



Statewide MPO Meeting Notes - DRAFT Friday, June 11, 2021

12:30 PM – 2:30 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Present:

- **Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs):** Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)- Alvan-Bidal Sanchez, Steve Cook, and Ron Papsdorf; Grand Valley Metropolitan Planning Region (GVMPO): Dana Brosig; North Front Range MPO (NFRMPO) – Becky Karasko, AnnaRose Cunningham, and Medora Bornhoft; Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG): John Liosatos, Kathryn Wenger, William Mast, and Mark Northrop; and Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG): John Adams
- **CDOT Regions:** Region 1 – Jordan Rudel, JoAnn Mattson, Region 2 – Wendy Pettit, and Region 4 – Josie Hadley, Jan Rowe
- **CDOT Division of Transportation Development (DTD):** Rebecca White, Marissa Gaughan, Aaron Willis, Jamie Collins, Keara McLean, Kathleen Collins, Carrie Tremblatt, Annelies van Vonno, Nathan Vander Broek
- **CDOT Division of Transit & Rail (DTR):** Julia Wcislo, Brian Hartman
- **CDOT Performance and Asset Management Branch (PAB):** Darius Pakbaz
- **CDOT Information Management Branch (IMB):** Erik Sabina
- **CDOT Office of Innovative Mobility (OIM):** Kay Kelly, Lisa Streisfeld, Mike King, Kayla Zacharias
- **CDOT Division of Accounting and Finance (DAF):** Paige Castaneda
- **Colorado Division Federal Highway Administration (FHWA):** Aaron Bustow and William Haas
- **Region 8 Federal Transit Administration (FTA):** Kristin Kenyon

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Update – Jamie Collins, CDOT STIP Manager

- The STIP has been updated and is awaiting final approval from FHWA and FTA.
- We are also waiting on the latest Planning Findings document from the FHWA and FTA. Once we receive the Planning Findings document, we will need to address any issues brought up in the Findings document. Since so much time was spent on the corrective action last year, the load will hopefully be lighter this year.
- Kristin Kenyon from FTA thanked Jamie and the team for all their efforts addressing the Planning Findings from last year. Jamie then thanked the DTR team for all their help getting the STIP straightened out for this year's adoption.

Division of Transit & Rail (DTR) Update – Julia Wcislo, CDOT Division of Transit

- DTR released their 2022 Super Call on June 1, which includes all application types (Admin/Operations/Mobility Management, Planning, and Capital). The notice of funding availability and application deadlines are posted on DTR's website.
- There will be a Super Call Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) Workshop on June 14 from 10 – 11:30 AM to answer questions.



- Dana Brosig asked if the date on the capital deadline was dependent on the earmark requests. Julia did not know the answer but will check and verify.
- Marissa Gaughan announced that the new DTR Director will be Amber Blake. Amber will start later this month.

Future SWMPO Meetings – Day, Time, and Format – Marissa Gaughan, CDOT Multimodal Planning Branch

- After the last SWMPO meeting in May, Marissa sent out a survey to determine if we should permanently move the MPO meeting from Friday afternoons to Thursday mornings before STAC. Almost all survey respondents wanted to move the meeting permanently to Thursdays. One person voted to keep the meeting alternating between Thursdays and Fridays. However, a couple key people did not respond, so Marissa opened it up for discussion.
- After some discussion, Marissa confirmed that if the SWMPO meetings will switch to Thursday mornings the day before STAC, the meetings would remain virtual. After confirming the meeting could be a hybrid with virtual attendance as an option, there were no objections to moving the meeting to Thursday morning.
- For the remainder of the year, MPO meetings will be at 8:30 AM Thursdays and will meet virtually, unless people in the Denver Metro Area want to come in person, and an email will be sent out to determine how many intend on attending in person to be sure enough room for the meeting is provided.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Transportation Policy Rulemaking Update (and disproportionately impacted communities analysis requirement) – Rebecca White, CDOT Division of Transportation Development

