

**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, October 2, 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 June 5, 2013 Meeting  
(Attachment A)

**CONSENT ITEM**

4. \* Move to recommend the proposed Urban Center amendments for modeling purposes  
(Attachment B) Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning & Operations

**ACTION ITEM**

5. \* Move to recommend to the Board of Directors that MVIC is the appropriate group to analyze and advise the Board on TIP improvements (policies, procedures, project selection), and other improvements to the TIP as agreed to during the meeting  
(Attachment C) Steve Cook, Acting Director, Transportation Planning & Operations

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

6. Other Matters
7. Next Meeting – November 6 2013
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





## SUMMARY OF METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING

June 5, 2013

MVIC Members Present: Rachel Zenzinger – Arvada; Nancy Sharpe – Arapahoe County; Sue Horn – Bennett; KC Becker – Boulder; Dennis McCloskey – Broomfield; Robin Kniech – Denver; Jack Hilbert – Douglas County; Sharon Richardson – Federal Heights; Marjorie Sloan – Golden; Ron Rakowsky – Greenwood Village; Don Rosier – Jefferson County; Jim Taylor – Littleton; Jackie Millet – Lone Tree; Katie Witt – Longmont; Hank Dalton – Louisville; Val Vigil – Thornton.

Others present: Mac Callison – Aurora; Suzanne Jones – Boulder; Art Griffith, Joe Fowler – Douglas County; Travis Greiman – Centennial; Phil Cernanec – Littleton; Darin Stavish, Jeff Sudmeier – CDOT; Jim Brady – Wilson Co.; and DRCOG staff.

### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.; a quorum was present.

### Public Comment

Julie McKay, Boulder County transportation planner, provided input on the RAMP eligible project process. She noted that Boulder County is supportive of participation in the program, and encouraged continued discussion of the implications of the program in the Denver region. She noted that they are supportive of funding of projects in the fiscally constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and that CDOT should provide additional information and assurances about the implications of the RAMP program on the fiscally constrained RTP.

### Summary of May 1, 2013 Meeting

The summary was accepted as written.

### Motion to recommend DRCOG input to the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) on Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnership (RAMP)-eligible projects

Jennifer Schaufele noted that a copy of the RAMP-eligible projects as published by CDOT was distributed. DRCOG staff recommends that input to CDOT should convey support for projects in the fiscally constrained RTP, projects that are not regionally significant (no action required by DRCOG Board to amend into the RTP), and projects that are regionally significant that are not currently in the RTP, in addition to the policies in the RTP. Ms. Schaufele noted that members have a couple of opportunities to weigh in on consistency. She further noted that staff feels that all projects on the list are consistent with the policies in the RTP.

Jim Taylor asked if CDOT selects projects for funding that are not currently in the fiscally constrained RTP, will the process to amend the RTP be streamlined. Ms. Schaufele noted that staff is ready to begin the process to amend the projects into the RTP as soon as a decision is made.

Jack Hilbert distributed a figure showing the Denver region transportation investment decision process and a sample of a project submittal.

Jack Hilbert **moved, seconded** by Dennis McCloskey to send a letter to CDOT that includes (1) the list of RAMP-eligible projects in the RTP, (2) the list of all other RAMP-eligible projects which are not regionally significant, (3) the list of all RAMP-eligible projects NOT in the RTP and (4) the 14 policies from the

RTP. The letter should explain the Board fully supports projects on lists 1 and 2 and any projects on list 3 that are consistent with the 14 policies from the RTP. When the final list is distributed by CDOT DRCOG will expedite amending the projects into the RTP if they are not already included. There was discussion.

Members expressed that the process to amend the projects should be simplified and expedited as much as possible. Some expressed continued concern with amending new projects in to the RTP and what effect it would have on projects already in the fiscally constrained Plan. Staff noted that CDOT and FHWA have assured us that fiscal constraint will not be an issue.

