

METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
June 4, 2014

MVIC Members Present: Elise Jones – Boulder County; Eva Henry – Adams 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; Tim Mauck – Clear Creek County; Rick Teter – Commerce City; Robin Kniech – Denver; Jack Hilbert – Douglas County; Todd Riddle – Edgewater; Marjorie Sloan – Golden; Ron Rakowsky – Greenwood Village; Don Rosier – Jefferson County; Shakti – Lakewood; Phil Cernanec – Littleton; Jackie Millet – Lone Tree; Val Vigil – Thornton.

Others present: Jeanne Shreve – Adams County; Mac Callison – Aurora; Bob Watts – Castle Rock; Joe Fowler, Eugene Howard – Douglas County; Tom Quinn – Lakewood; Kent Moorman – Thornton; Tim Kirby – CDOT; Ted Heyd – Bicycle Colorado; Ben Herman, Darcie White - Clarion; and DRCOG staff.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m.; a quorum was present. The Chair reminded members to participate in the evaluation of the Executive Director. It was noted that the Committee will be selecting two members and a minimum of four alternates to serve on the Regional Transportation Committee at the next meeting. Members interested in serving as members or alternates for the Committee were asked to email Connie Garcia to express interest.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Summary of May 7, 2014 Meeting

It was noted that Cathy Noon was listed in error as attending the meeting. The summary was accepted as revised.

Metro Vision 2040 Update – Parks and Open Space/Community Health and Wellness

Brad Calvert provided a brief overview of Metro Vision for members new to the Committee. He presented information on the schedule for updating Metro Vision to 2040, including public outreach efforts. and discussed the Parks and Open Space/Community Health and Wellness sections of Metro Vision.

Move to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee and the DRCOG Board the Draft Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation, Procedures for Preparing the 2016-2021 TIP

The Chair noted that additional comments from the Transportation Advisory Committee's (TAC) June 2 meeting were sent to members electronically yesterday. Copies of the criteria pages with relevant comments from TAC were distributed to members. Doug Rex provided information on the tables and comments provided by TAC. The criteria tables were discussed, along with the general text of the document. Specific changes agreed to by members are described below.

Page 28, Table 4, Multimodal Connectivity: add "or multi-use path" to points for adding a new bike lane or shoulders.

Page 29, Table 4, Environmental Justice: change the wording to read "...project length is located with **and provides benefits to** a 2040 RTP-defined environmental justice area. It was noted that staff should have discretion to identify "benefits." It was further noted that the criteria states the sponsor should identify the benefits.

Page 30, Table 5, Roadway Operational Improvement Projects: Roadway operational projects may add through-lanes; second bullet, revise to read "Turn lane additions at **appropriate** intersections are also part of the project."

Page 31, Table 5, Delay reduction: Change VHT (vehicle hours of travel) to PHT (person hours of travel). Staff will work on a metric to measure the reduction. Members agreed that they would like to see the metric and the points before making a decision on this topic.

Page 32, Table 5, Bus boarding per hour: TAC noted due to the change to PHT, this criterion is no longer necessary.

Page 33, Table 5, Multimodal connectivity: "2 points for a bicycle and/or pedestrian facility directly touching passenger...or existing bus stops **servicing multiple routes or providing high frequency service**; OR 1 point if facility is within 1/8 mile." "High frequency" is determined as 15 minute headways.

Page 37, Table 7, Transit Passenger Facilities projects: this project category is now open to all applicants; project sponsors must have transit agency or CDOT concurrence.

Page 43, Table 9, Bicycle/Pedestrian projects: some concern was expressed with requiring new facilities be "paved." At issue is determining whether facilities are commute-related in nature and not recreational. Half the members present felt that crush or fine trails should be allowed the points, half did not. The criteria will remain unchanged.

Page 50, Table 11, Studies: Roadway capacity studies must further the development of regionally-funded projects identified in the fiscally constrained RTP. There was discussion about eliminating the requirement for studies to be on "regionally-funded" projects. A member noted that locally-funded projects in the RTP should be allowed the points for studies as well. A suggestion was made that studies for locally-funded projects should be locally-funded as well.

Minor changes were recommended to the narrative portion of the document: The number of projects that sponsors are allowed to submit has increased, except for Denver (16 to 15) and Broomfield (12 to 8). City and County managers can now sign project submit submittals.

Staff presented proposed funding percentage targets for the various project types. It was noted that DRCOG has received a request from CDOT to participate in funding the I-70 Viaduct project. If the DRCOG Board approves CDOT's request, it will impact the funds available for TIP projects. Additional information on funding will be provided at the July meeting.

Metro Vision Issues Committee Summary

June 4, 2014

Page 3

Other Matters

No other matters were discussed

Next Meeting

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

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:00p.m.