

Board Officers

Jackie Millet, Chair
Elise Jones, Vice Chair
Doug Tisdale, Secretary
Vacant, Treasurer
Sue Horn, Immediate Past Chair
Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

AGENDA
METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE
Wednesday, September 3, 2014
4:00 p.m.
1290 Broadway
First Floor Boardroom



1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
The chair requests that there be no public comment on issues for which a prior public hearing has been held before the Board of Directors.
3. Summary of August 6, 2014 Meeting
(Attachment A)

ACTION ITEMS

4. *Move to recommend to the Board of Directors second phase project selection criteria for development of the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program
(Attachment B) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

5. Other Matters
6. Next Meeting – October 1, 2014
7. 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

We make life better!



METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
August 6, 2014

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

Others present: Jeanne Shreve – Adams County; Mac Callison – Aurora; Bob Watts – Castle Rock; Joe Fowler, Eugene Howard – Douglas County; Kent Moorman – Thornton; Ted Heyd – Bicycle Colorado; Jin Tsuchiya – CRL Associates; Flo Raitano, Acting Senior Managing Director, and DRCOG staff.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.; a quorum was present.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Summary of July 2, 2014 Meeting

The summary was accepted as submitted.

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

Doug Rex provided background for members on the second phase TIP project selection process. Members discussed the various criteria that should be included for second phase and recommended the following:

- Regional equity should be kept as a criterion. Members expressed interest in seeing what happens if you only look at DRCOG funds, If we include CDOT/RTD funds in equity, must find some way to measure contribution versus return. All transit should be included, not just RTD.
- Small communities should be kept as a criterion.
- Should consider beginning to look at MAP-21 related measures.
- Funding first/last mile connections, bike/ped should be taken into consideration.
- Multi-jurisdictional efforts should be taken into consideration.

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

Brad Calvert provided background on urban centers. Members were asked about the general question of whether to retain urban centers. The group made the following recommendations:

- A recommendation was made that a method to measure how we're doing with urban centers in meeting the goals set forth in Metro Vision should be developed. The goal

Metro Vision Issues Committee Summary

August 6, 2014

Page 2

isn't to increase urban centers; the goals are reducing water usage, reducing VMT, reducing carbons in the air, etc.

- Need more data on where we currently are in relation to the goals of 50 percent of housing and 75 percent of jobs in urban centers.
- The types of housing should be considered. Things such as percentage of owner occupied and rental units, whether the housing is affordable.
- The types and quality of jobs should be considered.

Other Matters

No other matters were discussed

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **September 3, 2014**.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00p.m.

ATTACH B

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

From: Flo Raitano, Acting Senior Managing Director
303-480-6789 or fraitano@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
September 3, 2014	Action	4

SUBJECT

Second phase selection for 2016-2021 TIP projects.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommend for the Board's consideration criteria to be used for the selection of 2016-2021 TIP projects in second phase.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

Background

DRCOG's 2016-2021 TIP projects will be selected in two phases. In the first phase, projects are selected directly from the score-ranked lists of funding requests by project type. A maximum of 75 percent of available funds will be programmed in first phase. The remaining 25 percent of funds are programmed in second phase and MVIC will consider other criteria in addition to project score.

At its July meeting, the Board approved the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Preparation* (aka TIP Policy) which will be used as the basis for selecting projects for the 2016-2021 TIP. Criteria to be used in the second phase selection process were not part of their action, but a kick-off discussion was held with MVIC at the August meeting.

Summary of August 6 MVIC Meeting

MVIC discussed several second phase criteria ideas it wished staff to explore for further discussion and possible action at its September meeting. The criteria discussed included:

- **TIP Score Points** – Used in the 2012-2017 TIP second phase scoring, would consider total project points from first phase selection.
- **Very Small Communities** – Used in the 2012-2017 TIP second phase scoring, would give special consideration to projects submitted by communities with less than \$10 million in annual net sales tax value (based on the most recent Colorado Department of Revenue).
- **County Funding Equity Status and Ratio** – Used in the 2012-2017 TIP second phase scoring. It is a calculation comparing the amount of dollars programmed within a county to the percent contribution from each county. A county's financial equity shall be considered "even" if its estimated percentage of programmed expenditures is within 10 percentage points of its computed percentage of contributions. Population, vehicle miles traveled, and transportation-related sales tax revenues were the attributes used to calculate the county contribution for the

2012-2017 TIP. For the 2016-2021 TIP, MVIC members were also interested in staff researching the following:

- *State Highway User Trust Fund* – The backbone of state and local transportation financing since its creation in 1953. Approximately 94 percent of the revenue is generated from motor fuel taxes and vehicle registration fees.
- *Regional Transit District (RTD) Net Taxable Retail Sales* – The RTD levies a sales and use tax of 1.0 percent within its boundary.
- *RTD Ridership* – RTD boarding information by route and location
- *PMT vs. VMT* – Change to reflect the measurement of people vs. vehicles.
- *Total Sales Tax Receipts by County*

MVIC requested staff to present the county equity information considering two expenditure scenarios (for 2003-2019): (1) using all funds programmed from CDOT, RTD and DRCOG; (2) only DRCOG programmed funds.

