AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 2019
6:30 – 9:00 p.m.
1001 17TH STREET
ASPEN-BIRCH CONFERENCE ROOM

1. 6:30 Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call and Introduction of New Members and Alternates
4. Move to Approve Agenda
5. 6:35 Community Spotlight
   • City of Northglenn
6. 6:45 Report of the Chair
   • Report on Regional Transportation Committee
   • Report on Performance and Engagement Committee
   • Report on Finance and Budget Committee
   • Presentation of Five-Year Service Award to Ashley Stolzmann, City of Louisville
7. 6:55 Report of the Executive Director
8. 7:05 Public Comment
   Up to 45 minutes is allocated now for public comment and each speaker will be limited to 3 minutes. If there are additional requests from the public to address the Board, time will be allocated at the end of the meeting to complete public comment. The chair requests that there be no public comment on issues for which a prior public hearing has been held before this Board. Consent and action items will begin immediately after the last speaker.

TIMES LISTED WITH EACH AGENDA ITEM ARE APPROXIMATE. IT IS REQUESTED THAT ALL CELL PHONES BE SILENCED DURING THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING. THANK YOU

Persons in need of auxiliary aids or services, such as interpretation services or assisted listening devices, are asked to contact DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (303) 480-6701.
CONSENT AGENDA

9. 7:25 Move to Approve Consent Agenda
   • Minutes of July 17, 2019 (Attachment A)

ACTION ITEMS

10. 7:30 Discussion of a resolution to adopt the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (Attachment B) Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning & Operations

11. 7:40 Discussion of eligibility rules and evaluation process for selecting non-infrastructure (marketing, outreach and research) projects to be funded through the TDM Services set-aside of the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (Attachment C) Steve Erickson, Director, Communications & Marketing

INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS

12. 7:50 Update on RTD’s Regional Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Feasibility Study (Attachment D) Matthew Helfant, Senior Transportation Planner, Brian Welch, Regional Transportation District

13. 8:10 AAA Brief – “Aging in Denver Region – Demographics and Needs” (Attachment E) Jayla Sanchez-Warren, Director, Area Agency on Aging

14. 8:30 Metro Vision 2020 – A retrospective analysis of goals and accomplishments (Attachment F) Brad Calvert, Director, Regional Planning & Development

15. 8:50 Committee Reports
   The Chair requests these reports be brief, reflect decisions made and information germane to the business of DRCOG
   A. Report from State Transportation Advisory Committee – Elise Jones
   B. Report from Metro Mayors Caucus – Herb Atchison
   C. Report from Metro Area County Commissioners – Roger Partridge
   D. Report from Advisory Committee on Aging – Jayla Sanchez-Warren
   E. Report from Regional Air Quality Council – Doug Rex
   F. Report from E-470 Authority – Bob Roth
   G. Report on FastTracks – Bill Van Meter

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

16. Board Collaboration Assessment Results (Attachment G) Jerry Stigall, Director, Organizational Development

17. Denver Region Data Brief - “The increasing cost of a home” (Attachment H) Brad Calvert, Director, Regional Planning & Development
ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

18. **Next Meeting – September 18, 2019**

19. **Other Matters by Members**

20. **9:00** **Adjourn**
SPECIAL DATES TO NOTE

Board Workshop August 23/24, 2019

For additional information please contact Connie Garcia at 303-480-6701 or cgarcia@drcog.org

CALENDAR OF FUTURE MEETINGS

August 2019
20 Regional Transportation Committee 8:30 a.m.
21 Performance and Engagement Committee 5:15 p.m.
21 Finance and Budget Committee 6:00 p.m.
21 Board of Directors 6:30 p.m.
26 Transportation Advisory Committee 1:30 p.m.

September 2019
4 Board Work Session 4:00 p.m.
17 Regional Transportation Committee 8:30 a.m.
18 Performance and Engagement Committee 5:15 p.m.
18 Finance and Budget Committee 6:00 p.m.
18 Board of Directors 6:30 p.m.
20 Advisory Committee on Aging Noon – 3 p.m.
23 Transportation Advisory Committee 1:30 p.m.

October 2019
2 Board Work Session 4:00 p.m.
2 Performance and Engagement Committee 5:30 p.m.*
15 Regional Transportation Committee 8:30 a.m.
16 Finance and Budget Committee 6:00 p.m.
16 Board of Directors 6:30 p.m.
18 Advisory Committee on Aging Noon – 3 p.m.
28 Transportation Advisory Committee 1:30 p.m.

*Start time for this meeting is approximate. The meeting begins at the end of the preceding Board Work Session
Members/Alternates Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Fifer, Chair</td>
<td>City of Arvada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve O’Dorisio (Alternate)</td>
<td>Adams County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Baker</td>
<td>Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Jones</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Beacom</td>
<td>City and County of Broomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Wheelock</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Williams</td>
<td>City and County of Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Flynn</td>
<td>City and County of Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Partridge</td>
<td>Douglas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby Szabo</td>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Vittum</td>
<td>Town of Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Teal</td>
<td>Town of Castle Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Maurer</td>
<td>City of Centennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Teter</td>
<td>City of Commerce City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Swanson (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Edgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Olson</td>
<td>City of Englewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Gippe</td>
<td>Town of Erie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Dick</td>
<td>City of Federal Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Brown</td>
<td>Town of Frederick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette Kelsey</td>
<td>Town of Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Dale</td>
<td>City of Golden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Walton</td>
<td>City of Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob LaBure (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Lakewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karina Elrod</td>
<td>City of Littleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Strock</td>
<td>Town of Lochbuie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynne Shaw</td>
<td>City of Lone Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Peck</td>
<td>City of Longmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Stolzmann</td>
<td>City of Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Sullivan</td>
<td>Town of Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Palaszewski</td>
<td>Town of Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Duran Mullica</td>
<td>City of Northglenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Diak</td>
<td>Town of Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Daigle</td>
<td>City of Sheridan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Sandgren</td>
<td>City of Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Voelz (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud Starker</td>
<td>City of Wheat Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Zarrin</td>
<td>Governor’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca White</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Van Meter</td>
<td>Regional Transportation District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Others Present: Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, Connie Garcia, Executive Assistant, DRCOG; Melanie Sloan, Adams County; Bryan Weimer, Arapahoe County; Don Wick, Arvada; Mac Callison, Aurora; Kim Groom, Broomfield; Brad Boland, Castle Rock; Joe Wilson, Commerce City; Jamie Hartig, Douglas County; Danny Herrmann, Jordan Rudel, CDOT; Kelly Tomajko, Citizen; Bill James, James Real Estate Services; Chris DeRosia, ACL Inc.; and DRCOG staff.

