AGENDA
DRCOG Board Work Session
Wednesday, November 1, 2017
4 p.m.
1290 Broadway
First Floor Boardroom

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Summary of September 6, 2017 Board Work Session**
   (Attachment A)
4. **Public Comment**
   The chair requests that there be no public comment on issues for which a prior public hearing has been held before the Board of Directors.
5. **Discussion of Regional Share Definition and Funding Allocation**
   (Attachment B) Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director
6. **Discussion of Regional Growth Initiative**
   (Attachment C) Brad Calvert, Director, Regional Planning & Development
7. **Adjourn**
BOARD WORK SESSION SUMMARY
September 6, 2017

Directors present:
Herb Atchison, Vice Chair Westminster
Steve O’Dorisio Adams County
Jeff Baker Arapahoe County
Elise Jones Boulder County
David Beacom Broomfield City and County
Anthony Graves (Alternate) Denver City and County
Kevin Flynn (Alternate) Denver City and County
Roger Partridge Douglas County
Bob Fifer Arvada
Aaron Brockett Boulder
George Teal Castle Rock
Rick Teter Commerce City
Steve Conklin Edgewater
Daniel Dick Federal Heights
Saoirse Charis-Graves Golden
Ron Rakowsky Greenwood Village
Shakti Lakewood
Phil Cernanec Littleton
Wynne Shaw Lone Tree
Ashley Stolzmann Louisville
Kyle Mullica Northglenn
John Diak Parker
Rita Dozal Superior
Heidi Williams Thornton
Debra Perkins-Smith Colorado Department of Transportation

Participating via Webex:
Lynette Kelsey Georgetown

Others present: Doug Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations, Jeanne Shreve, Adams County; Bryan Weimer, Arapahoe County; Mac Callison, Aurora; Jamie Hartig, Art Griffith, Douglas County; Kent Moorman, Thornton; Debra Basket, Westminster; Danny Herrmann, CDOT; Ken Lloyd, RAQC; Ted Heyd, Bicycle Colorado; and DRCOG staff.

Board Vice Chair Herb Atchison facilitated the work session. The session began at 4:00 p.m.

Summary of August 2, 2017 Board Work Session
The summary was accepted as presented.

Public Comment
No public comment was received.

Discussion of focus areas for the 2020-2023 TIP
Doug Rex briefed members on the Board’s discussion of this topic at the workshop. The group discussed the proposed focus areas, and developed a short list of priorities, which
include: improve mobility infrastructure and services for vulnerable populations, increase reliability of existing multi-modal transportation network, and improve transportation safety and security. Mr. Rex asked if members had comments or questions.

Member input included:
• It was noted it would be good to have additional description of the focus areas in advance of the September Board meeting.
• Some members noted they felt the selection exercise at the workshop felt rushed.
• More detailed information about the types of projects the focus areas would support was requested.

Mr. Rex asked for direction on bringing this item forward to the Board. Directors agreed that this item should be forwarded to the Board.

Discussion of TIP regional share policy items
Mr. Rex presented the recommendation on TIP regional share from the TIP Policy Working Group. The proposed process involves two project selection elements: a single Regional Share call for projects administered by DRCOG, and eight Subregional Share calls for projects administered by county-based forums. It was noted funds for the subregions would be apportioned using a formula based on population, employment, and person miles traveled. All project selection recommendations will come to the Board for final approval within the 2020-2023 TIP. Directors were asked to provide direction on the regional share framework (program and project eligibility definition) and percentage of available funds for regional share. A table showing project categories eligible for regional share funding was provided in the agenda packet.

Members discussed the process for the subregional process. Important points to consider included:
• All cities within a county must be invited to participate in the process, even if they are not DRCOG members. Similarly, Weld County would be invited to participate in that county’s process, even though they are not members of DRCOG.
• Municipalities that span more than one county would participate in more than one subregional group. Projects would be submitted for consideration to whichever county the project lies within.
• Mr. Graves stated after much discussion he is in support of the proposed regional split.
• A comment was made that small communities would not be able to compete for regional projects. It was noted that projects in the regional category are those that offer benefit to the entire region.
• A comment was made that anecdotal experiences should be solicited from the regions that are currently using the two-tier process.
• Directors expressed interest in including major regional arterials in the regional definition.

