

SUMMARY OF METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING
March 5, 2014

MVIC Members Present: Elise Jones – Boulder County; Eva Henry – Adams County; Nancy Sharpe – Arapahoe County; Bob Roth – Aurora; Sue Horn – Bennett; Suzanne Jones – Boulder; Cathy Noon – Centennial; Doug Tisdale – Cherry Hills Village; Tim Mauck – Clear Creek County; Robin Kniech – Denver; Jack Hilbert – Douglas County; Marjorie Sloan – Golden; Phil Cernanec – Littleton; Jackie Millet – Lone Tree

Others present: Mac Callison – Aurora; Art Griffith, Joe Fowler – Douglas County; Bryce Matthews – Parker; Jeff Sudmeier, Danny Herrmann – CDOT; Ted Heyd – Bicycle Colorado; Anne Marie Pettinato, Citizen, and DRCOG staff.

Call to Order

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

Public Comment

Ted Heyd, Bicycle Colorado, provided comment on the Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) update of the Statewide Transportation Plan. As part of the public outreach, CDOT conducted preliminary statewide surveys. Approximately 583 were returned from metro area residents. He noted that of 583 responses received, 54 percent of respondents selected increasing bike/pedestrian options and 33 percent selected increase transit options/reducing congestion as their priorities. He further noted that on the question of focusing use of limited resources, 66 percent listed "offer more choices for travel (including transit, bike/ped)," and 40 percent selected maintain the existing system.

Summary of February 5, 2014 Meeting

The summary was accepted as submitted.

Consent Item

Evaluation Criteria and solicitation process for regionally funded roadway capacity projects for the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP)

Suzanne Jones **moved, seconded** by Robin Kniech, to remove this item from consent. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Suzanne Jones noted concern with the gap closure criteria. She felt that a gap "up to 5 miles" seems extremely large. She stated she also thinks the points (15) seem high. Jackie Millet noted that for some roadways that might make sense (like C-470). She asked staff to weigh in on why TAC recommended that length. Steve Cook noted that there was not a specific discussion at TAC of the number; 5 miles is the length that was in the criteria from the last update. There is no technical basis for the number. Suzanne Jones also noted that related to this criterion is whether it pertains only to existing roadways.

Doug Tisdale **moved, seconded** by Suzanne Jones the gap closure evaluation criteria be amended to read the gap must be less than 3 miles and part of an existing roadway. There was discussion. Some members expressed disagreement with the motion. After discussion, the motion **failed** with 5 in favor and 7 opposed.

Jackie Millet **moved, seconded** by Cathy Noon the gap closure evaluation criteria, with an amendment to include “must be on an existing roadway.” The motion **passed** with 1 opposed

Robin Kniech noted that Denver wants to submit up to 9 projects for scoring. Other counties, such as Arapahoe, would be able to submit as many as 24 projects between the county and cities.

Robin Kniech **moved, seconded** by Doug Tisdale to expand the number of new projects allowed for submittal by Denver to 9, and allows the City and County of Broomfield to submit 4. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Jack Hilbert **moved, seconded** by Doug Tisdale to approve the evaluation criteria and solicitation process for regionally funded roadway capacity projects for the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (2040 RTP) as previously amended. The motion **passed** with 1 opposed.

Action Item

Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board improvements to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as agreed to during the meeting

Doug Rex distributed a revised Appendix to members. He noted that staff received a comment from jurisdiction staff in the second box under Urban Center criteria that it wasn't clear that the points are all or nothing, staff made a revision to clarify. The first item for action by members is the addition of affordable housing criteria in the second box.

Suzanne Jones **moved, seconded** by Jackie Millet, to accept the staff recommendation on affordable housing. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The second item for action is Urban Growth Boundary. Staff suggests that the language reflect a “modified” UGB. An area entirely surrounded by UGB/A that falls into the listed categories will be considered within the UGB/A for the purposes of evaluating project location (

Doug Tisdale **moved, seconded** by Nancy Sharpe to accept the staff recommendation as proposed in the revised Appendix F. The motion **passed** unanimously.

The final item for action is related to Strategic Corridors. Suzanne Jones noted that she does not think that every highway is strategic. She raised the issue of including the Jefferson Parkway. She noted there is a very tenuous agreement between the affected parties about how the Jefferson Parkway will be shown in the RTP (as a 100 percent locally funded roadway); and stated that Boulder would have issues with showing the proposed Parkway on the strategic corridor map. Elise Jones noted that perhaps only existing roadways should be shown. Cathy Noon noted that using the criteria of being a locally funded roadway would also then apply to E-470. Members asked that the term “strategic” be more clearly defined. Doug Rex noted this map isn't just for awarding points to roadway type projects; these strategic corridors will also be used to award funding to other types of projects, such as bicycle/pedestrian and transit. Jennifer Schaufele

reminded members that it was the Committee's decision to retain the strategic corridors as adopted. MVIC can recommend to the Board that the map be changed. Some members noted that they believe completing the beltway is strategic. Robin Kniech asked how often this map is or could be discussed or revised. Staff replied that this map has been used for at least two TIP cycles but can be amended or edited at any time. Staff further noted that this map could also be adjusted to reflect the result of the Northwest Area Mobility Study (NAMS). There was a recommendation to return the Jefferson Parkway to being a dashed line with "alignment to be determined" as opposed to the solid line as currently shown.