Chair Bob Fifer called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. with a quorum present.

Move to approve agenda

Director Vittum moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Public Hearing
Todd Cottrell provided background information on the draft TIP and air quality conformity documents.

Kyle Burdell, Citizen; provided comment in support of project alternatives.
Brandon Figliolino, Citizen, expressed support for alternative mode options included in the draft TIP.

Report of the Chair
• Chair Fifer introduced Don Wick, Arvada’s new public works director.
• Chair Fifer noted that the action items recommended at RTC are on this evening’s agenda.
• Director Stolzmann reported the Performance and Engagement Committee discussed responses to the Board Collaboration Assessment; and the Board Workshop agenda. The Board workshop is August 23/24 in Keystone.
• Director Flynn reported the Finance and Budget Committee approved contracts for the Area Agency on Aging and received the results of the DRCOG 2018 audit.
• Chair Fifer presented a Five-Year service award to Roger Partridge, Douglas County.

Report of the Executive Director
• Executive Director Doug Rex encouraged members and alternates to attend the Board workshop in Keystone on August 23/24. The deadline for room reservations is July 23. Community highlight posters are being sought for display at the workshop.
• Mr. Rex reported DRCOG has been involved in joint outreach meetings with CDOT, RTD and the Front Range Passenger Rail Commission as important transportation planning efforts begin. Meetings are occurring in conjunction with county transportation-forum level meetings.
• Metro Vision Idea Exchanges are occurring both in-person and via webinar. There are three upcoming on a variety of topics.
• The next Small Communities/Hot Topics forum is scheduled for Thursday, September 26 from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.
• A CDPHE funding opportunity supplying small grants to local governments has identified additional funds. As a result, two more communities received grants.
• The Urban Land Institute hosts Technical Advisory Panels in our communities. Erie recently participated in a panel. DRCOG provides matching funds for the program. Jefferson County will participate in September.
• Mr. Rex noted Director Jim Dale was recently recognized by his alma mater Kansas State University for outstanding achievements, humanitarian service and contributions to the veterinary profession.

Public comment
No public comment was received.

Move to approve consent agenda

Director Shaw moved to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Items on the consent agenda included:
• Minutes of the May 15, 2019 meeting

Discussion of a resolution amending the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program
Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief overview of the proposed amendments.

Director Daigle moved to adopt a resolution amending the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Discussion of approval of the 2020-2021 Unified Planning Work Program
Ron Papsdorf, Director of Transportation Planning & Operations, provided an overview of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The UPWP is a federally required document that outlines the proposed planning activities and tasks to be conducted within the Metropolitan Planning Organization area using federal transportation planning funds. The plan includes activities of DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD.

Director Diak moved to approve the draft FY 2020-FY2021 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Regional Transportation Funding update
Executive Director Rex provided an update on possible regional transportation funding scenarios currently being explored at the Metro Mayors Caucus (MMC). A work group has been formed to discuss the topic, comprised of DRCOG’s executive committee, county representatives, MMC and staff. The purpose is to discuss possible solutions to
the region’s transportation funding shortfall. He noted that there have been some discussions with legislators and the Governor’s office on the concepts.

Members discussed items such as what communities would be included; whether the concept is an “all-in” proposition; if there will be issues with TABOR; if the funding would be used for regional projects or local projects; and hold harmless clauses. Members agreed that the conversations should continue.

AAA Brief – “The Basics”
Jayla Sanchez-Warren, Area Agency on Aging (AAA) Director, provided foundational information about DRCOG’s AAA, the services offered, the community organizations funded and the program’s mandated advocacy role. The presentation is the first in a series that will prepare Directors for a strategic discussion at the Board workshop in August.

Bike to Work Day report
Allison Redmon, Way to Go Manager, provided background and participation information on the 2019 Bike to Work Day event.

Committee Reports
**State Transportation Advisory Committee** – Director Partridge reported the STAC received news of general fund transfers over the next two years of $2.5 billion. The 2045 Statewide Transportation Plan, recent and upcoming county outreach meetings, and multimodal options fund allocations were discussed.

**Metro Mayors Caucus** – Director Starker reported the MMC discussed homelessness, housing, and food resources. The group provided a monetary contribution to the Metro Denver Homeless Initiative.

**Metro Area County Commissioners** – Director Partridge reported the MACC discussed affordable housing.

**Advisory Committee on Aging** – Jayla Sanchez-Warren noted the new Colorado Senior Law handbooks and Senior Bluebook resources books are in.

**Regional Air Quality Council** – Doug Rex reported the RAQC Board is continuing its strategic planning process. Proposed regulations 20 and 21 were discussed, and the group received an overview of the Ozone monitoring values.

**E-470 Authority** – Director Teal reported the Authority recognized Mayor Rakowsky for his service to the Authority. A mid-year marketing review was discussed, and a contract for services was awarded to the Colorado State Patrol. The Authority has signed an IGA with the Town of Parker for annexation of a portion of land around the parkway.

**Report on FasTracks** – Director Van Meter reported RTD staff released a draft report on the unfinished FasTracks corridors and discussed with the Board. The draft report is available on the RTD website. He noted light rail ridership is down 13.7 percent. Bus services and commuter rail ridership numbers are up.

Next meeting – **August 21, 2019**

Other matters by members
No other matters were discussed
Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

__________________________
Bob Fifer, Chair
Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

__________________________
Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director
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 #
-------------|----------------|-------------
August 21, 2019 | Action | 10

SUBJECT
Draft 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and associated air quality conformity determination documents.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends approval of the 2020-2023 TIP and associated air quality conformity determination documents.

ACTION BY OTHERS
July 22, 2019 – TAC recommended approval
August 20, 2019 – RTC will act on a recommendation

SUMMARY
The TIP is a four-year program of projects laying out how federal, state, and local transportation funding is programmed in the Denver metro area. The TIP includes projects selected by CDOT, RTD, and DRCOG, each with their own selection process and funding sources. For the projects selected by DRCOG, the document is the culmination of work by DRCOG staff, subregional forums, partner agencies, committees, and the DRCOG Board of Directors, including the development of a new project selection process, a policy guidance document, calls for projects, and project selection.

