

Attachment A: Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

Monday, September 28, 2026

Meeting was held in-person with virtual option for public via Zoom

Attendance Log

Agency or interest	Member or alternate name	Attendance
Adams County	Bradyn Nicholson (Adams County)	In person
Adams County	Cathleen Valencia (Aurora)	Virtual
Adams County	Chris Chovan (Westminster)	In-person
Adams County	Eden Teklemariam (Northglenn)	Not present
Adams County	Greg LaBrie (Brighton)	In-person
Adams County	Jenna Hahn (Commerce City)	Not present
Arapahoe County	Ant Devita (Centennial)	In person
Arapahoe County	Brent Soderlin (Littleton)	In-person
Arapahoe County	James Katzer (Arapahoe County)	Not present
Arapahoe County	Ryan Seacrist (Arapahoe County)	Not present
Arapahoe County	Tom Worker-Braddock (Aurora)	In-person
Arapahoe County	Victor Rachael (Englewood)	In-person
Boulder County	Alex Hyde-Wright (Boulder County)	In-person
Boulder County	Angel Bond (Boulder)	Not present
Boulder County	Cammie Edson (Longmont)	Not present
Boulder County	Gerrit Slater (Boulder)	Not present
Boulder County	Jean Sanson (Boulder)	Not present
Boulder County	Michelle Melonakis (Lafayette)	Not present
Broomfield, City and County	Bryce Hammerton	Not present
Broomfield, City and County	Sarah Grant	Virtual
Colorado Department of Transportation Division of Transit and Rail	Jan Rowe	Not present

Agency or interest	Member or alternate name	Attendance
Colorado Department of Transportation Division of Transit and Rail	Vacant	Vacant
Colorado Department of Transportation Division of Transportation Development	Darius Pakbaz	Not present
Colorado Department of Transportation Division of Transportation Development	Marissa Gaughan	In-person
Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1	Jessica Myklebust	In-person
Colorado Department of Transportation Region 1	Jordan Rudel	In-person
Colorado Department of Transportation Region 4	Heather Paddock	Not present
Colorado Department of Transportation Region 4	Jim Eussen	In-person
Denver Regional Council of Governments	Douglas W. Rex	Not present
Denver Regional Council of Governments	Jacob Riger	In-person
Denver, City and County	David Gaspers	Not present
Denver, City and County	David Krutsinger	In-person
Denver, City and County	Jennifer Hillhouse	Not present
Denver, City and County	Jonathan Webster	Not present
Denver, City and County	Justin Begley (Vice Chair)	In-person
Denver, City and County	Riley LaMie	Not present
Douglas County	Chris Hudson (Parker)	In-person
Douglas County	Jason Oldham (Douglas County)	Not present
Douglas County	Justin Schmitz (Lone Tree) (Chair)	In-person
Douglas County	Larry Nimmo (Castle Pines)	In-person
Douglas County	Tom Reiff (Castle Rock)	Not present
Douglas County	Zeke Lynch (Douglas County)	In-person
Federal Highway Administration	Aaron Bustow	Not present

Agency or interest	Member or alternate name	Attendance
Federal Highway Administration	Paige Cipperly	Not present
Federal Transit Administration	Emma Belmont	Not present
Federal Transit Administration	Tracey McDonald	Not present
Jefferson County	Christina Lane (Jefferson County)	In-person
Jefferson County	Kellee Van Bruggen (Arvada)	Not present
Jefferson County	Matt Wempe (Golden)	Not present
Jefferson County	Mike Vanatta (Jefferson County)	Not present
Jefferson County	Mike Whiteaker (Lakewood)	In-person
Jefferson County	Rocky Macsalka (Wheat Ridge)	In-person
Non-metropolitan planning organization area	Colton Rohlof (Clear Creek County)	In-person
Non-metropolitan planning organization area	Jamie Boyle (Gilpin County)	In-person
Regional Air Quality Council	Kyra Reumann-Moore	Not present
Regional Air Quality Council	Tom Moore	In-person
Regional Transportation District	Chris Quinn	Not present
Regional Transportation District	Kiernan Maletsky	Not present
Southwest Weld County	Evan Pinkham (Weld County)	Not present
Southwest Weld County	Miguel Aguilar (Erie)	In-person
Special interest seat: Aviation	Brodie Ayers (Denver International Airport)	In-person
Special interest seat: Aviation	Kyle Finseth (Denver International Airport)	In-person
Special interest seat: Business	Frank Gray (Castle Rock Economic Development Council)	Not present
Special interest seat: Environment	Colleen Kirby Roberts (Peak)	In-person
Special interest seat: Environment	Lisa Sakata (HNTB)	Not present

