

METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
May 7, 2014

MVIC Members Present: Elise Jones – Boulder County; Nancy Sharpe – Arapahoe County; Bob Roth – Aurora; Sue Horn – Bennett; Suzanne Jones – Boulder; Cathy Noon – Centennial; Doug Tisdale – Cherry Hills Village; Robin Kniech – Denver; Jack Hilbert – Douglas County; Todd Riddle – Edgewater; Don Rosier – Jefferson County; Phil Cernanec – Littleton; Jackie Millet – Lone Tree; Val Vigil – Thornton.

Others present: Jeanne Shreve – Adams County; Mac Callison – Aurora; Travis Greiman – Centennial; Anthony Graves – Denver; Joe Fowler – Douglas County; Kent Moorman, Shakti – Lakewood; Gene Putman – Thornton; Jeff Sudmeier, Danny Herrmann – CDOT; Ted Heyd – Bicycle Colorado; Will Toor – SWEEP; Jin Tsuchiya – CRL Associates; and DRCOG staff.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m.; a quorum was present.

Public Comment

Ted Heyd, Bicycle Colorado, thanked the members and staff for their efforts on the TIP criteria update. He noted it's important to think about how the proposed criteria will affect the provision of a true multimodal transportation system.

Will Toor, Southwest Energy Efficiency Project (SWEEP) spoke about the proposed TIP criteria. He noted overall the criteria will move the TIP forward toward the policy goals expressed in Metro Vision. He noted the multimodal connectivity points related to transit lanes should be the same as the protected bike lane (8 points each). In roadway operations (capacity and reconstruction) the benefit should focus on reduction of person hours of delay rather than vehicle hours of delay.

Summary of April 2, 2014 Meeting

The summary was accepted as submitted.

Move to recommend to the Board of Directors *Project Location-related Metro Vision Implementation* evaluation criteria (Appendix F) for the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as proposed by staff

Brad Calvert briefly described the proposed project location-related evaluation criteria. He directed member's attention to a set of maps provided related to environmental justice areas.

Members expressed concern with the size of the environmental justice area shown on the map. Questions were asked about what criteria are used to determine the environmental justice areas. Staff explained that the designations are federally mandated, and are based on low income or minority demographics. Some concern was expressed that the time period of employment growth data used is from 2005 through 2013. What about growth that will occur this year, or during the first four years of the TIP? Staff reported that the 2005-2013 time span was selected for a couple of reasons: availability of data and many of the goals in Metro Vision are benchmarked in 2005.

Robin Kniech **moved** to adopt the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded. There was discussion. After discussion, the motion was **withdrawn**.

Val Vigil **moved** to table discussion on this issue. The motion was **seconded**. The motion was **withdrawn**.

Val Vigil **moved** to send the evaluation criteria back to the Transportation Advisory Committee for input as noted during subsequent discussion.

Issues for input from the Transportation Advisory Committee:

- Employment growth expressed in numbers rather than percentages.
- Concern was expressed that there is no requirement to actually serve the EJ area with projects. A benefit to the EJ community should be required.
- Should the measurement be the same for job growth of 250 jobs and 12,000 jobs? Perhaps some gradation of points should be considered.
- Promoting access to existing and emerging employment centers – how to balance existing and emerging.
- How will the potential of an area be defined, not just what's happened in the past.
- Should focus on getting people to jobs. Bus transit connectivity is an issue in areas with rail transit.

The motion **passed** with 1 opposed.

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

Doug Rex reviewed the materials provided and the process to date. He noted that several comments have been received by staff.

Bob Roth **moved** to send the criteria to the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) for technical comment. It was noted that the TAC has not had an opportunity to provide input. The motion was **seconded**. There was discussion.

Members provided the following input for Transportation Advisory Committee discussion:

- Capacity projects should focus on person miles of travel, not vehicle miles of travel.
- The points for adding a protected bike lane and for other bike facilities should be the same.
- HOV lanes should receive the same points as a bike lane (8).
- Currently, 2 points are proposed for a new bicycle or pedestrian facility that directly accesses a school and 2 points for new bicycle or pedestrian facility that directly touches a passenger rail station. The language could be clarified to read "provides a path to passenger rail/BRT station or school property and is within 1/8 of a mile."
- Why was the distance requirement removed for the protected bike lane? Staff noted that the requirement for the facility to run the full length of the project would be restored. A comment was made that the safety of separated bike lanes should be addressed.

## Metro Vision Issues Committee Meeting Summary

May 7, 2014

Page 3

- A comment was made that communities who have already invested in these types of projects (bike facilities, etc.) should be allowed to score the points for new projects adjacent to previously built facilities.
- Metrics using number of routes served should use number of persons served. TAC should be polled for their technical opinion on this topic.
- A comment was made to not give points for bike counters. Perhaps bike counters should be a required project element rather than a separate category.
- Grade separations were removed. Staff noted that they are still eligible; they just aren't called out separately.
- A question was asked about changing the length from 1800 feet to one mile for roadway operational improvements. Denver noted support for the change, as a recent Denver project was too short to qualify as capacity and too long for operational improvement.
- The time for getting transit agency support seems prohibitive. Sponsors used to be able to get a letter of support from the transit agency to submit with project applications.
- An issue was expressed with using federal money on new bus service, as federal dollars are not reliable.
- Look at allowing bicycle facility reconstruction based on criteria other than pavement condition (i.e., congestion, etc.). A comment was made that there should be some clarification of whether a facility is recreational.
- Restore the 1 point for a bicycle facility under 25 mph.
- On pedestrian only projects, include designated transit corridors.
- Urban centers and urban corridors should be used throughout the document.

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

### Presentation on Regional Economic Strategy

Brad Calvert provided a brief overview of the report. It was noted this item will be covered more fully at the May Board meeting.

### Presentation on Urban Sim

This presentation was postponed due to time constraints.

### Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **June 4, 2014**.

### Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:05p.m.