Per federal transportation planning requirements, air quality conformity documents must demonstrate that the 2020-2023 TIP will not cause a violation of federal air quality conformity standards. Accordingly, the 2040 MVRTP’s roadway and transit networks, as amended in May 2019, that include the air quality regionally significant projects contained in the 2020-2023 TIP, were modeled for air quality conformity. The results were used by the state Air Pollution Control Division to calculate pollutant emissions. All pollutant emission tests were passed, as shown in the air quality conformity documents linked within the attachments.

The documents were the subject of a public hearing before the DRCOG Board on July 17, 2019. Attachments include:

- A summary of the public comments and the staff response received prior to and during the public hearing.
- Proposed adjustments and changes that are reflected in the action draft TIP document as compared to the public hearing version.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
November 28, 2018 – Draft 2020-2023 TIP – Regional Share Projects
May 15, 2019 – Draft 2020-2023 TIP – Subregional Share Projects
July 17, 2019 – Public hearing
PROPOSED MOTION
Move to adopt a resolution approving the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program, and the associated air quality documents, DRCOG CO and PM 10 Conformity Determination and the Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Staff presentation
2. Draft Board resolution
3. Supporting documents
   • Action Draft - 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program
   • Action Draft - DRCOG CO and PM10 Conformity Determination
   • Action Draft - Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination
4. Public Comment Summary
5. Errata sheet

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Todd Cottrell, Senior Planner, Short Range Transportation Planning, at 303-480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.
2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program

Air Quality Conformity

Board of Directors
August 21, 2019

Draft Documents for Recommendation

- 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program
- Denver southern subarea 8-hour ozone conformity determination
- CO and PM10 conformity determination
What is a TIP?

- The **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)** is –
  - Short-term planning program identifying “real” transportation projects with fiscally-constrained federal and state funding
  - Federally-required; addresses FAST Act requirements
  - Updated every two years; DRCOG projects selected every 4 years
- Contains projects selected by DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD
- Helps implement –
  - **Metro Vision** and the **Regional Transportation Plan**

### TIP Funding Type Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Four-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)</strong> (formerly STP-Metro)</td>
<td>$134.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The most flexible, including roadways, bridges, bicycle and pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure, and transit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STBG set-aside for Transportation Alternatives (TA)</strong></td>
<td>$ 10.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primarily for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds</strong></td>
<td>$139.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projects/programs must provide an air quality benefit by reducing emissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and congestion. Major exceptions include roadway capacity and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Multimodal Transportation Options Funds (MMOF)</strong></td>
<td>$ 45.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New State source from 2018 SB-1. Eligible types include transit, TDM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs, multimodal mobility projects enabled with new technology,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies, and bicycle/pedestrian projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Dual Model Project Selection – Overview**

**Regional Share (20%)**
- Transformative projects/programs
- Quantitative benefits to the entire region
- Submitted through subregions to DRCOG, evaluated by peer review panel

**Subregional Share (80%)**
- Funds proportionately targeted for planning purposes to predefined sub-geographic units (counties)
- Subregions submit, evaluate, select, and recommend to the DRCOG Board

**Set-Asides**
- “Off the Top” programs each with Calls for Projects

---

**Regional Share Summary**

**TIP Regional Share Funding Recommendation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregional Forum</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Regional Share Funding Request</th>
<th>Total DRCOG Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>31-119 BRT Enhancements</td>
<td>$9,100,000</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>18th St Mall Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>Peaks to Plains Trail - SH 95 Tunnel 1 to Montgomery Gulch</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Arapahoe County</td>
<td>High Plains Trail/Cherry Creek Trail Connector</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>Mobility as a Service: Implementing an Open-Ticketing Platform</td>
<td>$1,613,084</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>RTD Transportation Transformation Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>$1,420,000</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Arapahoe County</td>
<td>US-36 PEI Study</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>SH 7 Preliminary and Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous TIPs**
- One or many centralized Call(s) for Projects

**Regional Share Summary**

- **Regional Share call:** July 31 to Sept 21
- **8 projects provide $179 million in total transportation investment**
Subregional Share Summary

| Subregional Share call: Jan 2 to Feb 27 | 82 projects will provide $546 million in total transportation investment | 7 projects recommended from more than one subregion |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Total DRCOG Request</th>
<th>Total Funding Target</th>
<th>Recommended Projects</th>
<th>Recommended Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$45,523,677</td>
<td>$32,933,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$70,582,990</td>
<td>$44,094,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$36,835,400</td>
<td>$15,291,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$8,480,000</td>
<td>$4,694,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$139,817,972</td>
<td>$50,293,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$39,700,000</td>
<td>$22,855,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffco</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$36,668,903</td>
<td>$32,924,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weld</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$7,630,000</td>
<td>$6,055,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$385,238,942</td>
<td>$209,139,000</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft 2020-2023 TIP: DRCOG Funding Allocation by Project Type*

Total funding: $284,839,103

* Excludes TIP Set-Asides

Multimodal:
Contains bike/ped and transit elements

Roadway Operational: $110,307,269
Bicycle/Pedestrian: $51,208,407
Roadway Capacity: $48,905,000
Transit and Multimodal: $63,953,427

Studies: $9,965,000

Of note:
- New category
- Bike/ped increase
Draft 2020-2023 TIP: Percentage of Projects by Type*

* Excludes TIP Set-Aside

- Bicycle/Pedestrian: 30%
- Roadway Capacity: 12%
- Transit and Multimodal: 20%
- Roadway Operational: 24%
- Studies: 13%

Of note:
- Bike/ped increase
- Total multimodal project share

Total projects funded in Regional and Subregional Share: 83

Regional Conformity of the TIP – Mobile Source Emissions

- Ozone, carbon monoxide, and PM-10 pollutants
  - Maximum budgets set through SIP process
  - Vehicle emissions are only a portion of total emissions (oil and gas, power plants, etc.)
- Conformity is for the regional system, not on individual projects;
- Emission modeling based on most recent planning assumptions
  - Demographics, fleet mix, cleaner vehicles, etc.
  - DRCOG runs travel model (trips, VMT, speeds) and state completes emission calculations
- 2020-2023 TIP passed all emission budget tests
Public Input

30-day public comment period

✓ Notifications
  website | social media | email blast | newspaper | Bike to Work Day Civic Center Station

✓ Online web map

Public hearing

✓ Capstone of public comment period
✓ Usually held one month before Board action

THANK YOU!
DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STATE OF COLORADO

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION NO. __________, 2019

A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE 2020-2023 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND THE ASSOCIATED DRCOG CO AND PM 10 CONFORMITY DETERMINATION AND THE DENVER SOUTHERN SUBAREA 8-HOUR OZONE CONFORMITY DETERMINATION.

