MobilityNEXT: Moving Forward on Arterial Efficiency
- Jim Doyle, Mobility Next & Chris Primus, HDR
- See handouts
- CU Denver, CSU, DU, CU Boulder are participating
- Focus 1: Arterial Corridors
  - Research what people are doing on light synchronization
  - Attaining broad support comes first
  - Working with HDR
  - Step 1 — Attain broad support
  - Step 2 — Assess readiness — pick corridors working with DRCOG
    - Gathering data to understand what infrastructure is in place — drawing on existing data first from cities, DRCOG others
    - Look for places with good infrastructure and communications like fiber
    - Pedestrian safety element
    - 20-25% reduction in congestion – based on Pittsburgh study
      - How many times a car has to actually stop
      - Even better stop reduction and red light running reduction for commercial vehicles
      - If we could achieve improvements at that level would users like FedEx and UPS help pay the cost
      - 6 months after assessment anticipate deployment
  - Step 3 — Understand needs
  - Step 4 — Evaluate technologies
  - Step 5 — Develop and evaluate pilots
- Focus 2: Workforce Mobility
- Focus 3: LM Logistics
- Focus 4: Mobility for Developers – particularly parking issues
- Maintaining focus on programs and projects that are aligned with regional goals
  - Concerns expressed that this was duplicative of work done by DRCOG
Make sure that integrating through the advanced mobility partnership – chamber, RTD and DRCOG
- This is an opt-in series of pilots that cities can determine if they are a good fit
- Hope to create body of knowledge around impacts of emerging technologies

**Empowering Transportation Planning Organizations** **HB20-1151**
- Report Out on Outreach
- Overview of process for a TPO to use authority in 1151 (handout)
- Bill has been introduced by Transportation Chairs Matt Gray and Faith Winter
- Empower TPO’s to ask for tax increases without additional cost, red tape and layers of duplicative government required by RTA statute
- Concerns about leaving the rural communities behind
  - MMC led MPACT64 consensus building and supported ballot and legislative attempts to fund entire state for most of last decade
  - Passage of CC and 110 shows which communities could pass local/individual solutions
  - Denver, Boulder and others have held off self-funding but have voters that will approve transportation measures based on 110 and CC
  - Rural areas have consistently rejected funding measures
  - More than 84% of population lives in the five MPO’s
    - Need to also be thinking about how to meet the mobility needs of these areas with new funding models
      - Air quality
      - Congestion
      - Growth pressures
- HB-1151 Simplifies the process — no need to for 50+ jurisdictions IGA
  - Would follow the normal board process
  - Governing body’s boundaries but jurisdictions can opt in or out
  - TPO’s could collaborate around corridors if that was their highest priority
- DRCOG board meeting Feb 5 to explain bill in detail
- MACC concerns around being left out of conversation
  - Framework was developed by MMC & DRCOG Board Leadership in 2018
  - MMC and DRCOG didn’t draft bill
  - Why would a community oppose an expansion of local control and having this tool?
  - Multi-year process allows plenty of time to address shortcomings, identify projects and address splits – but only if authority is extended by legislature
- Concerns about taxes from Boulder County jurisdictions funding other jurisdictions roadways
  - Some Boulder area cities would not approve of how other cities might use their own shareback – e.g., paving projects
  - Hasn’t sub-regional allocation model worked well under DRCOG?
• Concerns that inability to support 1151 signals a balkanizing of cities and lack of value in system approach to funding mobility needs
  o How does investment in a single city address the mobility of needs of populations that don’t live and work in the same place?
    ▪ 60,000 people who commute into Boulder daily for work (more than half of all jobs)
  o Employers cite our collaboration and regionalism as why we are a more attractive place to locate
• 1151 model is flexible, provides another option, and is not a mandate
  o Based on whatever needs the governing body defines
• Rural counties are currently being left behind because their voters aren’t supporting a statewide solution
  o 89% of funding from legislature for CDOT but Urbanized areas only have 25% of CDOT’s paved miles
  o Local needs (transit, streets, pedestrian and bike) were more than $17B in 2035 plan
  o Even 110 would not have fully met local needs
• Chamber is neutral still hoping for Statewide approach
  o Speaker has said she will not pass fees without bipartisan support
  o Governor said not putting another tax measure before voters
  o Even if legislature passes some fees with bipartisan support – it is unlikely to fund a majority of the local mobility needs
• 1151 is being used as leverage to get people to the table – but ETPO/1151 is an AND should not have its passage tied to whether Rs will support new statewide fees
• Some confusion that there is an element of direct allocation to RTD in 1151
  o Is the hold-harmless iron-clad?
  o Suggestion next meeting that mayors talk about project funding priorities

Group Discussion
• How Are Communities Responding to RTD Service Cuts and Changes?
  o Generally negative around service changes
  o Train cancellation and uncertainties make it difficult to encourage transit use
• No official feedback from RTD yet on Interim search – should be announced after meeting(s) on 1/28
• MMC proposing candidate RTD forums
  o Partner with local chambers, environmental community, AARP and others to spotlight the importance and role of the board and help with accountability issues
  o More than half of the Districts are up with either term limited or contested seats
• Legislative Action
  o Yet to be introduced Tate Bill with Democratic Cosponsors would introduce numerous changes to increase board size, additional reporting requirements, remove farebox recovery minimum, etc.
Business Items

- Meeting schedule is calendar hold and will meet as needed on 4th Friday

Present

1. Mayor Stephanie Piko
2. Ron Papsdorf
3. Rich Mauro
4. Laura Rizzo — Denver Chamber
5. Chris Primus, HDR
6. Mayor Jerry Valdes
7. Mayor Ashley Stolzmann
8. Mayor Pat Quinn
9. Debra Baskett
10. Roger Sherman — CRL
11. Pauletta Tonillas — RTD
12. RTD Acting GM — Heather McKillop
13. David Levy — Mobility Next
14. David Foster
15. Tony Milo — CCA
16. Karen Stuart — Colorado Transportation Commission
17. Vince Buzik — RTD Board
18. Mayor Herb Atchison
19. Mayor Marc Williams
20. Ted Leighty — Colorado Association of Home Builders
21. Mary Marchun
22. Jim Doyle — Mobility Next
23. Peter Kenney — Metro Mayors Caucus
24. Brendan McGuire
25. Meghan White — Metro Mayors Caucus
26. Catherine Marinelli — Metro Mayors Caucus