Other Matters
The work session ended at 5:56 p.m.
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors  

From: Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director  
303 480-6701 or drex@drcog.org

Meeting Date | Agenda Category | Agenda Item #
-------------|----------------|-------------
November 1, 2017 | Informational | 5

SUBJECT
Continue discussion on TIP Regional Share policy items: 1) framework for Regional Share eligible projects and programs 2) Regional/Subregional Share funding allocation.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
July 24, 2017 – TIP Policy Work Group

SUMMARY
Board Members are asked to continue discussion on the following two Regional Share topics and provide direction to staff prior to action anticipated at the November 15 Board meeting.

1. Regional Share Framework (program and project eligibility definition)
At the August 2 Board Work Session, directors first discussed the TIP Policy Work Group’s (TPWG) Draft Regional Share Framework for the 2020-2023 TIP (Attachment 1). The framework describes the types of regional programs eligible for Regional Share funding and defines specific types of eligible projects as identified on maps associated with DRCOG’s 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan.

Direction was also provided at the August work session to consider revising the eligibility rules to allow Regional Share funding for projects on Major Regional Arterials (MRAs). Board members discussed the concept at the September 6 Board Work Session, but did not arrive at consensus on the issue. Attachment 2 shows the location of MRAs in the DRCOG network and associated capacity projects in the 2040 fiscally constrained Regional Transportation Plan.

Requested Discussion/Direction: Should projects on MRAs be eligible for Regional Share funding?

2. Percentage of available funds for Regional Share
At the June 7 Board Work Session, directors first discussed a proposal by the TPWG to designate a maximum of 30 percent of available funds to the Regional Share (including “Other Commitments”) and a minimum of 70 percent to the Subregional Share. For illustrative purposes, Attachment 3 shows the estimated funding amounts (four-year totals). Estimates are also provided for each individual subregion (counties) based on population, employment, and person miles traveled.

Requested Discussion/Direction: What should the Regional/Subregional funding split be? 30% Regional Share and 70% Subregional Share as proposed by the TPWG?
**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**

- **June 7, 2017** – DRCOG Board Work Session
- **August 2, 2017** – DRCOG Board Work Session
- **September 6, 2017** – DRCOG Board Work Session

**PROPOSED MOTION**

N/A

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Revised draft of *Regional Share Framework for the 2020-2023 TIP* (8/30/17)
2. Major Regional Arterial Capacity Projects Eligible for TIP
3. Example Estimates of 4-Year Funding for 30% Regional and 70% Subregional Shares
4. Staff presentation

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

If you need additional information please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org.
Purpose and General Rules
Applications are limited to regional programs or projects that play a crucial role in shaping and sustaining the future of individuals, cities, and counties in the DRCOG region. Regional projects/programs should directly address established TIP Focus Areas through a systems approach focused on enhancing regional connections, regardless of travel mode. Regional programs or projects should connect communities, greatly improve mobility and access, and provide a high return on investment to the region consistent with DRCOG’s Metro Vision Plan and 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan. Funds that remain unallocated from the Regional Share Call for Projects will be added to the total Subregional Share allocation before being distributed to each subregion.

1. Programs Eligible for Regional Share
Programs funded through DRCOG’s Regional Share shall address mobility issues to a level that can definitively illustrate a “magnitude of benefits” fitting of a regional program. Participation within the proposed program, along with the anticipated services and benefits, must be available within the entire DRCOG TIP planning area (the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) area). Proposed studies, initiatives, and other efforts which cover the entire region will also be eligible. Regional programs will focus on optimizing the multimodal transportation system by increasing mobility and access, and/or programmatic efforts to ensure that people of all ages, incomes, and abilities are connected to their communities and the larger region.

