

## Statewide Steering Committee Meeting #2 Meeting Summary

**Date:** August 7, 2013  
**Time:** 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM  
**Location:** Colorado Department of Transportation, Headquarters Auditorium

### ***Statewide Steering Committee Attendees:***

Eric Bergman - CCI  
Craig Blewitt – MMT, TRAC  
Jasper Butero Jr. - SCCOG  
Stan Elmquist – NFRMPO  
Cecilia Garcia – CDOT Civil Rights Office  
Gail Hoffman – CDOT DTD  
Tracey MacDonald – CDOT DTR  
Mark Radtke – CML  
Ann Rajewski – CASTA, TRAC  
Jacob Riger – DRCOG  
Joan Schaffer – FRONT  
Jim Souby – ColoRail  
John Valerio – CDOT DTR  
Bill VanMeter – RTD

### ***Teleconference Attendees:***

David Johnson – RFTA, TRAC  
David Peckler - Snowmass Village Shuttle  
Karen Schneiders- CDOT Region 4  
Larry Squires, FTA

### ***Project Team Attendees:***

Holly Buck – FHU  
Bob Felsburg – FHU  
Will Kerns – OV Consulting  
Suzanne O'Neill – Transit Plus

**Meeting Goal:** **Consensus on vision, goals and objectives and input on important base data for analysis.**

### **Review of Steering Committee Meeting #1 – Tracey MacDonald, CDOT Project Manager**

At the last meeting we created a draft vision statement, based on some great discussion of Committee members' thoughts and views on the future of transit in Colorado.

The first of two open houses planned in each rural TPR will be scheduled this fall (September, October) after the second round of TWG meetings. Another open house in each TPR is planned in March with a draft of the statewide transit plan.

### **Review of regional meetings conducted to date – Key Themes – Holly Buck, FHU**

The project team has held six meetings so far, with two more scheduled in August. The South Central TPR is developing their own plan, and the UFR has a TPR meeting in the near future, at which Tracey will be presenting to determine if they have an interest in developing a regional transit plan.

During the first six regional meetings there were several recurring themes. These themes include:

- ▶ Need for flexible funding
- ▶ Need for increased financial resources
- ▶ Better intercity bus services
- ▶ Better inter-regional communication
- ▶ Increased medical service transportation

### **Statewide demographic data – Holly Buck, FHU**

The team has compiled a wide range of data and metrics for use in the TPR TWG meetings. These data, while important to the regional plans, must also be able to be rolled up into a form suitable for understanding transit at the statewide level as well. Sample graphics of some of these data were presented. The Committee was asked to review the types of data which have been compiled and how the data are presented in order to provide the team guidance on which data are most helpful and on how to illustrate the data in the most meaningful and useful fashion.

- ▶ **Statewide Demographics** - Population is projected to grow by a factor of 1.47x between now and 2040, Jobs are projected to grow by a factor of 1.61x in the same time period, and the Over 65 Population will grow by a factor of 2.20x.
- ▶ **Population growth by percentage, 2013- 2040 (by county)** - Elbert County has especially high growth from a percentage basis, but the actual value is much less than some of the other counties. This illustrates the need to look at the data from multiple perspectives.
- ▶ **AGE 65+ population growth, 2013-2040** – A significant number of counties will experience greater than 100% increase in this portion of the population by 2040.
- ▶ **Job growth projections between 2010 and 2040** - Elbert County is projected to experience the highest percentage of job growth, but is still only expected to have 15K jobs in 2040. Again, this illustrates the need to look at the data in several ways.
- ▶ **2012 K-12 English Learners** – These data are provided at the state level by each individual school district and can be used to identify communities with a higher than average limited English proficiency. These data can be used to identify where there is demand for transit; a Committee member commented that Hispanics are a large transit user base, and that students are also a large transit user group. Generally the numbers are higher in urban areas. Eagle County also has a relatively high portion of English Learners. These data are used for reporting purposes in Title VI as they relate to the equitable distribution of funds. This information will also be used to tailoring our outreach materials.

- ▶ **County to County Commuter Patterns** - This map illustrates commuter patterns between counties. The patterns are illustrated from county centroid to centroid, not to\from any particular cities. A Committee member asked about the arrow along I-70 between Eagle and Denver and asked if the number of commuters was close to the 1,000 threshold in the legend? If it is close, it might be worth changing the arrow ranges to show the high volume of commuters along this corridor. The team agreed to look into this question.