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

Motion to recommend how the Board will provide input regarding an MPACT64 project list for the sole purpose of polling

Jennifer Schaufele noted that several organizations throughout the state have been meeting to discuss transportation funding, known as MPACT64. CDOT is interested in conducting a poll of the public in August 2013 to determine their willingness to increase the sales tax to fund transportation projects. CDOT has asked DRCOG to provide input into establishing a project list from the Denver metro region. It is appropriate for DRCOG to participate in this process. As the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), DRCOG must act on and include all regionally significant projects in DRCOG's fiscally constrained RTP before they can be built, regardless of the project funding source. Staff believes that it is important to obtain the Board's input on the project polling list, and the Board's agreement on a list of projects for inclusion in the Blue Book if the initiative moves forward for voter approval. Staff suggests that all the pre-vetted lists (those in the adopted RTP and Metro Vision, as well as the regionally significant RAMP projects not included in the RTP or Metro Vision) be combined and the Board selects their top 20-25 projects to submit for polling.

KC Becker noted that she has concern with voting on a list of projects, as each jurisdiction would vote for their own project. She also noted that there may be a theme selected for the polling, such as safety or maintenance. Sue Horn noted that CDOT and the poll sponsors will be determining what goes on the list, and agreed that the Board should not be spending a lot of time putting together a list. Jack Hilbert noted that his understanding of the way the polling will work is the level of support for various funding areas, such as transit, maintenance, safety, etc., and the project list will be determined accordingly. Robin Kniech noted that every jurisdiction in the metro area is represented on the MTD. She further clarified that CDOT will not be conducting the polling. There is a set of business interests that have come to the jurisdictions for their input. Ms. Kniech noted this is a political process of what kinds of projects will encourage people to reach into their pockets and fund transportation projects, much the way they supported a new funding stream for transit. She noted that she didn't want to cede the regional goals, but allow CDOT to propose a list of significant, recognizable projects for the MTD to examine and select projects for the list. DRCOG would have an opportunity to provide input on the list, to ensure that projects on the list meet the region's goals. Ms. Schaufele noted that this is different from CDOT's request. Ms. Kniech noted that CDOT hasn't been at the MPACT64 meetings, and can't speak to what CDOT is asking. She stated that input from DRCOG is

important, but did not feel that DRCOG voting on a list of 25 projects is a very good or appropriate way of giving input.

Jackie Millet asked what the timeline is for providing input to CDOT. Ms. Schaufele noted that Debra Perkins-Smith asked for a list of projects soon, as polling is scheduled to begin in August. Jackie Millet noted that Lone Tree Mayor Jim Gunning is expecting DRCOG to provide a list. Jennifer Schaufele noted that perhaps some clarification is needed on what is expected of DRCOG. Sue Horn noted that there isn't enough time to vote on projects. She stated it was her understanding from the last MTD meeting that CDOT is going to compile the list, and they are in fact expecting to receive a list from DRCOG, as they have from other MPOs and TPRs around the state. Marjorie Sloan noted that she thinks CDOT already has DRCOG's project list. She further noted that it's her understanding that there will be an "A" and a "B" list.

Sue Horn **moved, seconded** by Jim Taylor, to send the list as combined by staff to CDOT with no prioritization. There was discussion.

Val Vigil noted that he assumes that all the MPOs and TPRs are sending unprioritized lists forward for consideration. Jim Taylor noted he agreed with allowing CDOT to pick the projects that fit their criteria for the poll. KC Becker noted she agreed.

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

#### Metro Vision 2040 – Housing and Economic Development

Brad Calvert noted that at the DRCOG Board workshop, members identified both housing and economic development as key points of emphasis to be explored during the Metro Vision 2040 update. He noted that the Sustainable Communities Initiative (SCI) anticipates and funds an assessment of how effectively people are connected to jobs, schools, and other amenities. This information will be input for the Board as it considers integrating housing and economic development into Metro Vision 2040 Information was included in the agenda materials related to the HUD Fair Housing and Equity Assessment, which lists required and suggested components.

Members discussed various topics for consideration, including diversity of housing, demographics of households, linkage between planners and economic development, location of new housing and the ability to maintain the location of workforce housing related to transit. There was discussion of whether or not the goal of locating 50 percent of new employment in urban centers is realistic.

#### Other Matters

No other matters were discussed.

#### Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for July 3, 2013.

#### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:47 p.m.

