

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, May 1, 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 April 3, 2013 Meeting
(Attachment A)

ACTION ITEMS

4. *Motion to recommend modifying Transportation Improvement Policy (TIP) policy regarding Station Area/Urban Center studies
(Attachment B) Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning & Operations
5. *Motion to provide direction to staff on Metro Vision 2040 Modeling Scenarios
(Attachment C) Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

6. CDOT RAMP Funding and Budgetary Program
(Attachment D) Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager, Transportation Planning & Operations

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

7. Other Matters
8. Next Meeting – June 5 2013
9. Adjournment

***Motion Requested**

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!



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 B

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

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

Subject: **FY14-15 Station Area/Urban Center Studies**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
May 1, 2013	Action	4

REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to recommend modifying Transportation Improvement Policy (TIP) policy regarding Station Area/Urban Center studies.

SUMMARY

- There is \$1.985 million in the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for urban center and station area studies.
- Station Area and Urban Center study funding is for creating detailed local visions and action strategies that contribute to the achievement of regional goals.
- The [Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee](#) (MVPAC) and DRCOG staff recommend modifying TIP policy to allow for more frequent funding cycles to accommodate changing regional and local circumstances.
- Eligible study types: corridor-wide studies, urban center and station area plans, next steps studies, and area planning and implementation activities – see attachment for specific details (Proposed Eligibility Rules).
- Evaluation criteria: Depending upon the study type, evaluation criteria will address various factors from the study area's inclusion in the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and/or Metro Vision; to giving priority to stations now open or open within 5 years; to the proposer's ability to implement study results; and more. See attachment for specific details (Evaluation Criteria).
- Other Eligibility Items:
 - Sponsors are limited to two studies per fiscal year.
 - \$75,000 minimum and \$200,000 maximum request per station area/urban center.
 - The DRCOG Board will vote to amend the TIP with projects meeting criteria as established herein.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

N/A

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

- Alternative 1 - Recommend TIP modifications as outlined herein and described in greater detail in the attachments.
- Alternative 2 - Leave TIP policy as is.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

MVPAC and DRCOG staff recommend Alternative 1.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Attachments:

- Draft FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies – Project Eligibility Criteria
- Draft FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies – Evaluation Criteria

FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies – Project Eligibility Rules

Station Area Master Plans or Urban Center Studies further implementation of the fiscally constrained regional transit network (do we have an updated figure we can point to) at existing or future rapid transit station locations OR further implementation of urban centers identified in the Metro Vision 2035 plan. Such studies include the four types of planning studies described below. Sponsors are limited to two studies per fiscal year (i.e. each sponsor could have as many as two studies in FY14 and two studies in FY15).

1.) Corridor-wide studies focusing on:

- Maximizing multi-modal connectivity within transit corridors (including high frequency bus corridors that serve one or more urban centers – high frequency bus corridors have headways of 15 minutes or less) and at individual station areas/urban centers along the corridor
- Identifying barriers to station area development and increased transit use along the corridor – barriers could include current land use, zoning and development standards; parking availability and cost; inadequate supportive infrastructure, etc.
- Creating corridor-wide implementation strategies and/or an action plan identifying such things as needed plan updates, code revisions, and financial or regulatory incentive
- Corridor-wide studies must involve all the local jurisdictions and other major stakeholders along the corridor

2.) Creation and adoption of an “original” or updated station area master plan or urban center study. The scope for such a plan/study must include:

Stakeholder Engagement

- Outreach and engagement process that promotes the involvement of stakeholders in the study area, with efforts and accommodations made to include low to moderate income, minority, and elderly or disabled citizens
- Active involvement by DRCOG, any relevant transit agency, and the public in the development of the plan

Placemaking

- Identification (map) of type and density of future land uses, including public spaces
- Internal circulation plan(s) (maps or graphics) for motor vehicles, transit, bicycle and pedestrian and strategies to increase multi-modal connections with the larger region
- Identifying barriers (e.g. parking, zoning, infrastructure, etc.) to station area and/or urban center development
- Detailed development strategies that allow people of all ages, incomes and abilities the opportunity to access a range of housing, employment, and services
- A market or fiscal feasibility analysis that assesses plan recommendations and ensures the proposed plan is realistic and/or efforts to market the area to the development community in cases where a traditional market might not yet exist

Action Plan and Implementation Strategies

- A clear and realistic action plan to address key findings, including identification of necessary policy or regulatory changes (e.g. comprehensive plan, zoning, etc.); infrastructure improvements, and housing strategies
- An implementation strategy that describes the organizational structure and process that will be used to ensure the action plan is implemented