2. Projects Eligible for Regional Share
Projects funded through DRCOG’s Regional Share shall include eligible transportation improvements that implement the fiscally constrained elements of the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2040 MVRTP) as specified in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2040 MVRTP Eligible Networks</th>
<th>Eligible Projects Reference Maps/Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 1: Project Categories Eligible for Regional Share Funding</strong> (stand-alone reconstruction projects are not eligible)</td>
<td>(as adopted in RTP at time of TIP Call for Projects in 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rapid Transit (rail and BRT/busway guideway corridors)</td>
<td>Figure A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Multi-Use Trails and Regional Corridors</td>
<td>Figure B*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Placeholder map until updated in early 2018 through the DRCOG Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeways on Regional Roadway System (stand-alone tollways are not eligible: E-470, NW Parkway, Jefferson Parkway)</td>
<td>Figure C**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity projects identified on Figure C are eligible. Operational projects that benefit freeway mainlines (red lines on Figure C) are eligible.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Managed Lanes System</td>
<td>Figure D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Freight System (new railroad grade separations that improve operations on the designated Regional Roadway System)</td>
<td>Figure 7 of Appendix 5 of 2040 MVRTP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For fiscally constrained roadway and rapid transit capacity project details, see Appendix 4 of the 2040 MVRTP.
Example Estimates of 4-Year Funding for 30% Regional and 70% Subregional Shares

Set-Asides
- Community Mobility Planning & Implementation
- TDM Services
- Regional Transportation Operations & Technology
- Air Quality Improvement
- Human Service Transportation

$49.4 Million

Regional Share and Other Commitments (e.g., Central I-70)
Call for Regional Projects/Programs
Similar to structure used for current TIP.

30% = $69 Million

Subregional Share
Proportionately targeted for planning purposes to predefined sub-geographic units for project identification and recommendation by eligible stakeholders within each subregion.

70% = $161 Million

Example County Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Avg of 2015 Pop &amp; Employ, and 2016 PMT</th>
<th>4-Year Funding (in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>$24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>19.25%</td>
<td>$31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>9.96%</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>24.15%</td>
<td>$38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>9.97%</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
<td>$27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Weld</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% $161 Million
2020-2023 TIP
Regional Share Framework
and Funding Allocation

Presented by:
Douglas W. Rex

Board Work Session
November 1, 2017
**Established TIP Focus Areas**

- Approved focus areas at September Board Meeting
  1. **Improve mobility infrastructure and services for vulnerable populations** (including improved transportation access to health services).
  2. **Increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network**
  3. **Improve transportation safety and security**

**Set-aside Share**

- Approved at August Board meeting
- $49.4 million to programs and pools
Regional Share Discussion

Today's discussion:

• Regional Share Framework
• Funding split between Regional and Subregional shares

Regional Share Framework

TPWG Proposal

• Defines eligibility for programs and projects
• Project eligibility based on predefined maps associated with DRCOG’s Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (MVRTP)
• Discussion: Should projects on MRAs be eligible for Regional Share funding?
Regional/Subregional Funding Allocation

TPWG Proposal

- Maximum 30% for Regional Share (includes “Other Commitments”)
- Minimum 70% for Subregional Share
- Discussion: What should the Regional/Subregional funding split be? 30% Regional Share and 70% Subregional Share as proposed by the TPWG?

Set-Asides

- Community Mobility Planning & Implementation
- TDM Services
- Regional Transportation Operations & Technology
- Air Quality Improvement
- Human Service Transportation

$49.4 Million

Example Estimates of 4-Year Funding for 30% Regional and 70% Subregional Shares

DRCOG Federal Funds (FY 2020-2023)

- $280 Million Total (Estimate)
- $230 Million
- $59 Million

Regional Share and Other Commitments (e.g., Central I-70)

- Call for Regional Projects/Programs
- Similar to structure used for current TIP.
- 30% = $69 Million

Subregional Share

- Proportionately targeted for planning purposes to predefined sub-geographic units for project identification and recommendation by eligible stakeholders within each subregion.
- 70% = $161 Million