# ATTACH B

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
October 2, 2013	Consent	4

**SUBJECT**

This action concerns approval of 2013 Urban Center amendments to the Metro Vision 2035 Plan.

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**

DRCOG staff recommends the proposed amendments for modeling purposes.

**ACTION BY OTHERS**

N/A

**SUMMARY**

The proposed urban center amendments are outlined in the summary (see attachment). Proposed amendments include new urban centers and major revisions to existing urban centers.

The [Metro Vision 2035 Growth and Development Supplement](#) outlines the process and criteria for evaluation of urban center proposals. Per the Board's process, an evaluation panel was formed and included representatives of the following: RTD, Wheat Ridge, Douglas County and Jefferson County. DRCOG staff concurred with the evaluation panel on all proposals.

DRCOG staff will base the land use modeling assumptions on the MVIC's urban centers recommendation for the Metro Vision Plan Assessment process.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**

N/A

**PROPOSED MOTION**

Move to recommend the proposed Urban Center amendments for modeling purposes.

**ATTACHMENT**

***Attachment: Cycle 2, 2013 Urban Centers Summary***

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcog.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcog.org) or Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, at 303-480-6839 or [bcalvert@drcog.org](mailto:bcalvert@drcog.org)

**METRO VISION PLAN AMENDMENTS – 2013 CYCLE 2 SUMMARY**  
**URBAN CENTERS**

The DRCOG Board adopted the updated [Metro Vision 2035 Growth and Development Supplement](#) in January 2012. The Supplement outlines the process and criteria for evaluating urban center proposals.

An evaluation panel comprised of member governments and regional planning partners reviews the proposed amendments and provides recommendations to DRCOG staff. DRCOG staff in turn provides the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) with both the evaluation panel recommendations and staff findings.

For proposed revisions to previously designated urban centers, jurisdictions consult with DRCOG staff to determine if policy-level review is warranted. If so, the proposed revisions are subject to the same review process as proposed new urban centers. Minor revisions are made administratively.

- In consultation with staff from the City and County of Broomfield two urban center revisions were deemed major revisions. Both were reviewed by the evaluation panel and DRCOG staff.

The table below summarizes the 2013 Cycle 2 urban center proposals, the evaluation panel’s recommendations and DRCOG staff findings.

<b>Summary: Cycle 2 2013 Urban Center Proposals</b>			
<b>Proposed Center</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Recommended Evaluation Panel</b>	<b>Recommended DRCOG Staff</b>
<b>Urban Centers</b>			
Downtown Littleton (New)	City of Littleton	Yes	Yes
Original Broomfield Urban Center Expansion (Revision)	City and County of Broomfield	Yes	Yes
1-25 / SH 7 Urban Centers Expansion (Revision)	City and County of Broomfield	No	No

**Proposed Urban Center (New): Downtown Littleton**

**Sponsor:** City of Littleton

**Proposed Amendment:** The proposed Littleton Downtown urban center is coterminous with what Littleton residents think of as Downtown and the boundaries of the Downtown Neighborhood Plan which include a northern boundary of West Belleview Avenue, western boundary of South Santa Fe Drive and Southern Boundary of Arapahoe Community College and an eastern boundary of the light rail and heavy rail tracks. The proposed urban center is approximately 45 acres. The existing and future housing and employment densities within the Littleton Downtown Urban Center are significantly higher than those in the surrounding areas consisting of a mixed use zone district which can allow up to 100 units to the acre. The existing Downtown Neighborhood Plan identifies pursuing an urban center



designation as a high priority. The area is serviced by the Southwest Light Rail line and includes the Downtown Littleton light rail station.

**Urban Centers Evaluation Panel Finding: Recommended**

**DRCOG Staff Finding: Recommended**

Review Comments Summary

- The proposed urban center and transit station location are regionally significant and have many existing attributes consistent with the vision for urban centers
- The city estimates a doubling of housing units in the future
- The area is already covered by a mixed use zone district allowing for higher densities
- Numerous activities consistent with Metro Vision have already occurred – e.g. renovation and repurposing of buildings, installation of pedestrian-scale lighting, incentives for restoration of historic structures, widening of sidewalks, and support for numerous public events, etc.