- **Multi-Jurisdictional Projects** – Consideration for projects that cross the geographic boundary of two or more DRCOG jurisdictions.
- **Interregional Projects** - Consideration for projects coordinated with communities/ MPOs outside the DRCOG MPO area.
- **Projects Not Eligible in First Phase** – Consideration for projects types, such as “Studies” and “Other Enhancement” only eligible in second phase.
- **Project Eligibility for Other Federal Funding Sources** – projects eligible for other funding categories not included in the 2016-2021 TIP Call for Projects.
- **Additional Consideration for Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects**
- **Number of Sponsor Projects Selected in First Phase**
- **Amount Sponsor Spends on Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects** – Collective investment regardless of funding source.
- **Project’s Relationship to Metro Vision Goals** – Does the project relate to the tenants of Metro Vision?
- **First/Last Mile connection** – Does the project provide a first/last mile connection?

DRCOG Staff Recommendation

Staff carefully researched the second phase selection criteria options suggested by MVIC members and offers the following recommendation which we believe fulfills MVIC’s intent of providing wide-ranging information for the Board to make an informed decision on second phase projects:

1. TIP Score Points
2. Very Small Communities
3. Projects Not Eligible in First Phase
4. Multi-Jurisdictional Projects
5. Number of Sponsor Projects Selected in First Phase

6. County Funding Equity Status and Ratio

- Contribution Factors:
 - Population
 - Employment
 - Vehicle Miles Traveled
 - State HUTF Disbursement to Counties
 - RTD Net Taxable Retail Sales (*only if RTD programmed projects are included on the expenditure side*)
- Expenditure Factors (programmed projects):
 - DRCOG
 - RTD
 - CDOT

Table 1a shows the county contributions and Table 1b reveals the resulting draft county equity calculation based on staff's recommendation to use DRCOG, RTD and CDOT programmed expenditures. Tables 2a and 2b illustrate the contributions and equity breakdown if only DRCOG administered funds are included in the calculation. In this scenario, RTD Net Taxable Retail Sales has been removed from the county contributions. It must be noted the draft equity calculation results (Tables 1b and 2b) do not yet incorporate the funding allocation for projects that will be selected in first phase this December. Tables 1a and 2a show other contribution attributes considered but not included in staff's recommendation.

DRCOG staff recommends the scenario illustrated in Tables 1a and 1b for the following reasons: (1) historically, the equity formula has included DRCOG, RTD and CDOT programmed projects (2) it is a better representation of the total overall investment within the DRCOG region (3) the equity formula with the addition of the HUTF, RTD sales tax and employment information has provided needed symmetry and balance between the contributions and expenditures.

Staff recognizes that its recommendation does not include all the suggested criteria and while we believe each has merit, ultimately criteria were not included for the following reasons:

- *Interregional Projects*– Staff is concerned the number of eligible entities that could receive consideration for this criterion would be limited to only communities on the periphery of the DRCOG region.
- *Project Eligibility for Other Federal Funding Sources* – Most, if not all of the projects to be considered for second phase will be eligible for some other federal funds administered by CDOT or RTD. Furthermore, staff is concerned that projects may be discounted in the evaluation process because they may be eligible for other funding...eligibility doesn't mean the project(s) will be funded.
- *Additional Consideration for Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects* – Staff believes this criteria isn't necessary since project descriptions will already be highlighted in the second phase project summary table.
- *Amount Sponsor Spends on Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects* – This information was not requested from the applicants as part of the call for projects. Additional data collection and verification would be required.

- *RTD Ridership* – Staff believes RTD sales tax is a better indicator of contribution by county.
- *PMT vs. VMT* – Staff believes, in this instance, VMT is a more straightforward, less complicated measure that better correlates to contributions.
- *Total Sales Tax Receipts by County* – Staff believes that HUTF and RTD sales tax are better indicators than total sales tax since they are transportation-specific collections.
- *Project's relationship to Metro Vision Goals* – Staff believes a project's relationship to Metro Vision goals is adequately addressed in first phase scoring criteria. For example, Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transit projects include several criteria related to their ability reduce VMT and single occupant vehicle (SOV) trips. Roadway project types include criteria addressing Metro Vision goals (multimodal connection features) and policies (reduced congestion, system preservation, and improved safety). In addition, 25 percent of first phase scoring points for all project types are based on how the project and sponsor address the tenants and goals of Metro Vision.
- *First/Last Mile connection* – Staff believes that first/last mile connections are adequately reflected in first phase scoring. For example, Bicycle/Pedestrian projects include several criteria points based on connectivity and accessibility to transit and other key land uses. Last mile type projects are already eligible in the Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transit project categories as well as the upcoming TDM Pool set-aside call for projects. Staff also notes that it may be difficult to clearly define which projects are or are not "last mile" as no clear definition has been established.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

July 2, 2014 MVIC Meeting
August 6, 2014 MVIC Meeting

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the Board of Directors second phase project selection criteria for development of the *2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program*.