Example County Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Avg of 2015 Pop &amp; Employ, and 2016 PMT</th>
<th>Subregional Share in Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>$24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>19.25%</td>
<td>$31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>9.96%</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>24.15%</td>
<td>$38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>9.97%</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
<td>$27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Weld</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$161 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Work Session - November 1, 2017
QUESTIONS/COMMENTS
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director
303 480-6701 or drex@drcog.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2017</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
Regional Growth Initiative – update and discussion

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
Background
In March, staff provided background information on circumstances that shaped the DRCOG’s Urban Growth Boundary/Area (UGB/A) initiative, which has been in place for nearly 20 years. At the March meeting, the Directors provided initial feedback on key growth and development issues facing the region and described key attributes of any initiative designed to collectively understand and manage growth in the region.

In May, staff shared data requested at the 2016 Board workshop, as well as other data and observations about growth in the region over the past few decades. Directors provided feedback on desired attributes of a regional growth initiative as called for in the adopted Metro Vision plan.

Regional Growth Initiative (RGI) – local input meetings
Over the past few months, DRCOG convened and consulted with an ad hoc technical group of local government planners to identify and evaluate potential regional growth initiatives. Approximately twenty jurisdictions participated in the four local input meetings held since July. Director input received in March and May provided an important foundation for these sessions. Additionally, since 2015, DRCOG staff has periodically engaged local staff and DRCOG Directors on the current growth initiative (UGB/A program).

Several key themes emerged from these conservations:

- DRCOG’s data analysis, modeling and forecasting work is positioned to provide information of value to both regional and local growth planning and decisions.
- Information should flow more freely and frequently between DRCOG and local governments.
- Through shared initiatives between DRCOG and its members, local governments should be empowered to help address growth and development issues of local and regional concern and advance the region toward Metro Vision outcomes.
- Together, local governments and DRCOG should work to maximize the benefits of growth while minimizing the negative impacts.
Potential Regional Growth Initiative(s)

*Metro Vision* notes several potential regional initiatives related to identifying local growth priorities and aspirations with an eye toward how observed and planned growth influence the region’s ability to achieve shared outcomes. Over the course of four input sessions DRCOG staff attempted to clarify and organize initiatives into a coordinated approach organized around four “pillars”:

1. Growth research
2. Convening conversations and information sharing
3. Commitment to action
4. Commitment to service

As these pillars began to take shape, the members of the ad hoc technical group determined their focus should be on the first two pillars, and suggested the DRCOG Directors should take up an initial discussion pillars 3 and 4 before a final proposal is developed and forwarded to the Board.

**Pillar 1: Growth research**

DRCOG staff should provide timely, topical, and relevant research and analysis that local governments can use to inform local planning, and potentially local growth and development decisions. DRCOG staff could release a series of small, frequent, single-topic briefings, or a more robust, multi-topic report that identifies key growth issues in the region. This effort could also be supported by “on-demand” data and consultation from DRCOG that assists local and regional planning efforts (i.e. exploratory scenario analysis).

An additional exercise that could be part of this pillar is the identification of urban reserves or priority preservation areas.

**Pillar 2: Convening conversations and information sharing**

Pillar 2 would integrate regular and routine information sharing into an existing and required DRCOG function – the development of small area land use forecasts. This current effort relies on the participation and input of local governments, but could expand to include a more formal understanding or acceptance of the forecast, and therefore the underlying local priorities and assumptions the forecast is built on (in addition DRCOG’s land use modeling tools).

This pillar could also include collaborative efforts to track upcoming development projects, so that a single source for recent and near-term development activity is available to all stakeholders.

**Pillars 3 and 4: Commitment to action / commitment to service**

The local technical group felt better positioned to respond to pillars 1 and 2. Both deal with their operations and local staff to DRCOG staff coordination. The local technical group expressed that commitment to increased coordination would be critical to the overall success of the initiative. However, the resulting word “commitment” in pillars 3 and
4 prompted the technical group to ask for some feedback from DRCOG Directors – DRCOG staff is seeking initial Director input at this afternoon's meeting.

Pillar 3, commitment to action, would provide jurisdictions with the opportunity to explore a regional issue and to make commitments related to growth and development initiatives. Those “opting in” on an issue, or for a specific geography that shares common issues, would join a cohort of other jurisdictions to jointly explore approaches with DRCOG.