Assessment and Impacts

- Indicators or metrics related to key strategies (e.g. housing affordability, multi-modal connectivity, leveraging private investment, environmental quality, etc.)
- Identification of the transportation impacts and air quality benefits of the proposed plan
- Current and future population, housing units, and employment estimates to the year 2040 (in five-year increments), including distribution of planned housing units by type and square feet of future non-residential development

3.) Additional “Next Step” plans/studies to further the development of the area if a station area master plan or urban center study was previously developed and adopted. Such plans/studies are only eligible if they:

- Are for planning activities that are clearly and unambiguously related to transportation infrastructure for use by the general public, AND
- Are for planning/design activities that do not conflict with any relevant transit agency’s planning/design activities as demonstrated by a letter of concurrence from the agency.

Next Step studies should be identified in an existing plan for the area and must further the existing plan – potential Next Step projects could include:

- Parking management studies
- Access management plans
- Corridor redevelopment plans
- Design studies and concepts for multi-modal infrastructure projects
- Street design standards/manuals
- Regional multi-use trail feasibility study
- Multi-use Trail/Bike Facilities plan
- Urban design and development guidelines
- Targeting housing strategies (e.g. to facilitate jobs-housing balance, affordable housing, etc.)
- Comprehensive wayfinding plans and strategies
- Traffic circulation studies (including traffic simulation model development)
- First/Last-mile mobility implementation, financing, partnership studies
- Transit circulator feasibility
- Transportation demand management studies and implementation activities

4.) Area Planning and Implementation Activities

Area Implementation Activities will promote innovative planning activities that can be replicated throughout the Denver region. Eligible projects will include multiple jurisdictions, station areas and urban centers aiming to study a common issue while focusing on local context and implementation strategies – the projects could include:

- Electric or natural gas-fueled vehicles facility planning
- Parking management planning and strategies
- Development and TOD financing strategies
- Workforce and affordable housing tools
- First/last-mile mobility implementation and financing studies

FY 14-15 Station Area/Urban Centers Studies - Evaluation Criteria

Metro Vision establishes the importance of urban centers in transit station areas in the region's efforts to reach regional goals and describes a desired future that includes healthy, livable communities connected by a robust multi-modal transportation network. These communities will have high levels of internal connectivity and be well-connected to the region at large. Additionally, they will support housing suitable for a wide range of incomes and the full spectrum of life stages; and use innovative planning, zoning and urban design strategies to promote higher density, mixed-use development, and transportation options.

DRCOG staff will determine eligibility based on the Project Eligibility Rules. The following evaluation criteria will be applied to all eligible submittals.

Project Evaluation – Regional Priorities

DRCOG staff will conduct an evaluation to identify priority projects in each eligible study type (i.e. corridor-wide, original studies, next steps, and area planning and implementation activities). A second evaluation (Project Impact) will also be conducted as described below. Regional priorities for studies are as follows:

1. **Corridor-wide studies:** Priority will be given to existing transit corridors and corridors on the fiscally constrained regional transit network that are not receiving corridor planning funds through the region's Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI). Transit corridors included in the FC-2035-RTP Regional Transit Network that are not receiving SCI corridor planning funds include:
 - I-225 LRT Corridor: Parker Road to East Corridor
 - North Metro Rail Line (Denver Union Station to Stock Show Station & Stock Show Station to 72nd Ave Station)
 - Southeast Rail Extension: Lincoln Ave. to Ridgegate Pkwy
 - West Corridor LRT: Denver Union Station to Jefferson County Gov't Center
 - Downtown Denver Circulator
2. **"Original" or major updates to Urban Center/Station Area Plans:**
 - Proposed study areas include a rapid transit station and include an urban center designated in *Metro Vision* will be given priority.
 - Urban centers designated as "existing" or "emerging" will be prioritized over "planned" urban centers.
3. **Next Steps Studies**
 - Stations that are currently open to the public or on corridors expected to be open for service within 5 years according to the current FC-2035-RTP Regional Transit Network will be given priority.

4. Area Planning and Implementation Activities

- Studies, plans, tools plans or programs that directly advance Metro Vision, including RTP, policies (e.g. Urban Centers and Transportation policies) through regional/multi-jurisdictional planning and implementation will be given priority.