Agency or interest	Member or alternate name	Attendance
Special interest seat: Equity	Angie Rivera-Malpiede	Not present
Special interest seat: Freight	Wally Weart	Virtual
Special interest seat: Housing	Jeffrey Boyd	In-person
Special interest seat: Non-motorized	Sue Prant (Community Cycles)	In-person
Special interest seat: Older adults	Hilary Simmons (A Little Help)	In-person
Special interest seat: Older adults	Karie Erickson, (Aging Resources, Douglas County)	Not present
Special interest seat: Transportation demand management	Carson Priest (Smart Commute)	In-person
Via Mobility	Dawn Sluder (Lakewood Rides)	Not present
Via Mobility	Frank Bruno	In-person

Others present: John Gardoki – CDOT, Shawn Poe – WSB, Sara Ciasto, Jeremy Haywood, Kelly, Amanda Cabot – CDOT, Shweta Iyer – Clear Creek County, Huiliang Liy – Aurora Transportation Planning, Josie T.

DRCOG staff present: Alvan-Bidal Sanchez, Aaron Villere, Emily Lindsey, Nora Kern, Jhas Cooper-Moore, Sang Gu Lee, Kathryn Rush, Cole Neder, Noreen Smith, Sheila Lynch, Malorie Miller.

Call to Order.

Chair Justin Schmitz called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. with a quorum present.

Announcements and Public Comment.

Alvan-Bidal Sanchez announced that Tom Worker Braddock recently transitioned from the City of Aurora to RTD and will now serve on the committee representing RTD. Staff also announced that Walter "Wally" Wart will be stepping down from the Freight Special Interest seat. Wally shared remarks expressing his appreciation for the opportunity to serve on the Transportation Advisory Committee, noting that his service with DRCOG was a highlight of his career. He will remain in the role virtually until a successor is appointed. Committee members thanked Wally for his years of service, expertise on freight issues, and significant contributions to the committee and the Denver region. Committee members recognized that his knowledge and support of DRCOG's work will be greatly missed.

September 28, 2026 Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Summary.

The summary was accepted.

Action Items

Transportation Improvement Program Amendments

Josh Schwenk, Senior Planner with the Programming and Project Delivery Team, presented this item.

Josh provided an overview of a package of proposed amendments to the 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Many of the amendments reflected funding and project changes resulting from the recently approved CDOT 10-Year Plan, while others were necessary to incorporate projects within the expanded MPO boundary that now includes Clear Creek and Gilpin counties.

The amendments included funding adjustments for several CDOT Region 1 and Region 4 projects, updates to the CO 119 project following receipt of federal RAISE funding, additional funding for the Federal Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit project, modifications to the Colorado Boulevard BRT project, expanded safety improvements along US 85, additional funding for the US 287 Safety Median project, pre-construction funding for the I-25 Segment 4 project, and pavement and safety improvements along CO 7. He also presented administrative amendments to add existing federally and state-funded projects in Clear Creek County, including the Floyd Hill project, Eisenhower-Johnson Tunnel maintenance and rehabilitation, the I-70 climbing lane project, and the Idaho Springs Mobility Hub.

Mike Whitaker moved to recommend the attached project amendments. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. No members opposed the motion or abstained.

Transportation Improvement Program Set-Aside Policy Amendment

Josh Schwenk, Senior Planner with the Programming and Project Delivery Team, presented this item.

Josh provided an overview of proposed amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Set-Aside Policy, which guides the administration of DRCOG's set-aside funding programs. The proposed changes primarily focused on the Livable Centers Small Area Planning Program and were intended to incorporate lessons learned and improve alignment with program goals.

The amendments included revisions to the program purpose to better emphasize the connection between land use and transportation planning, updates to eligible project locations and project types, and the addition of a scoring criterion related to the integration of land use, housing, and transportation. He also proposed requiring pre-application meetings between project sponsors and DRCOG staff for all internally managed set-aside programs, formalizing a practice that has helped applicants better align projects with program objectives and strengthen application quality.

During discussion, Zeke Lynch suggested updating references to the "2050 Regional Transportation Plan" throughout the policy to instead reference the "currently adopted" plan, which staff agreed would provide greater flexibility for future plan updates.

Frank moved to recommend approval of the proposed TIP Set-Aside Policy amendments to the Regional Transportation Committee. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously with no opposition or abstentions.

Informational Briefings

2029-2032 Transportation Improvement Program – Draft Application

Todd Cottrell, Program Manager of the Programming and Project Delivery Team provided an overview of the draft application questions for the 2029–2032 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) call for projects. Staff developed the proposed questions over the past six months with input from DRCOG subject matter experts and feedback received through the TIP Subcommittee. The application retains its overall structure while incorporating updates intended to improve clarity, alignment with the draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and consistency in project evaluation.