Robin Kniech **moved, seconded** by Suzanne Jones, the proposed TIP strategic corridors include the existing plus FasTracks as indicated in the staff proposal and add the word "existing" to the term freeways, tollways, and arterials and that the map be adjusted accordingly. There was discussion.

Sue Horn asked if making the change would affect any other roadways. Staff noted it would not. Nancy Sharpe asked if the proposal would show the Jefferson Parkway with a dashed line? Robin Kniech noted that she does not believe the Jefferson Parkway has a legal implication on the map, and is not part of the motion. Elise Jones noted that the roadway could be added to the map when it gets built.

After discussion, the motion **passed** with 3 opposed.

Nancy Sharpe and Jack Hilbert noted the Jefferson Parkway should be left on the map with a dashed line.

Jackie Millet **moved, seconded** by Cathy Noon, to change the name of the map to be titled "TIP Strategic Corridors for the Purpose of Scoring Projects Only." The motion **passed** unanimously.

Elise Jones asked what the relationship is between recommendations of the NAMS study and this map. Staff replied it is anticipated the map would be revised to include outcomes not already shown on the map as strategic rapid transit corridors; notably, SH-119, US-287, SH 7, and South Boulder Road. Members felt that the Board should be kept apprised of such changes. Doug Tisdale noted he doesn't feel it's appropriate for staff to make changes to the map without it coming back to the Board. Others felt that this should be considered an administrative change, rather than a policy decision for the Board.

Sue Horn **moved, seconded** by Jackie Millet, to direct staff to make any changes necessary to correspond with RTD changes to the routes. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Metro Vision Point Allocation

Doug Rex noted that the only changes made to the Metro Vision points was to divide the points equally between the Urban Center criteria, and to remove the 1 point for proximity to DIA. The total Metro Vision points available are changed from 26 to 25.

Jackie Millet **moved, seconded** by Doug Tisdale, to accept the scoring as presented by staff. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Benefit criteria for bicycle/pedestrian and transit TIP projects

Staff noted the TAC proposed “indicator units” will provide a more meaningful and representative basis for comparing the likely relative benefits of projects. Jackie Millet asked how short drive-alone trips are determined. Steve Cook noted they are calculated within the travel model. This provides an indication of a good potential for types of trips that could change to bicycle/pedestrian. The data is generated by staff and will be provided to project applicants prior to the application deadline. Elise Jones asked about regional connectivity for bicycle commuting. Steve Cook noted there is a separate criterion for connectivity and missing links, this criterion is purely for calculating user/benefits, and is just one criterion of many for bicycle/pedestrian projects. Commissioner Jones noted that it seems as though the radius used for measurements is from one-half mile to 1.5 miles; in their sector bicycle commuting is often greater than 1.5 miles, its more about connecting communities or employment centers. Where is this captured in the process? Staff noted it is captured in other criteria that will be discussed next month. Cathy Noon asked what census data is being used. Steve Cook noted that five year American Community Survey data is being used.

Robin Kniech **moved, seconded** by Doug Tisdale, to accept the staff recommendation as presented for bicycle/pedestrian and transit. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Elise Jones noted just because a project is built in the proximity of a problem doesn't mean the problem will be solved. She stated her staff feels that some project level evaluation is necessary to determine if a project will solve a problem. Jackie Millet noted she has concerns about funding studies, not knowing whether a project will result or not. Jennifer Schaufele noted that it is difficult to determine if projects that receive funding actually do what they promise. She noted the biggest problem is criteria change with each TIP cycle. Projects are not built before new criteria are selected. Perhaps a better approach will be to develop performance measures through the organizational development process.

Doug Tisdale **moved, seconded** by Jackie Millet, to recommend improvements to the Transportation Improvement Program as agreed to during the meeting pursuant to the various motions on the elemental parts. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Phil Cernanec noted the goal of this process is to have simple language for members to be able to explain reasons for the decisions made.

Informational Item

A conceptual TIP Selection Process

Jennifer Schaufele stated that the work on the TIP criteria has provoked discussion on defining what “regional” means to the Board. There are some substantial projects in the TIP that could be considered regional. Staff believes it is possible for the Board to define what “regional” means, focusing time and funds on those regional projects, with any remaining funds provided to members to invest as they see fit. If members believe that this

is worth pursuing for this TIP cycle, then additional MVIC meetings will likely be necessary, as well as additional work by the TAC and jurisdiction staff. Jackie Millet noted that when she saw the list of projects that received funding in the last TIP cycle, it became apparent that the projects that got funded were not necessarily those that scored the highest number of points. Robin Kniech stated she thinks that regional projects should be those that help advance the region's goals, such as reducing VMT, reducing congestion, etc. Phil Cernanec agreed. He noted that perhaps two pools aren't enough. Doug Rex briefly took members through some slides that show what is currently being done here in the Denver metro area and what some other MPO's are doing. Members agreed to continue to look at this concept.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **April 2, 2014**.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.