ATTACHMENT

- Table 1a: Staff Recommended County Revenue Contributions for DRCOG, CDOT and RTD TIP Expenditures
- Table 1b: Draft Equity Calculations for Second Phase Selection of the 2016-2021 TIP (*considers DRCOG, CDOT and RTD TIP Expenditures*)
- Table 2a: Staff Recommended County Revenue Contributions for DRCOG TIP Expenditures Only
- Table 2b: Draft Equity Calculations for Second Phase Selection of the 2016-2021 TIP (*considers DRCOG TIP Expenditures only*)

Reference Material: [Adopted 2016-2021 TIP Policy Document](#)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Flo Raitano, Acting Senior Managing Director, at 303-480-6789 or fraitano@drcog.org; or Douglas Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org

Table 1a

Staff Recommended County Revenue Contribution Attributes
(for DRCOG, CDOT and RTD TIP Expenditures Scenario)

Staff Recommended:

Revenue Factors	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Denver	Douglas	Jefferson	SW Weld	Total
Population (2010)	451,989	556,917	302,198	51,697	596,720	283,811	548,793	47,564	2,839,689
% of Regional Total	15.92%	19.61%	10.64%	1.82%	21.01%	9.99%	19.33%	1.67%	100%
Employment (2010)	191,729	335,129	186,066	36,437	505,745	131,288	275,676	17,998	1,680,068
% of Regional Total	11.41%	19.95%	11.07%	2.17%	30.10%	7.81%	16.41%	1.07%	100%
VMT (2012 Cycle 2)	11,511,519	12,446,677	5,683,124	1,614,837	14,794,649	7,853,365	12,175,423	2,415,896	68,495,490
% of Regional Total	16.81%	18.17%	8.30%	2.36%	21.60%	11.47%	17.78%	3.53%	100%
HUTF Disbursements (2012)	\$20,939,023	\$22,393,027	\$12,066,890	\$1,780,195	\$24,366,347	\$9,772,755	\$24,372,995	\$1,925,987	\$117,617,221
% of Regional Total	17.80%	19.04%	10.26%	1.51%	20.72%	8.31%	20.72%	1.64%	100%
RTD Taxable Retail Sales (2013 \$1,000s)	\$5,731,000	\$8,456,000	\$4,033,000	\$1,004,000	\$12,861,000	\$3,108,000	\$6,538,000	\$100,000	\$42,270,628
% of Regional Total	13.56%	20.00%	9.54%	2.38%	30.43%	7.35%	15.47%	1.10%	100%
Staff Recommendations Average of Factors	15.10%	19.35%	9.96%	2.05%	24.77%	8.99%	17.94%	1.80%	100%

Others Reviewed:

Net Taxable Sales (2013 \$1,000s)	\$6,332,900	\$9,217,300	\$4,338,300	\$1,044,700	\$12,841,100	\$4,268,700	\$6,885,700	\$631,047	\$45,559,747
% of Regional Total	13.90%	20.23%	9.52%	2.29%	28.19%	9.37%	15.11%	1.39%	100%
RTD Daily Boardings	23,991	51,883	28,466	2,400	219,694	5,028	28,949	52	360,463
% of Regional Total	6.66%	14.39%	7.90%	0.67%	60.95%	1.39%	8.03%	0.01%	100%

Table 1b

**Draft Equity Calculations for Second Phase Selection of the 2016-2021 TIP
Total TIP Expenditures vs. Estimated County Revenue Contributions**

(Does not yet include First Phase selected projects for 2016-2019)