Project Evaluation – Project Impact

In addition to the Regional Priorities Evaluation a second evaluation criteria will be applied to proposed, eligible projects. Proposals will be evaluated by a project recommendation committee comprised of DRCOG staff, selected regional stakeholders with a variety of interests and expertise (e.g. transportation, design, environment, housing, etc.), RTD and local governments that have previously received funds, but are not seeking funds in FY14 or FY15. The committee will submit recommendations to the appropriate DRCOG committees and Board of Directors. Recommendations will reflect the regional priority evaluation described above and the project impact criteria described below.*

Study Need (20% - proposed) - *Application will include an issue statement that clearly identifies the local /regional need of the study along with the desired outcomes.*

Potential of Study Area to Contribute to the vision, goals and policies embodied in Metro Vision (60% - proposed), including:

- Be active, pedestrian-, bicycle-, and transit-friendly places that are more dense and mixed in use than surrounding areas
- Promote regional sustainability by reducing per capita VMT, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions
- Provide reliable mobility choices to all users: residents and visitors of all ages, incomes and abilities, as well as businesses that provide services and produce or sell goods.

Local Commitment and Ability to Implement (10% - proposed) – *Urban Center/Station Area studies are the first step in a larger commitment to implement the plan and create positive changes at the local level that contribute to regional goals. Applicants will describe prior activities in support of quality growth projects in the study area as well as the sponsor’s ability to successfully complete the project in a timely fashion while involving project area stakeholders. Sponsor overmatch will also be considered.*

Innovation and Feasibility (10% - proposed) – *Proposed studies will be evaluated on project applicability, feasibility and innovation. Project evaluation will focus on:*

- *Innovation in project scope*
- *Practicality/feasibility of scope of work and budget*
- *Coordination with other local governments, organizations, and non-profits*
- *Applicability and transferability of project outcomes locally and regionally*

* At such time that Project Impact evaluation criteria have been finalized DRCOG staff will develop an application that provides guidance to sponsors on information needed to evaluate project proposals.

DRAFT

ATTACH C

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

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

and Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning and Operations
303 480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org

Subject: **Direction to Staff on Metro Vision 2040 Modeling Scenarios**

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
May 1, 2013	Information	5

REQUESTED ACTION

The purpose of this item is to 1) update MVIC on guidance from the DRCOG TAC and Metro Vision Planning and Advisory Committee (MVPAC) concerning scenario planning for Metro Vision 2040 and, 2) get assurance from MVIC the technical committees and staff are heading in the appropriate direction.

SUMMARY

- Scenario analysis may assist the Board in identifying and later adopting policies and action strategies to help the region attain certain goals over the next 20 years.
- Metro Vision scenario analysis is akin to estimating the expected worth of your financial portfolio over a given period of time by assuming changes in key factors like the value of your individual securities or adjustments in interest rates. Not unlike estimating your portfolio's worth when favorable or less favorable events occur, Metro Vision scenario analysis estimates impacts of changes for example, in population growth rates, roadway congestion, revenue collection, etc. between now and the year 2040.
- In December 2012, MVIC discussed and provided feedback on scenario analysis for the 2040 Metro Vision Plan, identifying important overall outcomes to measure like vehicle miles traveled, job accessibility by transportation mode, combined housing and transportation costs, etc. (See Table 1).
- Using MVIC's December feedback, DRCOG's TAC and MVPAC worked to refine the measures, making them more precise. For example, using the first outcome on Table 1, VMT, it's suggested VMT be calculated in at least three different ways to better understand various effects of the scenarios on VMT.
- Not unlike how you may make adjustments in your financial portfolio based on quarterly earnings statements, as DRCOG's scenario analysis modeling progresses over the summer and model results are assessed, some additional refinements may be necessary, i.e., some model outputs aren't technically reliable.
- Table 2 (attached) shows four example scenarios discussed by TAC and MVPAC. The adjustments listed under each scenario represent staff's initial effort to define levels of change that may be discernible in model results. Early model results will inform us as to the need to increase the level of change of any factors. These example scenarios offer wide variations for the purpose of stimulating thought and discussion:

- Scenario A focuses on expanding roadway system;
 - Scenario B focuses on increased and more affordable transit service;
 - Scenario C reflects a population growth rate much higher than currently predicted; and,
 - Scenario D will adjust factors to see “what is necessary” to meet current Metro Vision goals. These adjustments will be finalized after obtaining preliminary model results this summer.
- The number of possible scenarios and combinations of adjusted factors is limitless. In addition to being impracticable to account for every possible change in key factors, time constraints limit DRCOG to modeling 4 to 6 scenarios.
 - Of the scenarios selected, each will be run through the DRCOG model to produce comparable outcome measures. Existing policies and planning assumptions in Metro Vision 2035 will serve as the 2040 Base Scenario.
 - Next steps:
 - At its regular meeting in May, the DRCOG Board will discuss and recommend scenarios for staff to begin modeling.
 - Later this summer, staff will update committees regarding progress and obtain any necessary further direction.