WHEREAS, the Denver Regional Council of Governments, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the continuing transportation planning process within the Denver Transportation Management Area designed to prepare and adopt transportation plans and programs; and

WHEREAS, this transportation planning process is carried out through a cooperative agreement between the Denver Regional Council of Governments, the Regional Transportation District, and the Colorado Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015 requires that a Transportation Improvement Program identifying projects for which federal funds will be spent be prepared; and

WHEREAS, a Transportation Improvement Program containing roadway, transit, multimodal, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements expected to be carried out in the federal fiscal year period of 2020 through 2023 with reasonably anticipated revenues has been prepared through the transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, Section 176(c)(3) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, requires that the Metropolitan Planning Organization not give its approval to a transportation plan or program unless such plan or program conforms to an approved or promulgated state implementation plan for air quality; and

WHEREAS, an analysis of the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program has been prepared consistent with the requirements of the Clean Air Act, as amended, and regulations promulgated by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency; and

WHEREAS, this analysis found that the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program conforms to the state implementation plan for air quality; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors held a public hearing on the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program and conformity on July 17, 2019; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Committee has recommended approval of the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program and associated conformity findings.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Denver Regional Council of Governments, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, hereby adopts the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Denver Regional Council of Governments hereby determines that the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program conforms to the applicable implementation plans approved or promulgated under the Clean Air Act, as amended, by virtue of the demonstrations incorporated in the associated DRCOG CO and PM-10 Conformity Determination and the Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination required pursuant to Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act, as amended.

RESOLVED, PASSED AND ADOPTED this _____ day of ________________, 2019 at Denver, Colorado.

________________________________________
Bob Fifer, Chair
Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

_______________________________________
Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director
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>August 21, 2019</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT**
Eligibility rules and evaluation process for the selection of non-infrastructure (marketing, outreach and research) projects to be funded through the DRCOG Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Services set-aside through the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**
Staff recommends approval of the eligibility rules and evaluation process.

**ACTION BY OTHERS**

- **July 22, 2019** – TAC recommended approval
- **August 20, 2019** – RTC will act on a recommendation

**SUMMARY**
The 2020-2023 TIP Policy established $1.8 million in federal funds for TDM non-infrastructure projects (marketing, outreach and research) over the four-year period. Eligible projects for the upcoming call for projects include marketing and outreach and market research. The primary goal of these projects is to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality, and secondarily to pilot projects that will demonstrate effectiveness of an approach that might be scaled or replicated across the region. The FY 2020–2021 call for projects will be for $900,000 plus $236,000 unallocated from FY 2019, for a total of $1,136,000.

Staff will present the proposed process and criteria for selecting TDM non-infrastructure projects for fiscal years 2020 and 2021. Next steps includes approvals by the DRCOG board, with a call for projects in fall 2019.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**

- **July 18, 2018** – Board approved 2020-2023 TIP Policy (Table 2. 2020-2023 TIP Set-Aside Programs)

**PROPOSED MOTION**
Move to adopt the eligibility rules and evaluation process for selecting non-infrastructure (marketing, outreach and research) projects to be funded through the TDM Services set-aside of the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

**ATTACHMENTS**
1. Eligibility Rules and Selection Process document
2. Staff presentation

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Steve Erickson, Communications and Marketing Director, 303-480-6716, serickson@drcog.org.
TDM Services Set-Aside
FY 2020 and FY 2021 Projects

Eligibility Rules and Selection Process
For the selection of non-infrastructure (marketing, outreach and research) projects

Program Purpose
The TDM Services set-aside was developed to support marketing, outreach and research projects that reduce single occupant vehicle (SOV) travel and ultimately reduce traffic congestion and improve regional air quality. The specific goals of the TDM Services set-aside are listed below.

Program Goals
- Reduce single occupant vehicle travel
- Reduce traffic congestion
- Improve regional air quality
- Pilot new approaches to transportation demand management (TDM)
- Improve awareness of and access to mobility options for people of all ages, incomes and abilities

Sponsor Eligibility Requirements
- Project sponsors must be eligible to be direct recipients of federal transportation funds. These include local governments, governmental agencies and nonprofits. Non-local government sponsors must include documentation of support from the applicable local government(s) where the project is located. Private, for-profit companies (e.g., contractors, suppliers, or consultants) are not eligible.
- Project sponsors must also be in good standing with the State of Colorado via the Secretary of State’s business database: http://www.sos.state.co.us/pubs/business/businessHome.html
- All scopes of work must adhere to the federal Surface Transportation Block Grant program guidance: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/.
- Project sponsors must pledge local matching funds or in-kind match.

Project Eligibility Requirements
Funding background
The 2020-2023 TIP Policy established $1.8 million in federal funds for TDM non-infrastructure projects over the four-year period. The 2020-2021 call for project will be for $900,000 plus $236,000 unallocated from FY2019.

Eligible project types
Applications must be for new projects or activities which implement TDM strategies that reduce SOV travel and ultimately contribute to reducing traffic congestion and improving regional air quality. Applicants must demonstrate how their project/program will have a direct impact on reducing SOV travel, improving air quality, and reducing traffic congestion. Eligible project types may include, but are not limited to:
- Public education, marketing and outreach promoting or expanding use of non-SOV mobility
Innovative projects that pilot and demonstrate effectiveness of approach.
Market research that helps identify opportunities to promote non-SOV mobility

Funding Requirements

Applicants may request funding for up to two years for federal fiscal years 2020 and 2021. There is no funding minimum or maximum. However, a single entity will not be awarded more than 50% of the available funds. Project sponsors should clearly describe how the funding request is supported by the work proposed for the project.