- CDOT had temporarily paused the GHG rulemaking update to wait until SB 260 was adopted since some language in SB 260 could impact the trajectory of the rulemaking process.
- Now that SB 260 language is finalized, there is a better understanding and clarification of some of the authority issues. The language in SB 260 makes it clear that CDOT has a strong role in the process, particularly with transportation planning.
- What we are looking at now is joint action with the Air Quality Control Commission (AQCC). The AQCC will take up a Rule and the Transportation Commission (TC) will do its own Rulemaking in this area. The issue of budgets and sub-budgets is still under discussion.
- The next product is a policy paper that CDOT has been working on during this down time. It will describe more fully what is being considered, and put the planning Rule into context with all the other GHG reduction measures CDOT is undertaking. The intent is to workshop the paper with the TC next week. It will likely be a late addition to the TC packet.
- Right now, the schedule has both AQCC and TC convening and opening the GHG Transportation Rulemaking session in July, though this date is still tentative.
- Discussion and Questions:
 - Ron Papsdorf (DRCOG) said that the policy and guideline requirements in SB 260 seem different from the AQCC rulemaking process, which is a formal regimented process. He asked clarification on the process for CDOT, and what the TC is using for guidelines and policies. Rebecca responded that CDOT's rulemaking authority is not as regularly used as the AQCC, but we do have an official Administrative Procedure Act (APA) rulemaking process that we will use in addition to a policy and procedural directive. Some areas of the policy such as the mitigation menu will go into a policy or procedural directive so that it is more easily changeable, whereas other areas such as the mechanism for the modeling work will go through the CDOT rule making process.
 - Ron Papsdorf then asked about SB 260's language around "Regionally Significant Project" in the context of the GHG Transportation Rulemaking. In the MPO Federal Transportation Planning process, "Regionally Significant Project" has a very specific and important definition and context. He is concerned that this rulemaking and the language in SB 260 could cause a lot of confusion. Ron added that if the rulemaking and SB 260 use the same definition for "Regionally Significant Project" as the MPO Federal Transportation Planning process, it could include far more projects than intended, and could make the planning process



very cumbersome if they need to do a project by project analysis of every single “regionally significant project”. He added that DRCOG does not have the time or resources to do this. Steve Cook added that they were also concerned that not clarifying the language would result in small projects triggering new non-conformity GHG analysis for the entire system, forcing them to make multiple amendments throughout the year.

- Bill Haas noted that there is another default definition of regionally significant project in 22 CFR 450. He interprets this as saying a regionally significant project in Denver or Colorado Springs would look very different from one in Montrose or Durango. He also added that in SB 260 “capacity projects” and “regionally significant projects” are used somewhat interchangeably. He argued that CDOT should develop a more specific definition for “regionally significant project” that is appropriate for this context. Bill added that CDOT should avoid definitions that are too close to federal air quality conformity definitions, as federal definitions have the teeth, are quite restrictive, and can shut down projects.
- Steve Cook added that another word that you need to be careful about is “capacity,” adding that, as lots of various projects can increase carrying capacity, but can have very different impacts – such as a traffic signal coordination project, versus a major highway widening like Central 70.
- Medora Bornhoft asked about this requirement on project-level impacts. She asked if CDOT would be doing project level emissions for all regionally significant projects. Rebecca said she believed this to be the role of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. Rebecca agrees that this falls into CDOT’s role rather than the role of the MPOs. However, Ron Papsdorf mentioned that some MPOs also conduct NEPA for their projects. He added that if the CDOT idea is to implement these guidelines to CDOT projects going through a NEPA process, he thinks that is fine. However, he added that there are many smaller locally funded air quality projects that never go through a NEPA process, as well as a variety of different NEPA processes. He asked if Rebecca just meant EIS NEPA processes or all NEPA processes. Rebecca noted that the SB 260 language mentioned CDOT’s environmental study process, so she believes CDOT’s NEPA process is where the analysis should occur.
- Rebecca agreed that CDOT should work with the MPOs to develop a specific definition of “regionally significant projects” instead of using an existing definition that could create difficulties.
- Medora Bornhoft asked Rebecca to talk about how the rulemaking with AQCC and TC rulemaking processes would work together. Rebecca said that CDOT is still working with Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) to figure out the specifics and the division of authorities.
- Rebecca said they would schedule the next GHG Advisory Committee meeting, but added that she could schedule a separate MPO meeting so the MPOs could talk to CDOT about this issue.