	(all figures in \$1,000s)								
TIP Expenditures (DRCOG, CDOT, & RTD)	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Denver	Douglas	Jefferson	Weld	Regional Total
<i>All Historic TIP Funds</i> (Fed+State+RTD) 2003-2011	\$547,759	\$773,276	\$400,895	\$121,874	\$2,606,671	\$371,691	\$983,452	\$2,600	\$5,808,219
<i>CDOT Programming</i> 2012-2015	\$267,401	\$134,712	\$152,978	\$73,678	\$384,191	\$61,523	\$145,014	\$28,622	\$1,248,118
<i>RTD Programming</i> 2012-2015	\$428,039	\$342,865	\$54,060	\$38,160	\$423,636	\$6,773	\$153,455	\$0	\$1,446,987
<i>DRCOG Selected</i> for 2012-2015	\$62,836	\$27,706	\$37,414	\$29,368	\$58,738	\$11,586	\$35,570	\$100	\$263,320
DRCOG Selected 1st Phase for 2016-2019 (TBD)	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Total	\$1,306,035	\$1,278,559	\$645,347	\$263,079	\$3,473,235	\$451,574	\$1,317,491	\$31,322	\$8,766,644
Expenditures as a % of the Regional Total	14.9%	14.6%	7.4%	3.0%	39.6%	5.2%	15.0%	0.4%	100%
Rev. Contribution as a % of the Regional Total (see Table 1a)	15.1%	19.4%	10.0%	2.1%	24.8%	9.0%	17.9%	1.8%	100%
Expenditure % / Contribution %	99%	75%	74%	146%	160%	57%	84%	20%	
Equity Status	Even	Under	Under	Over	Over	Under	Under	Under	

Table 2a

Staff Recommended County Revenue Contribution Attributes
(for DRCOG Only TIP Expenditures Scenario)

Staff Recommended:

Revenue Factors	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Denver	Douglas	Jefferson	SW Weld	Total
Population (2010)	451,989	556,917	302,198	51,697	596,720	283,811	548,793	47,564	2,839,689
% of Regional Total	15.92%	19.61%	10.64%	1.82%	21.01%	9.99%	19.33%	1.67%	100%
Employment (2010)	191,729	335,129	186,066	36,437	505,745	131,288	275,676	17,998	1,680,068
% of Regional Total	11.41%	19.95%	11.07%	2.17%	30.10%	7.81%	16.41%	1.07%	100%
VMT (2012 Cycle 2)	11,511,519	12,446,677	5,683,124	1,614,837	14,794,649	7,853,365	12,175,423	2,415,896	68,495,490
% of Regional Total	16.81%	18.17%	8.30%	2.36%	21.60%	11.47%	17.78%	3.53%	100%
HUTF Disbursements (2012)	\$20,939,023	\$22,393,027	\$12,066,890	\$1,780,195	\$24,366,347	\$9,772,755	\$24,372,995	\$1,925,987	\$117,617,221
% of Regional Total	17.80%	19.04%	10.26%	1.51%	20.72%	8.31%	20.72%	1.64%	100%
Staff Recommendations Average of Factors	15.48%	19.19%	10.07%	1.97%	23.36%	9.40%	18.56%	1.98%	100%

Others Reviewed:

Net Taxable Sales (2013 \$1,000s)	\$6,332,900	\$9,217,300	\$4,338,300	\$1,044,700	\$12,841,100	\$4,268,700	\$6,885,700	\$631,047	\$45,559,747
% of Regional Total	13.90%	20.23%	9.52%	2.29%	28.19%	9.37%	15.11%	1.39%	100%
RTD Daily Boardings	23,991	51,883	28,466	2,400	219,694	5,028	28,949	52	360,463
% of Regional Total	6.66%	14.39%	7.90%	0.67%	60.95%	1.39%	8.03%	0.01%	100%
RTD Taxable Retail Sales (2013 \$1,000s)	\$5,731,000	\$8,456,000	\$4,033,000	\$1,004,000	\$12,861,000	\$3,108,000	\$6,538,000	\$100,000	\$42,270,628
% of Regional Total	13.56%	20.00%	9.54%	2.38%	30.43%	7.35%	15.47%	1.10%	100%

Table 2b

Draft Equity Calculations for Second Phase Selection of the 2016-2021 TIP
DRCOG Only Expenditures vs. Estimated County Revenue Contributions

(Does not yet include First Phase selected projects for 2016-2019)

	(all figures in \$1,000s)								
TIP Expenditures (DRCOG Only)	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Denver	Douglas	Jefferson	Weld	Regional Total
<i>DRCOG Selected Historic Funds</i> 2003-2011	\$59,577	\$65,926	\$63,959	\$45,147	\$92,784	\$2,814	\$43,388	\$2,600	\$376,193
<i>DRCOG Selected for 2012-2015</i>	\$62,836	\$27,706	\$37,414	\$29,368	\$58,738	\$11,586	\$35,570	\$100	\$263,320
DRCOG Selected 1st Phase for 2016-2019 (TBD)	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Total	\$122,413	\$93,632	\$101,373	\$74,515	\$151,522	\$14,400	\$78,958	\$2,700	\$639,513
Expenditures as a % of the Regional Total	19.1%	14.6%	15.9%	11.7%	23.7%	2.3%	12.3%	0.4%	100%
Contribution as a % of the Regional Total	15.5%	19.2%	10.1%	2.0%	23.4%	9.4%	18.6%	2.0%	100%
Expenditure % / Contribution %	124%	76%	157%	591%	101%	24%	67%	21%	
Equity Status	Over	Under	Over	Over	Even	Under	Under	Under	