A local cash or in-kind match of at least 17.21% of the total project cost is required (federal share equals 82.79%). CDOT is the steward of these funds and does not track overmatch. If a sponsor wants to commit more funding to the project on their own, they may do so.

Application Process

1. **Attend a mandatory TDM Services set-aside pre-application workshop**
2. **Identify the project concept and begin early discussions with DRCOG staff** (strongly encouraged, not required)
3. **Submit a letter of intent**
   - With a multi-step application process, interested applicants should submit a letter of intent and include applicant’s contact information, a project description and estimated project cost. Supplemental materials will be accepted if they contribute to the understanding of project being proposed.
4. **Letter of intent discussion**
   - DRCOG staff will review the letter of intent and request additional information as needed. Applicants will be contacted by staff to discuss the proposal before next steps are taken. This will include screening of project proposals for eligibility, identification of potential partners and or project links, and an opportunity to discuss proposed project outcomes. If the letter of intent is accepted, sponsors will be invited to apply.
5. **Invited applicants, complete and submit an application**
   - Applications should be submitted along with letters of support from impacted or participating entities. No more than two applications per sponsor will be accepted. Per CDOT requirements, the application requires a mandatory Risk Assessment form to be submitted along with the application.
6. **Project review, scoring and recommendation**
   - Applications will be reviewed and scored based on the set-aside evaluation criteria. The project review panel will prepare a recommendation to present to DRCOG’s Transportation Advisory Committee and Regional Transportation Committee for a recommendation prior to a presentation to the Board of Directors for approval.
7. **Applicants are notified about approved projects**

Project Funding Evaluation and Selection Process

DRCOG will establish a project review panel to assist with scoring and evaluating projects. Participants may include staff from DRCOG divisions:

- Transportation Planning and Operations
- Regional Planning and Development
- Communications and Marketing (Way to Go)
- Area Agency on Aging, and/or
- Executive Office
The review panel will also include external stakeholders and subject matter experts who may represent:

- Federal Highway Administration
- Colorado Department of Transportation
- Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
- Regional Air Quality Council
- Regional Transportation District
- Transportation demand management professionals

Each member of the panel will review the applications and assign points to the criteria based on information contained in the project application forms. See section A below.

In addition, DRCOG staff will score based on data-driven criteria listed in section B below.

The panel will convene to discuss the applications and scoring and reach consensus on the list of recommended projects to be funded by the TDM services set-aside. The recommended list of projects will be taken through DRCOG committees for review and final approval by the DRCOG Board of Directors.

### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDM Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Scored by Project Review Panel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Measured/Scored by DRCOG Staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Short Trip Opportunity Potential</td>
<td>Is the project within a short trip opportunity zone? &lt;br&gt; <strong>Short trip opportunity zones defined in DRCOG Active Transportation Plan</strong> &lt;br&gt; 1 – Project is not located in a short trip opportunity zone range based on percent of project area that is identified as a short trip opportunity zone, normalized based on projects submitted &lt;br&gt; 7 – Project area serves short trip opportunity zone(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Environmental Justice Area</td>
<td>EJ Population (Minority, Low-Income) &lt;br&gt; 1 – Does not serve any EJ area range based on percent of project area that is identified as an EJ area, normalized based on projects submitted &lt;br&gt; 6 – Entirely in EJ area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Serves DRCOG Designated Urban Centers (UCs)</td>
<td>Urban Centers: Existing and Emerging Dataset &lt;br&gt; 1 – No Urban Centers range based on percent of project area that is identified as an urban center, normalized based on projects submitted &lt;br&gt; 6 – Strongly serves/focuses on established UCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Financial Partners</td>
<td>0 – No other financial partners &lt;br&gt; 2 – One additional financial partner &lt;br&gt; 3 – If two+ partners (must be identified in application as funding match partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>0 – Any “in-kind” &lt;br&gt; 3 – All cash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Award Conditions**

- Funding provided to local government sponsors should not replace existing local funding for staff.

- Applicants should not request funding for projects, activities, or services that are currently performed by other agencies or government entities. Applicants should not request funding for projects, activities, or services that are currently performed by, or may compete with, the private sector.

- All project scopes of work are subject to review and approval by DRCOG and CDOT.

- Each applicant awarded funds will sign an IGA and enter into a contract with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) to implement the project depending on the type, location and other characteristics of the project. CDOT is the ultimate steward of these federal funds. CDOT will specify requirements for status reporting and reimbursement requests.
Each awarded project sponsor will be required to attend reimbursement training (approximately 4 hours) that defines the documentation required for tracking expenses and requesting reimbursement.

Project sponsors will be expected to work closely with Way to Go, the regional TDM brand, to identify synergies and cross-promotion opportunities.

Each awarded project sponsor will be required to attend a post-project debrief with DRCOG staff, and to submit a final report.

Projects must be completed within two years from the contract start date.

Project sponsors will work with DRCOG, CDOT, RTD (as appropriate), and FHWA/FTA to ensure that the project is being implemented in accordance with federal requirements.
FY 20-21 Transportation Demand Management Set-Aside

FY 2020-2023 TIP Set-Aside Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set-Aside Programs</th>
<th>4-Year DRDCOG-allocated Funding Allocations for the 2020-2023 TIP</th>
<th>Calls for Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community Mobility Planning and Implementation | $4,800,000  
- $2,000,000 for small area planning and/or transportation studies  
- $2,800,000 for small infrastructure projects | Calls for Projects for both are tentatively scheduled for the summer of 2019 and 2021. |
| TDM Services                          | $13,400,000  
- $8,800,000 for the DRDCOG Way to Go program  
- $1,800,000 for 7 regional TMA partnership @ $900,000/year  
- $1,800,000 for TDM non-infrastructure projects | Calls for Projects for the TDM non-infrastructure projects are tentatively scheduled for the summer of 2019 and 2021. |
| Regional Transportation Operations & Technology (traffic signals and ITS) | $20,000,000 | Calls for Projects are tentatively scheduled for the fall of 2019 and 2021. |
| Air Quality Improvements              | $7,200,000  
Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC) will receive:  
- $4,800,000 for vehicle fleet technology  
- $1,900,000 for an ozone outreach and education program  
- $600,000 in FY20 for an ozone SIP modeling study | |
| Human Service Transportation          | $4,000,000  
- $4,000,000 to improve service and mobility options for vulnerable populations by funding underfunded/underserved trips and rolling stock expansion. | Calls for Projects are tentatively scheduled for the summer of 2019 and 2021. |
TDM services program purpose and goals

**Purpose:** to support marketing, outreach and research projects that reduce single-occupant vehicle travel

**Program Goals**
- Reduce traffic congestion
- Improve air quality
- Pilot new approaches to TDM
- Support healthy and active choices
- Improve awareness and access to mobility options for people of all ages, incomes and abilities

Funding available and sponsor eligibility

**Funding available 2020 – 2021 call**
- $900,000 for 2 year-projects, plus . . .
- $236,000 in unallocated funds from 2019
- Total - $1,136,000

**Eligibility**

Project sponsors must be eligible to be direct recipients of federal transportation funds. Private, for-profit companies (e.g., contractors, suppliers, or consultants) are not eligible.