PRIOR BOARD ACTION

- August 2012 - Approval of approach to using scenario analysis to inform the Metro Vision 2040 plan update process
- December 2012 – MVIC provided guidance to staff on outcome measures to be evaluated through the 2040 scenario planning process

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

N/A

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Attachments:

- Table 1: Regional Scenario Outcome Measures
- Table 2: Draft 2040 Factors to Consider in Scenarios – Example Scenarios for Discussion

Table 1
DRCOG 2040 Regional Scenario Outcome Measures

April 25, 2013

Important Outcome Topic Areas (Based on MVIC keypad polling at Dec. meeting)	Refined Measures (per TAC & MVPAC)		
	All are weekday measures unless otherwise noted		
VMT (Vehicle Miles of Travel) & PMT (Person Miles of Travel)	VMT/capita, VMT/household, Avg. trip length	VMT% of total PMT	Share of VMT & PMT by travel mode
VHT (Vehicle Hours of Travel) & PHT (Person Hours of Travel)	Share of PHT by travel mode	VHT% of total PHT	Share of VHT & PHT by travel mode
Traffic congestion (e.g. Vehicle & Person Hours of Delay, other measures)	Vehicle hours of delay per household	Lane miles severely congested, Avg. speed, Peak/Off Peak variation	Level of Service (LOS) for different modes
Travel mode share (bike, walk, transit, SOV, transit, carpool, etc.)	% persons SOV to work	% persons using transit (& bike, walk) to work and for all trips	Calculate for peak hour and for specific corridors also
GHG (Greenhouse Gas) emissions by transportation	GHG transportation emissions/capita		
Criteria pollutant emissions (Ozone-Hydrocarbons & Nitrogen Oxides, PM-10, CO)	Air quality conformity mobile source emissions		
Job accessibility by mode of travel (For entire region and for environmental justice areas)	% of population with 100,000+ jobs within: 55 min. transit ride, 20 min. drive, walk, bike	# of jobs located within 1/2 mile of transit stop or station	Jobs within X miles of bicycle facilities
Cost of traffic congestion (economic, etc.)	total cost of delay to freight, motorists, & passengers	annual congestion delay cost per person	consider fuel costs
Regional housing and population density	housing units per square mile in UGB area		
Fuel (energy use and cost) use for transportation	Total gasoline/fuel consumption	Gasoline/fuel consumption per capita	
Cost of "regional system" transportation facilities	Cost of added roadway capacity, rapid transit, etc	Costs for preservation of transportation system	Per Capita
Housing and employment growth in designated Urban Centers	Average commute time/distance	Transit accessibility	
Where people live vs. where they work (e.g. median distance, % less than "X" miles, etc.)	#/% of home-to-work trips with both origin and destination within 1/2 mile of transit service	average work trip travel time (and distance?) by travel modes (for representative locations (TAZs)	where people live defined by age and mode choice
People/jobs/trips within "X" miles of transit, bicycle facilities	% within 1/2 mile and 1 mile of transit stop or station	% of pop within 1/2 mile of off-street multi-use trail	Number of jobs within X minutes of representative locations
Number of transportation options available to residents (rural vs. urban vs. suburban)	mode shares defined by rural geog (outside of DRCOG UGB/A)	mode shares defined by urban centers	% of population in each "area type" with good access to transit service
Land consumption for Urban Development	Square miles within DRCOG region		
Representative fiscal impacts of growth (localized examples)	Cost of new development vs. re-development/retrofits		
Degree of mixed land uses	% of region with strong mix of existing or zoned land uses		
Housing + Transportation Costs to residents	Housing & transportation costs & share of income by geographic areas	Average commute time	Housing affordability

Table 2
Draft 2040 Factors to Consider in Scenarios - Example Scenarios for Discussion
 April 24, 2013