**Proposed Expansion (Existing Center): Original Broomfield Urban Center**

**Sponsor:** City and County of Broomfield

**Proposed Amendment:** The existing and proposed urban center expansion covers an area generally bounded by Main Street to the east, West 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south, US 36 to the south and west and the West 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue – SH 128 corridor to the north. The proposed expansion area adds 430 acres to the existing urban center (37 acres). The additional land area is a mix of undeveloped land, light industrial, business/commercial, city park facilities, and railroad rights of way. The vision for the area is a mixed use district that will support a significant new regional transit hub in the vicinity of West 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue, while preserving land for light industrial uses and protecting the historic influences of Old Broomfield. The US 36 Express Land Project (BRT) is adjacent to the urban center. West 112<sup>th</sup> Ave, located in the proposed expansion area, will be realigned to connect with Uptown Avenue (west side of US 36) to create a more direct connection with Arista/Broomfield Urban Transit Village.

**Urban Centers Evaluation Panel Finding: Recommended**

**DRCOG Staff Finding: Recommended**

Review Comments Summary

- The evaluation panel expressed some concern over the projected housing densities outlined in the application, but noted the proposed expansion area has significant potential to become more mixed-use and multimodal in the future
- Existing land use diversity in the area is an asset
- Proposed expansion area may include more diverse, attainable housing options (including seniors) than other proximal areas
- Existing planning efforts identified areas to preserve/secure for enhanced local and regional trail connections

## Proposed Expansion (Existing Center): I-25/SH 7 Urban Center

**Sponsor:** City and County of Broomfield

**Proposed Amendment:** The existing and proposed urban center expansion area is generally located to the north and west of the intersection of State Highway 7 and I-25. The expansion would increase the urban center from 268 acres to 1,993 total acres. The proposed expansion includes primarily undeveloped land, but much of the area is master planned with approved planned unit development (PUD) plans. A significant portion of Broomfield's future growth is expected to occur within the northern portion of Broomfield, including the area covered by the proposed expansion. All lands within the urban center are zoned for PUD. An estimated 50,000 employees will work within the revised urban center boundary.

**Urban Centers Evaluation Panel Finding: Not Recommended**

**DRCOG Staff Finding: Not Recommended**

### Review Comments Summary

- Future employment estimates are significantly higher than the current regional forecast
- The proposed urban center appears to be too large and does not feel cohesive
- There was concern as to how to manage and concentrate growth within such a large area
- A multi-jurisdictional approach (including the City of Thornton) may contribute to a more cohesive approach
- Approved planned unit development (PUD) plans are in place but it's unclear how they are connected and contributing to a shared local vision for the area
- The area has many positive aspects and Broomfield should consider seeking revised designation in the future with a more modest proposal – perhaps as soon as Cycle 1 2014

# ATTACH C

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

From: Steve Cook, Acting Director, Transportation Planning and Operations  
303-480-6749 or [scook@drcog.org](mailto:scook@drcog.org)

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
October 2, 2013	Action	5

#### SUBJECT

Development of the next TIP (*Transportation Improvement Program*).

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommend for the Board's consideration more simple, straightforward policies and procedures for selecting projects in the upcoming 2016-2021 TIP.

#### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

#### SUMMARY

DRCOG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), selects projects to receive federal transportation funds. On average these funds add up to more than \$60 million annually.

Below is the 18-month schedule:

- Early spring 2014 – Adopt TIP Policy Document which outlines policies and procedures for project selection
- Summer 2014 – Solicit call for projects; sponsors complete applications
- Fall 2014 – Evaluate project submittals
- Winter 2014/15 – Select projects to fund; approve the TIP

In developing the 2016-2021 TIP, staff proposes to identify, analyze and improve upon the existing TIP process to make project selection much more straightforward, while reducing member and DRCOG staff costs.

DRCOG staff researched how a dozen MPOs in major metropolitan areas select TIP projects (see below). Some aspects of their processes are far more difficult to explain than DRCOG's [current TIP](#), while others are less complicated. While there are no wrong or right ways to select projects as long as it is accomplished within the broad federal rules, simplification at one level can create hurdles at other levels or be considered unacceptable for any number of reasons. And finally, what is viewed to be perplexing to some jurisdictions may be an extremely important consideration to another.