Project sponsors must also be in good standing with the State of Colorado via the Secretary of State’s business database: [http://www.sos.state.co.us/pubs/business/businessHome.html](http://www.sos.state.co.us/pubs/business/businessHome.html)

All scopes of work must adhere to the federal STBG program guidance.

Project sponsors must pledge local matching funds or in-kind.
Two-Step Application Process

1. Attend a Mandatory TDM Service Application Workshop
2. Identify the project concept and begin early discussions w/DRCOG staff
3. Submit a Letter of Intent
4. Discuss Letter of Intent with DRCOG Staff
5. Applicants Invited to Apply
6. Submit Application
7. Project Review and Scoring
8. Recommendation to DRCOG committees and Board of Directors
9. Applicants notified about approved projects.
1. **DRCOG review panel includes internal and external stakeholders**
   - Panel may include staff from DRCOG divisions:
     - Communications and Marketing (Way to Go)
     - Area Agency on Aging
     - Transportation Planning and Operations
     - Regional Planning and Development
   - Panel may include external stakeholders and subject matter experts:
     - Federal Highways Administration
     - Colorado Dept. of Transportation
     - Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
     - Regional Air Quality Council, RTD, other TDM professionals

2. Each member of the panel will review the applications and assign points to the criteria based on information contained in the application – Section A

---

3. In addition to review committee scoring on evaluation criteria, DRCOG will score based on data-driven criteria as shown in Section B

4. Panel will convene to discuss applications and reach consensus on a recommended list of projects

5. Panel will recommend list of projects to be funded through the set-aside for review and approval by DRCOG committees and Board of Directors
Criteria and Weighting

- **Review Panel Scoring (75% of total)**
  - VMT reduction
  - Level of innovation and uniqueness
  - Replicability
  - Access
  - Funding effectiveness
  - Project and applicant readiness
  - Timing/synergy of project

- **DRCOG data-driven scoring (25% of total)**
  - Short trip opportunity potential
  - Environmental justice area
  - Serves DRCOG designated Urban Center
  - Financial partners
  - Local Match

THANK YOU!

Steve Erickson
Director, Communications and Marketing
serickson@drcog.org
303.480.6716
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>August 21, 2019</td>
<td>Informational Briefing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
Update on RTD’s Regional Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Feasibility Study

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
BRT offers the potential for mobility and access improvements at relatively modest capital and operating costs compared to rail. RTD is exploring opportunities for BRT implementation, based on existing and anticipated travel demands. The study’s primary goals are to identify and prioritize corridor-based or fixed-guideway BRT projects within RTD’s service area that are the most promising corridors to be funded either locally, regionally, at the state level, or federally, or any combination thereof.

In February, RTD briefed the Board on findings from a second tier of analysis of potential corridors and the routes being recommended to advance into the tier 3 evaluation. This presentation will provide preliminary results from the tier 3 evaluation and a preliminary analysis of the tier 4 evaluation. RTD will also discuss next steps.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
July 17, 2018  
February 20, 2019

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
Presentation and supporting materials

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; Matthew Helfant, Senior Transportation Planner, at 303-480-6731 or mhelfant@drcog.org; or Brian Welch, Senior Manager, RTD, at 303-299-2404 or Brian.Welch@RTD-Denver.com.
Study Goal & Desired Outcomes

• Study Goal
  • Develop a data driven process to identify feasible BRT corridors

• Desired Outcomes
  • Develop a District-wide BRT network
  • Identify multiple corridors for near-term BRT investment
  • Identify one or more projects ready for FTA Small Starts project development
RTD Annual Ridership Projections

Tiered Evaluation Methodology

CANDIDATE CORRIDORS
Identify all Potential Corridors

TASKS
- Identify corridors for evaluation of BRT feasibility

RESULTS
- Identify potential corridors for advancement to Tier 1

TIER 1
Identify High Demand Travel Corridors

TASKS
- Evaluate candidate corridors

RESULTS
- Identify top 20-30 corridors for advancement to Tier 2

TIER 2
Identify Congestion and/or Delay

TASKS
- Evaluate top 20-30 corridors retained in Tier 1

RESULTS
- Identify top 20 corridors for evaluation in Tier 3

TIER 3
Identify Viability of Capital Investment

TASKS
- Evaluate top 20 corridors for evaluation in Tier 2

RESULTS
- Identify top 5-10 corridors for evaluation in Tier 4

TIER 4
Final Evaluation & Prioritization

TASKS
- Evaluate top 5 corridors for final selection

RESULTS
- Identify multiple corridors for long-term BRT investment
Recap of Stakeholder Engagement

- December 2018
  - RTD Local Government/Planning Meeting (preliminary Tier 2)
- January 2019
  - DRCOG TAC
- February 2019
  - RTD Board (finalized Tier 2/initiate Tier 3)
  - DRCOG RTC and Board
- March 2019
  - CDOT Coordination Meeting
- May 2019
  - RTD Local Government/Planning Meeting (preliminary Tier 3/initiate Tier 4)
- June 2019
  - Local Agency Bus Tour
- July 2019
  - DRCOG TAC

Results of Stakeholder Engagement

- Developed a District-wide Regional BRT Network that could be phased in over time
- Include language that assured stakeholders of RTD’s support of local agency BRT investments
- Updated evaluation to include passenger miles of travel and reduced stop spacing
- Added all NAMS corridors to the BRT Network
- Removed phasing from the BRT Network
- Created two categories of BRT: corridors likely to compete well for FTA funds and corridors that may have more success seeking local and state funds
Proposed District-wide BRT Network

Tier 3 Evaluation and Results
Tier 3 Routes

**Goal** - Identify viability of capital investment
- Right-of-way availability
- Viability of lane repurposing
- Viability of exclusive or semi exclusive lanes
- Meets FTA definition of BRT
- Alignment with agency plans/policies

**Result** - Identify top corridors for Tier 4 evaluation
Tier 3 Results
Tier 4 Route Development

- This extensive level of analysis focuses on those corridors that appear to have high potential to compete well for FTA Small Starts funding.
- Tier 4 analysis is necessary to test adherence to Small Starts project justification criteria.
- Corridors that are not Federal funding candidates did not require this level of analysis.