The proposed application includes sections covering project information, project need and benefits, RTP priorities, project readiness, and a new regionalism category. Notable changes include replacing multimodal mobility with reliability as an RTP priority, combining overmatch and project readiness considerations into a single scored section, and adding a regionalism measure to help evaluate the regional significance of projects in the regional share process. Staff also refined application language to focus evaluations on project outcomes when fully constructed and added tailored questions for study-only applications.

Justin Begley asked whether applicants would be provided with guidance or cross-references identifying where to find information needed to answer application questions, such as relevant plans, data sources, and DRCOG tools. Todd explained that applicants will primarily rely on DRCOG's existing data tool and its available data layers to support responses. Where questions are based on specific plans or documents, staff intend to reference those sources to help applicants identify the appropriate information.

Jessica Myklebust suggested adding irrigation ditches to the examples listed under project readiness considerations, noting that coordination with irrigation companies can create challenges like railroad coordination and is often overlooked. Todd agreed with the suggestion and noted that the purpose of the question is to encourage applicants to think through potential project risks and obstacles early in the process so projects can remain on schedule and within budget.

During closing remarks, Jacob Riger thanked the TIP Subcommittee for its participation and feedback, noting that the subcommittee process helped strengthen the draft application questions. Staff indicated that the draft questions will be incorporated into the broader TIP policy amendment that will be returned to TAC for review in October.

2029-2032 TIP Development Process Update

Todd Cottrell, Program Manager of the Programming and Project Delivery Team, provided an overview of proposed updates to the 2029–2032 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) development process, including subregional funding target calculations, project eligibility criteria tied to Regional Transportation Plan air quality staging periods, and regional share funding request minimums and maximums. Staff reviewed how funding targets are calculated using population, employment, and vehicle miles traveled, discussed the impacts of the MPO boundary expansion to include Clear Creek and Gilpin counties, and sought feedback on whether the current \$100,000 minimum and \$20 million maximum regional share funding request thresholds should remain in place.

Colton Rohloff of Clear Creek County commented that the current funding target formula underrepresents the county's transportation impacts because it places equal emphasis on population and employment despite Clear Creek accounting for a disproportionately high share of regional vehicle miles traveled generated by recreation and tourism. He asked the committee to consider whether the formula adequately reflects those unique transportation demands.

Jamie Boyle of Gilpin County echoed those concerns and noted that visitor trips, tourism activity, and casino employment generate transportation impacts that are not fully reflected in population and employment statistics. She encouraged TAC members to consider whether the current formula captures transportation realities across all jurisdictions.

Jacob Riger acknowledged the challenge of balancing funding equity across an increasingly diverse MPO and noted that DRCOG's goal is to find a fair approach while recognizing the unique characteristics of all counties in the region.

Justin Begley commented that many TAC members may not yet feel prepared to take positions on potential formula changes without first discussing the issue with their respective subregional forums and suggested that additional conversations may be needed.

Chris Chovan of Westminster noted that all jurisdictions experience unique transportation demands, such as employment-related travel, and emphasized the importance of applying consistent measures across all counties rather than tailoring metrics to individual circumstances. He suggested that other funding sources may be better suited to address unique local needs.

Jessica Myklebust questioned whether the current \$100,000 minimum regional share request remains appropriate given inflation and increasing consultant costs, noting that even relatively small studies often exceed that amount today.

Committee members asked whether the minimum request threshold should be increased because of the availability of other DRCOG planning and study funding programs. Todd and Jacob responded that staff recommend leaving the minimum unchanged because project needs vary significantly across jurisdictions. Maintaining the current threshold preserves flexibility for smaller communities and avoids creating additional barriers to participation, even if larger jurisdictions would not pursue projects at that funding level.

Committee members then discussed the current \$20 million maximum regional share funding request limit and whether it continues to meet the program's goals. Todd explained that the cap was originally established to balance regional investments and avoid a scenario where a single project consumes a large share of available regional funding. He noted that staff were seeking feedback on whether that approach is still appropriate given increasing project costs.

Hilary Simmons asked whether removing or increasing the cap could create staff capacity challenges by encouraging a larger number of very large funding requests and whether additional screening criteria might be necessary. Todd responded that existing processes already provide opportunities for staff involvement before applications are submitted and noted that additional policy criteria could be considered if the cap were modified.

Alex Hyde-Wright asked how often applicants have requested or received the full \$20 million maximum award during previous TIP cycles. Todd responded that projects requesting or receiving the maximum award have been relatively uncommon, with most regional share requests typically falling within the \$5 million to \$15 million range.