How other MPOs select TIP projects (these are high-level summaries of selection processes):

- Two MPOs (Seattle and San Francisco areas) take 50% of their MPO funds and distribute them to the counties, who in turn select TIP projects within their boundaries. Counties and

municipalities work together to evaluate, prioritize, and select projects. The remaining funds are allocated by the MPO to pre-established "regional" projects. **Challenges of DRCOG adopting this process** include creating a new technical -- and potentially political -- burden for member governments.

- The Philadelphia MPO recently entered into a pilot agreement with the state DOT to swap a portion of the MPO's federal funds with state funds, creating more flexibility in selecting various types and sizes of projects. Since federalizing projects drives up costs and hinders project implementation, this money swap allows those costs to be avoided by member governments. Many DRCOG member governments have expressed interest in competing for smaller project amounts; this approach could provide that opportunity. **Challenge of DRCOG adopting this process** is a significant coordinated effort by DRCOG and CDOT to reach an agreement in time for project solicitation.
- Like DRCOG, several MPOs use subjective and objective criteria. Also like DRCOG, some use scales to rank projects, i.e., "high-medium-low" versus 1-5. Also like DRCOG, many of our peers use staff or expert panels or a combination of the two to rank projects. **Challenge for DRCOG** is deciding on objective and/or subjective criteria; determining whether the type of scale matters; and whether there is value in using experts to help with ranking.

Other potential opportunities to improve the TIP follow. After the staff presentation, MVIC will be asked to provide recommendations for the Board's consideration. Committee members are invited to suggest additional improvements or other aspects of peer MPO TIPs staff might research. Staff anticipates other opportunities for simplification will present themselves and there will be many other decisions relative to the TIP between now and spring 2014.

- **Overmatch requirement**

Federal rules require about a 20 percent match from local sponsors. The current TIP awards points to projects providing additional match.

**Staff recommends** eliminating funding overmatch as a scoring criterion because CDOT no longer tracks overmatch expenditures in the contract/reimbursement process. Overmatch has little value during the evaluation and selection of projects.

- **Unique project type funding pools for the new TIP**

The current TIP has five pools. Pools allow for the comparison of like projects to one another. For example, the Board has a pool for traffic signals and urban center studies. Rather than being ranked alongside highway projects, traffic signal projects or urban center studies compete with like projects for finite pool funds.

**Staff recommends** retention of the pools as currently defined.

- **Number of project types and associated evaluation criteria**

There are 30 pages of criteria for the 16 current project types. Staff is confident this can be reduced by combining or even eliminating certain project types and criteria.

**Staff recommends** that a condensed list be formulated.

- **Adjust minimum funding amounts project sponsors can request**

Oftentimes project costs are so low, the sponsor is disallowed from submitting a TIP request because of established minimum funding amounts. This exists in part to reduce the number of contracts CDOT administers. Moreover, we have established situations where four different minimums apply.

**Staff recommends** exploring both the reduction of the minimum amounts as well as the circumstances where they're applied.

- **Consider if and how many points should be assigned to predictive and non-measurable attributes**

The predictive benefits/non-measurable attributes of projects are subjective and contribute to the overall complexity of project ranking. Examples include VMT and pollutant reductions.

**Staff recommends** non-measurable benefits be eliminated from the TIP.

In addition to any recommendations made at the MVIC meeting, **staff suggests MVIC recommend** it is the appropriate group to analyze and advise the Board on TIP policies and project selection improvements. If the MVIC has specific technical questions, it can refer them to the TAC (Transportation Advisory Committee) .

#### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

2013 DRCOG Board Workshop

#### PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board:

- MVIC is the appropriate group to analyze and advise the Board on TIP improvements (policies, procedures, project selection)
- Other improvements to the TIP as agreed to during the meeting

#### ATTACHMENT

N/A

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or [jschuafele@drcog.org](mailto:jschuafele@drcog.org) or Steve Cook, Acting Director, Transportation Planning & Operations at 303-480-6749 or [scook@drcog.org](mailto:scook@drcog.org)