Factors	2040 BASE Scenario	Scenario A Roadway & Managed Lanes Focus	Scenario B Transit, Bicycle, Pedestrian Focus	Scenario C Really High Pop Growth w/ Base Transp. System	Scenario D "What Will it Take"? to Meet MV goals **
SOCIOECONOMIC/DEMOGRAPHIC		Change From Base 2040 Scenario			
Population Growth (2010 to 2040)	1,350,000	same as base	same as base	2,000,000	same as base
Employment Growth (2010 to 2040)	765,000	same	same	1,300,000	same
Household Growth (2010 to 2040)	611,000	same	same	841,805	same
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM					
Rapid Transit System-Rail miles (2035 FasTracks)	110	same	All FasTracks (+50)	same	↑
Rapid Transit - Bus/HOV Center Line (CL) miles	47	+100 miles managed lanes	+ 50 miles managed lanes	same	↑
Bus Service Levels (annual hours)	2,970,000		20% increase	same	↑
Bus Service Levels (annual miles)	35,600,000		20% increase	same	↑
Cost (fares) for Transit	Inflation		reduce price / reflect more free transit use	same	↑
Additional Roadway Lane Miles (LM):					
- new Regional System (non-toll) LM	800	+ 200 ln. miles	reduce to +400 LMs	same	↑
Toll / Managed Lane CL miles	committed system	+ 100 miles	+ 50 miles	same	↑
Other Fees, etc.					
Cost of Gasoline (e.g. \$3.80 @ 2%/yr inflation)	~\$6.75/gal		~\$13.50/gal	same	↑
Additional "Cost of Driving"	Inflation		double	same	Adjust any of these factors as desired
Miles of Bicycle Facilities	2,000		3,000	same	↑
Acceptance (Utility Factor) of Walk/Bicycling			"double"	same	↑
Share of Pop. "Driving" / Auto availability	1.74 autos/HH		reduce # autos/HH	same	↑
Location/Amount of Free or Pay Parking			Add costs in additional areas?		↓
GROWTH & DEVELOPMENT					
UGB/UGA Additional Area (sq. miles)	260	?	?	350 ?	↓
Share / Amount of Growth in Urban Centers					
- Housing Units	17%				50%
- Employment	48%				75%
Share Infill vs. Greenfield New Development					
OTHER					
Level of Teleworking (work at home)	6.3%				↓
Average Household Size	2.376				↓
Age Cohort Distribution (e.g. % > age 65)	25%				↓

Goals: ** 10% less VMT/capita
 ** 10% less GHG/capita
 ** 50% of HH, 75% employment growth in urban centers

ATTACH D

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

From: Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager
(303) 480-6747 or scook@drcog.org

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
May 1, 2013	Informational Briefing	6

REQUESTED ACTION

No action requested. This item is for information only.

SUMMARY

- At its April meeting, the Board approved MVIC recommendations regarding CDOT's RAMP (*Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnership*) program:
 - Remain neutral on all projects and not prepare letters of support
 - Identify all RAMP-eligible projects included in the adopted *2035 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan* (referred to as the RTP herein) 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). Hold additional meetings, if necessary.
 - 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.
 - As CDOT may select project(s) not in the 2035 RTP and which are viewed as inconsistent with the RTP, the Board would then decide whether or not to amend the project(s) in the RTP.
 - Adjust the Board's RTP amendment schedule as needed to accommodate any RAMP amendments to the 2035 RTP.

- Major RAMP milestones:
 - May 1—Pre-applications for projects due to CDOT
 - May 31—Eligibility determined
 - July 1—Final applications due to CDOT
 - Aug 30—CDOT recommended Program list of RAMP projects to fund

- Next steps for the DRCOG Board:
 - **May 15 DRCOG Board meeting**
 - A list of all projects in the DRCOG region submitted to CDOT for RAMP selection will be provided to the DRCOG Board prior to this meeting. The Board will be informed as to which projects are in the adopted 2035

RTP and which are not. Staff will answer any questions Board members may have regarding the RTP goals, policies and action strategies.

- **June 5 Metro Vision Issues Committee meeting**
 - DRCOG staff will provide the list of RAMP-eligible projects which are included in the RTP; these projects automatically receive the Board's support.
 - DRCOG staff will also provide a list of any RAMP-eligible projects not included in the RTP. MVIC will review those projects in light of adopted RTP goals, policies and action strategies and will recommend Board action.

- **June DRCOG Board meeting (date to be determined)**
 - Approve a letter to CDOT accompanied by the final list of RAMP-eligible projects supported by the DRCOG Board.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTION

N/A

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

ALTERNATIVES

N/A

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

BACKUP INFORMATION

Attachments:

- 2035 Metro Vision RTP Goals, Policies and Action Strategies
- RAMP Project Selection Process (March 11, 2013)
- RAMP Calendar & Draft DRCOG Review Process

Links:

- [RAMP \(Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships\)](#)

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.

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.
Enterprise Bridge	Goal of Enterprise Bridge Program	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project selection based on Enterprise Bridge Plan
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 Partnerships 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-Private 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-Private 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. 	<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

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?
		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		

Push out a month if no consensus