Justin Begley observed that the \$20 million cap was not derived from a specific formula and instead originated from previous policy discussions about balancing regional equity with project funding needs. Chris Chovan commented that current roadway and transit project costs have increased substantially, making \$20 million a relatively small contribution to many large projects. However, he expressed support for maintaining the cap because it helps preserve opportunities to fund multiple projects throughout the region.

During discussion, committee members generally acknowledged the challenge of balancing increasing project costs with the desire to maintain geographic equity and fund multiple regional priorities. Alex asked whether the proposed project eligibility restrictions related to RTP air quality staging periods would apply only to air-quality-significant projects. Todd clarified that the proposed

eligibility restriction would apply to any project included in the RTP with an identified staging period, regardless of whether it is classified as air quality regionally significant.

Staff indicated that the funding target methodology, application questions, eligibility requirements, and funding request thresholds will all be incorporated into the draft TIP policy amendment scheduled to return to TAC for additional review before a recommendation is considered later in the year.

Community and Innovative Planning Set-Asides: Call for Letter of Interest

Emily Lindsey, Program Manager of the Active and Emerging Mobility Team, presented this item on behalf of both the Active and Emerging Mobility Team and the Subarea and Project Planning Team.

Emily provided an overview of the upcoming call for Letters of Interest (LOIs) for the Community-Based Transportation Planning Set-Aside and Innovative Mobility Set-Aside programs. The call will be open from October 1 through November 15. Both programs provide DRCOG-led technical assistance, require no local match, and support transportation planning initiatives across the region.

The Community-Based Transportation Planning Set-Aside includes approximately \$500,000 in funding and focuses on transportation planning projects serving historically marginalized communities through community engagement and implementation-focused planning efforts. The Innovative Mobility Set-Aside includes approximately \$1.25 million in funding and supports planning, feasibility, preparedness, and analysis projects related to emerging mobility technologies and transportation innovations. Eligible applicants include local governments, regional agencies, TMAs, TMOs, nonprofit organizations, and state agencies. Staff encouraged potential applicants to attend an informational webinar on October 1 and coordinate with DRCOG staff prior to submitting an LOI.

Zeke Lynch asked for clarification on the recommended \$250,000 minimum project size for the Innovative Mobility Set-Aside and noted the contrast with the earlier discussion regarding the \$100,000 minimum funding request for regional TIP projects. He suggested TAC may want to revisit regional project minimums and maximums during future discussions. Emily Lindsey clarified that the \$250,000 minimum applies only to projects submitted through the Innovative Mobility Set-Aside Program and reflects the scope and technical requirements typically associated with those projects.

During discussion, committee members noted that the set-aside programs provide valuable support for local agencies by eliminating match requirements and reducing administrative burdens through DRCOG-led project management and procurement. Staff emphasized the importance of strong collaboration between project sponsors and DRCOG throughout project development and implementation.

East Colfax BRT Next Alternative Analysis Study Final Report

Cole Neder, Senior Planner with the Regional Transportation Planning Team, provided an overview of the completed Colfax BRT Next Alternatives Analysis, an 18-month federally compliant study that identified a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for extending Bus Rapid Transit service along East Colfax from I-225 to the E-470 area. The project supports the Regional Transportation Plan's future regional BRT network and evaluated transit, mobility, and safety improvements along the approximately six-mile corridor. Study goals included improving access to jobs and housing, increasing transit reliability and ridership, enhancing multimodal safety, and supporting future growth along the corridor.

The study included three phases of public engagement and extensive outreach through public meetings, surveys, social media, community events, schools, and stakeholder organizations. Feedback consistently showed strong support for faster and more reliable transit service, improved pedestrian safety, and investments that would better connect residents with jobs, schools, and essential services. Respondents also expressed interest in improving safety both at stations and while using transit.

Staff evaluated multiple transit technologies and corridor configurations, including mixed-flow BRT, a hybrid side-running BRT alternative, and a fully dedicated center-running BRT option. After evaluating cost, feasibility, ridership, travel time savings, corridor conditions, and future growth potential, the study identified a hybrid side-running BRT alternative as the Locally Preferred Alternative. The recommended concept includes enhanced stations, transit priority treatments, semi-dedicated bus lanes in portions of the corridor, multimodal access improvements, and bicycle parking at stations.

Cole explained that the preferred alternative is expected to improve transit travel times, increase ridership, enhance reliability, and provide long-term mobility benefits as development continues along the corridor. He emphasized that the LPA represents a vision for future investment and will guide future environmental review and design efforts but does not represent a final project design or construction commitment.

No questions were asked by committee members following the presentation. Committee members expressed appreciation for the update and noted the importance of continued transit investment along the growing East Colfax corridor. Chair comments highlighted the significance of seeing the project advance after many years of discussion and planning.

Administrative Items

Member Comment/Other Matters.

There were no additional member comments or other matters.

Next meeting

November 16, 2026

Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.