

## 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.