Tier 4 Route Development and Evaluation
Federal Boulevard

Tier 4 Preliminary Analysis
VMT and Boardings

Ridership
Tier 4 Preliminary Analysis
Travel Time Savings

**AVERAGE TRAVEL TIME SAVINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker/Leetsdale/Speer</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th/Park</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tier 4 Preliminary Analysis
Next Generation Technology Readiness

**NEXT GENERATION TECHNOLOGY READINESS**

- **Low**
- **Medium**
- **High**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Technology Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker/Leetsdale/Speer</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th/Park</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tier 4 Preliminary Analysis
Capital Cost

**CAPITAL COST** (does not include vehicles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>43M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker/Leetsdale/Speer</td>
<td>80M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>47M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th/Park</td>
<td>30M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>69M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>60M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>39M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cost based on improvements identified in CCD GO SPEER LEETSDALE

---

Tier 4 Preliminary Analysis
O&M Cost

**ANNUAL OPERATING & MAINTENANCE COST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>2.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker/Leetsdale/Speer</td>
<td>7.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>4.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th/Park</td>
<td>4.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>4.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>3.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>2.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**O & M COST/BOARDING**

- Alameda: $1.81
- Parker/Leetsdale/Speer: $1.25
- Colorado: $1.30
- Havana: $1.95
- 38th/Park: $1.84
- I-25: $2.13
- Federal: $3.44
- Broadway: $2.28
Economic Development (Commercial, Multifamily, Jobs)

- Planned Commercial Space per Mile
- Existing Commercial Space per Mile
- Employment Likely to Use Transit
- Total Employment
- Planned Multifamily Units
- Existing Multifamily Units

FTA Small Starts Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Number of jobs</th>
<th>Parking supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-transit dependent linked trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total linked trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles traveled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity Mapping

DRAFT Matrix of Tier 4 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 4 Corridor</th>
<th>Atlantic Ave</th>
<th>Taft Blvd-Lafayette St</th>
<th>Colorado Blvd</th>
<th>Hamden St</th>
<th>#38th &amp; Culver Ave</th>
<th>Broomfield</th>
<th>Top 2015</th>
<th>Bottom 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 Daily Boardings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Travel Time Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost per Mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Cost per Boarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smar Starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source – US Census Bureau 2017 ACS 5-year estimates, Table B13001: Poverty Status
Schedule and Stakeholder Engagement

- RTD Local Government/Planning Meeting (August 14)
- DRCOG RTC/DRCOG Board of Directors (August 21)
- RTD Board of Directors, Present final report (October 8th)

Discussion
Supporting Materials/Maps

Tier 3 Corridor Development and Evaluation
Quebec St TIER 3 Evaluation

Evaluation Summary
The Quebec Street corridor travels through the boundaries of the City and County of Denver, the City and County of Lakewood, and Jefferson County. Communities along Quebec Street in Denver face challenges, including high traffic volumes, limited public transportation options, and traffic congestion. The study identified potential for BRT service on Quebec Street, which could alleviate these issues. A detailed analysis of the corridor's potential for BRT service was conducted, including a review of existing infrastructure and community support.

Community Support for BRT

- Local: Favorable
- Study: Favorable
- Community: Favorable
- Neighborhood: Favorable
- City: Favorable
- County: Favorable
- State: Favorable

Physical Viability
Route Length: 12.1 miles
- Green: 37%
- Yellow: 22%
- Red: 41%

Key
- Green: 1-lane or 2-lane bus service with dedicated right-of-way
- Yellow: 1-lane or 2-lane bus service with shared right-of-way
- Red: Conventional transit service

Alameda Ave TIER 3 Evaluation

Evaluation Summary
The Alameda Avenue corridor travels through the boundaries of the City and County of Denver, Jefferson County, and Arapahoe County. The corridor connects East Denver and Colombia, with a total length of 13.4 miles. Alameda Avenue is a medium-capacity roadway that supports BRT service. The BRT corridor evaluation and community input were conducted with emphasis on identifying potential BRT corridors based on existing conditions and future traffic volumes. Considering the corridor's potential for BRT service, this study will be proposed for further evaluation in the Tier 4 of the BRT Corridor Study.

Community Support for BRT

- Local: Neutral
- Study: Favorable
- Community: Favorable
- Neighborhood: Favorable
- City: Favorable
- County: Favorable
- State: Favorable

Physical Viability
Route Length: 11.7 miles
- Green: 43%
- Yellow: 31%
- Red: 23%
Havana St/Hampden Ave TIER 3 Evaluation

Evaluation Summary
The Havana Street/Hampden Avenue TIER 3 Evaluation is conducted to evaluate Havana Street and the vicinity for the implementation of BRT services. The corridor extends through Denver, Aurora, and Lakewood, spanning approximately 10 miles. The evaluation includes a detailed analysis of existing conditions, public input, and potential BRT implementation strategies. The evaluation process includes the analysis of existing transit services, traffic volumes, and public interest in BRT services.

Community Support for BRT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Support for BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Viability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRT Corridor</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evans Ave TIER 3 Evaluation

Evaluation Summary
The Evans Avenue corridor travels through Aurora, Englewood, Lakewood, and South Park Hill. The section of the corridor from Arapahoe to West Colfax Avenue is proposed for BRT implementation. This section of Evans Avenue is a medium-mix of single-family and multi-family residential areas with a high need for improved transit services. The evaluation includes a detailed analysis of existing conditions, public input, and potential BRT implementation strategies. The evaluation process includes the analysis of existing transit services, traffic volumes, and public interest in BRT services.