The team would like to make the data as visual as possible to help make it easier to read and use. Some data may need to be presented both graphically and tabularly. There will be a lot more detailed information available on the local level; however, we will scale appropriately for the statewide effort. Tracey told the group that we will also be looking at corridor level data.

- ▶ Radtke, CML -Referenced a map he had seen a few years ago of commercial bus service in Colorado that he found helpful. John Valerio had this map and distributed it to the group.
- ▶ Souby, ColoRail – While we should be concerned especially about over 65 population, there is also the 18-30 generation that is gravitating towards transit and is less likely to use automobiles. These generations are both very important to the future of transit in Colorado. We need to show the population numbers and growth by age ranges.
- ▶ Valerio, CDOT - Can we compare Colorado data to national data regarding how many have access to a car? Possibly only 5% of households do not have access to a car.
- ▶ O'Neill, Transit Plus - Information on minorities in CO is possibly too low; the data for this may need to be reevaluated.
- ▶ MacDonald, CDOT – LEP data is actually the one that is too low; that was the reason for compiling school district data. It is believed that the minority data is reasonably accurate.
- ▶ Butero, SCCOG – The Colorado Department of Education is gathering some of this data, but it may be a few years behind.
- ▶ Garcia, CDOT – She has seen national Latino growth data, but not necessarily Colorado data. She would like to know more about this. We need to see how dependent these Hispanic groups are on transit, however the data are very mixed up with LEP and low-income data.

### **Refine vision, goals and objectives – Bob Felsburg, FHU**

The last time the SSC met there was considerable discussion about the future of transit in Colorado and the views of the Committee members on what aspects of a transit system would be important in the state. As a result of that discussion, a draft vision statement was formulated but it was not concise because it attempted to incorporate as many of the thoughts as possible. Since that meeting the team had refined the statement to more concisely reflect the intent of what had been discussed at the previous meeting. In an attempt to keep the vision succinct, it was restructured to also include a number of supporting goals.

#### **Vision:**

The resulting Vision that was presented was:

*“Colorado’s public transit system will enhance mobility for the citizens and visitors of Colorado, offer transportation choices to all segments of the state’s population, improve access to and connectivity among transportation modes, and promote environmental stewardship in an efficient, effective and safe manner.”*

Several questions were the basis of the discussion on this vision: Is the vision clear? Does it hit the key points?

The Committee agreed that the vision statement should be brief and clear. There was considerable discussion regarding specific words that would more simply define the type of transit policies, programs and system which should be the desired outcome of the plan. The discussion also focused on using words that did not have multiple meanings. It was agreed that buzzwords should not be used. Based on this conversation, the project team edited the vision statement as defined on the attached document.

#### **Goals:**

Based on the discussion at the last meeting, the project team drafted six supporting goals to the vision statement. In addition, the team had outlined some objectives associated with each of these goals. These objectives were prepared to reflect things that CDOT could, in fact, effect. These were presented to the Committee, with a request for suggested modifications.

The conversation resulted in several of the goals being retitled, some of the goal texts being revised, and a few objectives being added. For example, the title “Coordination” for one of the goals was determined to be inappropriate and was revised to “Transit System Development and Partnerships”, which seemed to be more demonstrative of the goal. Funding and private development were also more clearly stated in the revisions. Similarly, it was suggested that the Safety and Security goal be revised to clearly reflect security for both the patrons and the infrastructure. All of these suggested revisions have been incorporated into the attached document.

#### **Performance-based planning – Bob Felsburg, FHU**

The purpose of this brief discussion was to advise the Committee on the background of performance-based planning and to summarize some of the work that has already been done within CDOT regarding this issue. The DTR Performance Measures Framework, on which several Committee members worked, was briefly presented. The other element of the discussion was the current work that CDOT is doing in updating Policy Directive 14. Regarding transit, this effort is currently focused on Infrastructure Condition (State of Good Repair and Asset Management Plans) and on System Performance (ridership and connectivity).

#### **Next Steps**

- ▶ Provider Surveys to be distributed around the state.
- ▶ Conduct Transit Working Group Meetings - Round 2.
- ▶ Conduct regional open houses.

#### **Future Steering Committee Meeting Dates**

October 30<sup>th</sup>, January 8<sup>th</sup>, March 26<sup>th</sup>, May 28<sup>th</sup>