Pillar 4, commitment to service, involves DRCOG staff’s role supporting members through consultation and facilitation. A significant part of this pillar 4 role would be in support of the cohorts emerging in pillar 3.

Today’s Discussion

- Should we continue down this path and bring back a more detailed proposal?
- If the proposed cohort approach has some promise, any initial thoughts on what “commitment to action” might entail?
- Are there issues (topic / shared geographic issues) that jump to mind when you think of commitment cohorts?
- What other information would be helpful as you consider initiatives related to coordinated/collaborative efforts to maximize the benefits of growth while minimizing potential negative impacts (through lens of Metro Vision)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED MOTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTACHMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Metro Vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you need additional information please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or <a href="mailto:drex@drcog.org">drex@drcog.org</a>; or Brad Calvert, Director, Regional Planning and Development, at 303-480-6839 or <a href="mailto:bcalvert@drcog.org">bcalvert@drcog.org</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 2: Through a coordinated effort between DRCOG and local communities, new urban development occurs in an orderly and compact pattern within regionally designated growth areas.

A process to identify local and regional urban growth priorities helps the region manage the growth of the region’s urban footprint. While locally adopted policies and market demand determine the location of urban development, local commitments to coordinate and collaborate on the expansion of urban growth lead to better use of regional resources for infrastructure, reduced regional vehicle travel and conservation of open land.
### March – Today’s growth challenges

**Greenfield and infill**
- Both have infrastructure challenges
- Both require investment

**Business location decisions**
- Transportation options
- Access to qualified employees

**Housing and transportation**
- Household costs
- Getting people to work

**Initiative for today’s challenges?**
- Not punitive
- Communicate growth aspirations
- Consultation or advice
- Help improve plans and investments

### May – Initiative purpose & function

**Primary purpose:**
- Preserve open land
- Help focus infrastructure investment

**Help do?**
- Grow beneficially
- Collaboration and coordination

**Board role**
- Represent their jurisdiction
- Prioritize

**DRCOG staff role**
- Facilitate
- Modeling/analysis

**Local staff role**
- Planners
- Reporters/users
- Collaborators

---

### Local staff input

**Who:** Planners and other staff from 20+ jurisdictions

**What:** One kickoff webinar (background)
- Four in-person meetings

**When:** July – October 2017

**Why:** Help DRCOG staff shape a draft proposed initiative(s) for Board consideration

**How:** Overview of previous feedback, brainstorming, discussion, DRCOG staff presentations, questions, response to material, etc.
• Drafted initial proposal and reviewed with local stakeholders (Mtg. #4)
• Think we have identified some potential ingredients
• Request from local stakeholders to check with Board on a few key ingredients
• Today: Work Session participants weigh-in, shape next steps

Where we think we are

Key themes – reviewed and confirmed

► DRCOG has information of value to growth and development planning – both regional and local
► Information should frequently flow between DRCOG and local governments
► Local governments should be empowered to act on a variety regional growth issues
► Together, local governments and DRCOG should work to maximize the benefits of growth while minimizing the negative impacts
RGI - four pillars

1. Growth research
2. Convening conversations & info sharing
3. Commitment to action
4. Commitment to service

Four pillars in a “strategic house”

- Growth research
- Convening conversations & info sharing
- Commitment to action
- Commitment to service

Balanced Scorecard
If we excel in these 3-4 areas, will we achieve our vision?

Holistic, coordinated effort
1: Growth research

Potential products:
- Growth & development research reports/briefings
- Urban reserve area map
- Priority preservation area map

Rationale:
- Growth decisions happen all the time – education and information can help
- Increase understanding of nearer-term challenges/trends that will shape ability to achieve Metro Vision
- Potential value in developing a shared understanding of locations suitable for urban-level development and/or preservation as natural areas

2: Convening conversations & info sharing

Potential products:
- Formal small area forecast acceptance or adoption
- Development pipeline platform
- Sub-regional meetings

Rationale:
- Direct additional time and energy into coordination and shared understanding of region’s growth forecast
- Improve understanding of near-term development
- Develop more opportunities for information sharing and coordination
Outcome 2: Through a coordinated effort between DRCOG and local communities, new urban development occurs in an orderly and compact pattern within regionally designated growth areas.

