# WORK SESSION NOTES of the TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

North Front Range Transportation and Air Quality Planning Council Windsor Recreation Center - Pine Room 250 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street Windsor, CO

June 11, 2015 1:03 – 2:10 p.m.

# **TAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Eric Bracke, Chair – Greeley
Suzette Mallette, Vice Chair – Larimer County
Dawn Anderson – Evans
Stephanie Brothers – Berthoud
Seth Hyberger – Milliken
Will Jones – GET
Karen Schneiders – CDOT
Gary Thomas – SAINT
Dennis Wagner – Windsor

## **NFRMPO STAFF:**

Terri Blackmore Becky Karasko Aaron Buckley Alex Gordon Angela Horn Josh Johnson

## **TAC MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Aaron Bustow – FHWA
Amanda Brimmer – RAQC
Gary Carsten – Eaton
John Franklin – Johnstown
Eric Fuhrman – Timnath
Ingrid Hewitson – CDPHE
John Holdren – Severance
David Klockeman – Loveland
Janet Lundquist – Weld County
Jessica McKeown – LaSalle
Martina Wilkinson – Fort Collins

The Work Session began at 1:03 p.m.

# **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

## 2040 Regional Transportation Plan: Chapter 8: Plan Scenarios

Karasko presented Chapter 8: Plan Scenarios, a new chapter as recommended by Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (MAP-21).

Schneiders stated clarification is needed on which projects are included in the 2040 Build scenario. Horn explained the four roadway model analysis scenarios showing the progression of I-25 build-out. Mallette requested additional analysis scenario information to reduce confusion. Schneiders stated I-25, including SH 14 to Harmony Road and SH 392 are significant while, Trilby Road and County Road 30 are not significant along I-25. She also added the purpose of running the scenarios and their success/failure needs more explanation in the plan. The travel time index (TTI) results chart needs more explanation in relation to the scenarios.

Blackmore stated the analysis scenarios have been run to satisfy the desire to expand I-25, but are not fiscally constrained. Blackmore stated only scenarios that are fiscally constrained are needed. Thomas suggested the model runs could be placed in an appendix. Mallette stated the reason for TTI increase or decrease needs clarification in the text.

Karasko explained the transit scenario, including the assumptions made for each transit agency: Transfort has increased frequency/decreased headways; GET has new routes; and there is no change for COLT. Schneiders stated Phase 3 should be removed from the text as it is specific to the Transfort

Strategic Operating Plan. Jones stated in the future GET routes will use numbers for identification rather than colors and the headway frequencies are incorrect. Schneiders stated FLEX and Bustang should be included as separate transit services.

Bracke questioned the amount of money going to the transit scenario and the amount going to the roadway scenario. Horn stated it was difficult to fully allocate funding for transit and roadway projects, but in the transit scenario projects are meant to have more funding. Mallette and Jones suggested including routes highlighted in the Regional Transit Element (RTE). Blackmore stated the Greeley to Denver along US 85 connection will not be modeled. Jones suggested using Surface Transportation Program (STP-Metro) funds to improve frequency in local transit. Blackmore stated Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds should be completely used on the two regional routes. Horn stated staff is waiting for information from the modeling consultant to fill out *Table 8-11: Ridership Results*. Schneiders requested a transit scenario funding figure to be included for the analysis scenarios.

# 2040 Regional Transportation Plan: Chapter 11: Congestion Management Process

Karasko discussed changes made to Chapter 11 since the 2035 RTP Update including the seven national goals and two performance measures, specific to the Congestion Management Program (CMP).

Schneiders stated the change in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) growth per capita needs clarification. Karasko stated the four congestion management goals come from the CMP. Mallette stated there needs to be better clarification of CMP goals and RTP goals. Karasko explained the forms of congestion, travel time datasets, and Bluetooth counter purchase/installation progress. Mallette stated the NFRMPO congestion survey needs additional explanation and the hanging sentence on page 10 should be removed.

Karasko explained the move from volume over capacity (V/C) measurements to TTI. Schneiders stated TTI maps need to be repeated in this chapter and the V/C move to TTI should be explained further. Karasko explained the transit specific CMP performance measures. Jones indicated GET cannot currently provide directional ridership measurements and stated there needs to be more discussion about vehicle on-time performance. Blackmore explained the listed transit performance measures are desired with a caveat for providers who cannot collect all of this information. Karasko discussed the next steps for the RTE, CMP, and RTP. Mallette stated NFRMPO employees needs to be changed to VanGo employees in the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Strategies section.

Schneiders stated the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) in Chapter 11 Section D needs to show what is happening in the NFRMPO and what members are doing for 2016. Blackmore stated a map of existing and committed ITS projects is needed. Schneiders discussed the need to highlight the maintenance decision support system (MDSS) under ITS. She also mentioned that the bus rapid transit section needs to be moved above the ITS section, to include it with transit. Johnson stated the headings in Chapter 11 need further clarification.

#### **Discussion**

Blackmore requested TAC members review the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) which was sent out with the TAC packet and to provide additional planning activities completed in 2014.

The Work Session adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

### Meeting minutes submitted by:

Aaron Buckley, NFRMPO Staff

5 at the Windsor Recreation Center, Pine Room.					