Statewide Travel Survey Update – Erik Sabina, CDOT Information Management Branch.

- Eric Sabina gave an update on the Statewide Travel Survey. The Oversight Committee, which includes representatives from all the MPOs, met for the first time on Wednesday. Key topics included:
 - History of surveying in Colorado
 - How collaboration and scheduling would work
 - High-level structure of how the consultant would run the survey
 - The project team will start with a recruitment survey, recruit participants, and do household demographics.
 - The recruitment survey will be followed by a retrieval phase to collect travel data.
 - Data collection would be done primarily through smart phone app to make it very easy for respondents.
 - Sampling methods, sample size and composition, observations about specific subgroups of users (ebikes, scooters, package delivery, etc.) will be determined.
 - Accounting for seasonality, weekday vs weekend data, winter vs summer data.



- Data needs – What data do the various partners want to have collected? What data was collected in the past? What additional data should be added for this survey? Is there any data that we no longer need to track? What are our analytical and planning needs?
- Process Going Forward:
 - Once a data dictionary is solidified, the consultant will be programming the data collection app, as well as a browser interface for those without smart phones. There will also be a method for collecting data by phone interview.
 - Prior to the full study, there will be a pilot survey. The full survey will take place at some point after the pilot.
 - In the short run, they will be using location-based services (LBS) data to track how travel behavior is changing and reaching stability/"new normal" for the next year before doing the full survey.
 - The full survey likely won't be conducted until 2022, or later, in order to allow for adjustment in travel behavior post-COVID.
- Erik is coordinating with additional partners who want to be involved in the project and working to find out if they are able to contribute financially and what needs they have.
- Erik is also working with CDOT's Division of Accounting and Finance (DAF) to move money from MPOs into the project accounts. They will be a number of upcoming meetings to hash out technical details and get the pilot project going.
- Questions & Discussion:
 - Kayla Zacharias (OIM) asked if other CDOT office would be able help review and develop the survey questions. Erik responded that yes, various CDOT divisions and offices would have the opportunity to contribute to the question development.
 - John Liosatos asked if the purchase of LBS data for this effort would give MPOs some of the more granular data that they usually cannot afford on their own. He asked if there was an opportunity to give the MPOs access to this data, so they could do more meaningful modeling and analysis for GHG rules.
 - Will Mast said it was less about the data and more about access to LBS data service to do trip analysis. Being able to have access to a service like that would enable them to do more analysis and improve their modeling.
 - Erik Sabina responded that CDOT has had a contract with INRIX for 5 years that allowed them to provide data to -planning partners. They have recently re-upped the contract through a third party vendor. He will need to check if the new contract allows sharing data with partners. Erik added that we should discuss how future contracts should be structured. In regards to this project, one of the consultants has a pipeline to LBS data vendors, so CDOT is not actually buying any at this time. However, one of the task orders is to purchase some of this data. Erik concluded that the first step would be to circling back to the INRIX contract and making it more than a year-by-year third party contract.

Other Business

- CDOT Staffing Updates – DTD and DTR
 - Aaron Willis was promoted to Statewide and Regional Planning Section Manager.
 - Amber Blake will soon join CDOT as the Director of the Division of Transit and Rail.
 - Region 4 recently hired Jan Rowe as a Transit and Innovative Mobility Liaison.
 - The CDOT Office of Innovative Mobility will be advertising for a Project Coordinator position in the near future.
- Future Agenda Topics
 - Ron Papsdorf asked the other MPOs what their processes and schedules would be for putting out a call for projects for Multimodal Options Funds (MMOF) funds.



- SB 260 will be a standing agenda item since there are bound to be more and more questions as the Bill goes into effect.
- Darius Pakbaz added that another future agenda topic should be safety targets and National Performance Measures (NPMs) and upcoming target setting.

Next meeting will be the morning of Thursday, August 12. There will be a room available for those who wish to attend in person. If you plan to attend in person, please let Kathleen know so we can be prepared, otherwise we are assuming you will be attending virtually.