A process to identify local and regional urban growth priorities helps the region manage the growth of the region’s urban footprint. While locally adopted policies and market demand determine the location of urban development, local commitments to coordinate and collaborate on the expansion of urban growth lead to better use of regional resources for infrastructure, reduced regional vehicle travel and conservation of open land.

Legend
- Pillar 1 connection
- Both pillars connect
- Pillar 2 connection

* More on connections to other RGI pillars in subsequent slides

Local staff input and pillars 3 & 4

- Felt better positioned to provide feedback on pillars 1 & 2
  - Deals with operations and staff-to-staff coordination/collaboration

- Many interested in concept with pillars 3 & 4
  - Requested Director feedback related to commitment (yet to be defined)
  - Without some level of commitment – there may be less interest in pillars 1 and 2
  - Circle back as nature/definition of commitment is better understood
Outcome 2: Through a coordinated effort between DRCOG and local communities, new urban development occurs in an orderly and compact pattern within regionally designated growth areas.

A process to identify local and regional urban growth priorities helps the region manage the growth of the region’s urban footprint. While locally adopted policies and market demand determine the location of urban development, local commitments to coordinate and collaborate on the expansion of urban growth lead to better use of regional resources for infrastructure, reduced regional vehicle travel and conservation of open land.
Commitment to action: cohorts – a potential approach

Key language from objective and objective narrative nested within outcome (emphasis added):

- “…help focus and facilitate future growth in locations where urban-level infrastructure already exists…”
- “DRCOG will work with member communities to identify local urban growth priorities and aspirations…”
- “…achieve a compact regional footprint and other shared outcomes…”

Local priorities, aspirations, needs and abilities (local and DRCOG) will vary.

Compact footprint requires holistic focus (infill, fringe, infrastructure, barriers, etc.)

Pillars 3 and 4: working together

Pillar 3: Commitment to action
- Jurisdiction joins cohort on a specific issue or geography when appropriate
- Commits to explore growth & development issues (that resonate both locally and regionally) with other members of cohort
- Recognizes that jurisdictions “contribute through different pathways and at different speeds”

Pillar 4: Commitment to service
- As previously directed: DRCOG staff to be more than “accountants”
- Continuous identification of timely/needed regional and local initiatives in support of Metro Vision
- Member-driven support, consultation – including use of DRCOG tools and technology
How are we most successful:
• “Police station or university”
• Nearer-term focus (peer learning and identification of potential actions)
• Opt-in regionalism in support of collective impact

Topics where we’ve already stumbled into informal cohorts:
• Boomer Bond
• Vision Zero
• Urban Centers
• Small Communities Forum
• …

Potential flow: commitment cohorts

- Identify problem
- Research promising practice
- Convene and incubate
- Release
Example: commitment cohorts

Growth research finds that black cats are causing bad luck, negatively impacting the region’s quality of life. 13 communities opt-in to address locally.

Cohort (supported by DRCOG) scan locally, regionally, nationally for best and/or emerging practices:
- Cat spray paint
- Cat relocation programs
- Black cat demand management

DRCOG staff facilitates cohort discussions of problem, potential solutions, how to pilot test ideas, etc.

Community staff draft individualized action plans for consideration by local stakeholders/decisionmakers.

Discussion questions

- Should we continue down this path and bring back a more detailed proposal?
- If the proposed cohort approach has some promise, any initial thoughts on what “commitment to action” might entail?
- Are there issues (topic / shared geographic issues) that jump to mind when you think of commitment cohorts?
- What other information would be helpful as you consider initiatives related to coordinated/collaborative efforts to maximize the benefits of growth while minimizing potential negative impacts (through lens of Metro Vision)?
Regional Growth Initiative (RGI)

Nov. 2017 Board Work Session:
Update and Discussion