Scenario Planning Overview

Regional scenarios contain a package of “what-if” factors that represent a change from our Base 2040 assumptions (2040 Base). Scenarios are modeled to produce transportation, air quality, population, and other outcome measures. In 2013 DRCOG staff modeled five scenarios that adjusted base assumptions – three of those scenarios included changes to assumptions related to the share of growth captured in urban centers. Key observations developed by staff with input from the MVPAC and TAC (Transportation Advisory Committee) follow.

- Scenarios demonstrated that the region’s goal to accommodate a significant share of future population and employment growth in urban centers will greatly influence the region’s ability to lower vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increase travel by other modes.
- Scenarios that did not focus on housing growth in urban centers and/or transit areas had little notable change from 2040 Base on VMT.
- Scenarios that focused population and employment growth in urban centers resulted in decreased congestion compared to base, and also increased access to employment via transit.
- In addition to focusing growth in urban centers adjustments to transit and auto costs impacted scenario performance and progress toward regional goals.
- Significant increases in overall households and household densities are needed to meet the Metro Vision goal of accommodating 50 percent of new housing in urban centers.

Other Items to Consider in Metro Vision 2040 Development and Implementation

Existing “50/75” Goal

Recent data analysis suggested the region made significant progress toward the existing goal in the past few years, but work remains to be done if the region is to achieve this goal. Overall stakeholder sentiment is that the goal is aggressive, but should remain in Metro Vision 2040. As noted previously, consideration will be given to the measure or indicator associated with employment growth – e.g. how to properly measure job growth/change in urban centers.

Urban Center Boundaries

Throughout the stakeholder engagement process numerous entities noted the importance of areas that fall just outside existing urban center boundaries. Many areas adjacent to centers have experienced more intense development along with the urban center due to desirable market conditions. Most urban centers were designated several years ago under designation criteria that



changed in early 2012 – a thorough and thoughtful review of urban center boundaries may be needed to fully capture local areas prioritized for increased population and employment growth.

Implementation Tools and Assistance

Stakeholders consistently identified the potential need for DRCOG to take on a more direct role in ensuring local communities have the tools to successfully realize their local vision for urban centers. Suggested roles for DRCOG varied widely, examples of identified roles include: toolkits to assist with vision implementation; funding local planning studies and updated regulations; facilitating infill development; and educational tools and programs.

Ongoing Measurement and Evaluation

The urban centers survey and interviews revealed that most jurisdictions communities do not monitor metrics associated with individual urban centers, but would like data on each individual urban center. The Metro Vision 2035 Growth and Development Supplement commits DRCOG staff to conduct periodic surveys of local governments with urban centers – the first of survey was completed as part of the Metro Vision 2040 process and a high-level summary was provided in this issue update. Going forward DRCOG will need to consider the most effective and appropriate way to monitor and evaluate individual and collective urban center performance.