Community Support for BRT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Support for BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Viability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRT Corridor</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tier 4 Corridor Development
## Colorado Blvd

### Proposed Peak Service Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Trips/hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40P/Colorado Blvd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Ave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southmore Station</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend
- Mobility Hub
- Transit Signal Priority (TSP)
- Conditioned Queue Jump with TSP
- Dedicated Transit Lanes with TSP
- Existing Bus Network
- Speed & Reliability Improvements
- Repurpose existing through lanes & two-way left turn lanes
- Planned Rapid Transit Line and Station
- Existing & Funded Rapid Transit Line and Station
- Rapid Transit Projects In Facility
- Planned BRT/Station

## Alameda Ave

### Existing Peak Service Plan

### Proposed Peak Service Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Trips/hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Ave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portmore Station</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend
- Mobility Hub
- Transit Signal Priority (TSP)
- Conditioned Queue Jump with TSP
- Dedicated Transit Lanes with TSP
- Existing Bus Network
- Speed & Reliability Improvements
- Repurpose existing through lanes & two-way left turn lanes
- Planned Rapid Transit Line and Station
- Existing & Funded Rapid Transit Line and Station
- Rapid Transit Projects In Facility
- Planned BRT/Station

*Weekly ridership frequency: 2017 Average Weekday Boardings: 3,878*
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>August 21, 2019</td>
<td>Informational Briefing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
Second presentation in AAA primer series: “Aging in Denver Region – Demographics and Needs”

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
In July, DRCOG staff provided foundational information about DRCOG’s Area Agency on Aging (AAA); the services offered, the community organizations that are funded and its mandated advocacy role.

Tonight’s presentation will share information on the expected growth in the region’s older population, needs identified by older adults and a preview of the strategic discussion at the Board workshop in August.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENTS
Staff presentation

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Brad Calvert, Division Director, Regional Planning and Development at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org; or Jayla Sanchez-Warren, Division Director, Area Agency on Aging at 303-480-6735 or jswarren@drcog.org.
Aging in the Denver Region
Demographics and Needs

Presented by:
Brad Calvert
Jayla Sanchez-Warren
August 21, 2019

July Board of Directors meeting
• Area Agency on Aging basics
• Area Agency on Aging programs
• where we came from and where we need to go

August Board of Directors meeting
• examining aging demographics
• discussion of needs

Board Workshop (Aug. 23-24)
• efforts at the state and federal level to reduce health care costs
• AAA opportunities
• building capacity for older adults in the region

Second presentation in series
Resources used for this presentation

Colorado: Population growth

Percent change by age (2000 – 2016)

All ages: 28.6%
Growth by age group: 2016-2050

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>% change (2016-2050)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-plus</td>
<td>489%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-plus</td>
<td>308%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-plus</td>
<td>141%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all ages</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking back and forward: Age matters

Ratio of working age to older adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>age 16-64</td>
<td>7.8 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age 65-plus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>age 16-64</td>
<td>2.9 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age 65-plus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: "Single Year of Age Data" [Colorado] State Demography Office.
65-plus population: By poverty status and race

- Colorado:
  - White alone, not Hispanic or Latino: 6.0%
  - Minority: 13.8%

- Denver region:
  - White alone, not Hispanic or Latino: 5.3%
  - Minority: 13.5%

65-plus housing-burdened status

- Colorado:
  - Spend 30% or more on housing:
    - Owners: 26%
    - Renters: 27%

- Denver region:
  - Spend 30% or more on housing:
    - Owners: 63%
    - Renters: 64%
STRENGTHS AND NEEDS OF OLDER ADULTS
Older adults help drive the economy

Older Coloradans mean economic growth.

Between 2016 and 2040, the number of jobs generated by retirees will increase by over 160,000—a nearly 150% increase.

Source: [Colorado] State Demography Office Region 3 Economic Forecast
2018 Community Assessment Survey of Older Adults

54% have lived in their community for more than 20 years

How likely are you to remain in your community throughout retirement?

- Very likely: 50%
- Somewhat likely: 23%
- Somewhat unlikely: 10%
- Very unlikely: 17%

Community as a place for older residents

- Community as a place to live
  - 2010: 87%
  - 2015: 86%
  - 2018: 85%

- Community as a place to retire
  - 2010: 74%
  - 2015: 70%
  - 2018: 62%

- Overall quality of services provided to adults age 60 and older
  - 2010: 61%
  - 2015: 57%
  - 2018: 53%

percent “excellent” or “good”
Community design and land use

- Availability of affordable quality housing: 2018 - 40%, 2015 - 28%, 2010 - 13%
- Availability of affordable quality food: 2018 - 70%, 2015 - 67%, 2010 - 54%
- Ease of travel by car: 2018 - 77%, 2015 - 78%, 2010 - 65%
- Ease of walking: 2018 - 73%, 2015 - 68%, 2010 - 62%

Community information

- In general, how informed or uninformed do you feel about services and activities available to older adults?
  - 2018: 61%, 2015: 56%, 2010: 56%

- Availability of information about resources for adults age 60 and older
  - 2018: 50%, 2015: 43%, 2010: 41%
## 2018 Community Assessment Survey of Older Adults

### Frequency of internet use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>use email, texting or video to communicate</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get the news or weather</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research or study a topic of interest</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find the answer to a question</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shop, search for products and services</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find directions or look up a map</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banking online (paying bills, investing, etc.)</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look up health and medical information</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use social media (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn)</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find info on community resources and events</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community conversations: Challenges

- transportation
- finding good health care
- good nutrition
- affordable places to live independently and with assistance
- home and yard work
- home maintenance
- no family nearby
- affording and finding in-home help
- cost of daily needs
- scams and fraud (especially phone)
- lack of Medicaid assisted living availability
- understanding resources that are available
- paying monthly bills

Community conversations: Community supports

- **The Douglas H. Buck Center**: classes, health clinics, place to exercise and socialization
- **Transportation**: light rail, subsidized senior transportation, community circular bus
- services for older adults at libraries
- free legal clinic on Fridays at [Bemis Library](#) in Littleton
- Aurora Center for Active Adults
- elder abuse task force
- home delivery services
- **volunteers**: A Little Help, Seniors’ Resource Center, Volunteers of America were mentioned
- free medical alerts
- **Gilpin County Human Services**: classes, exercise, outings, transportation, in-home meal delivery
- Neighbor Network provides services, support, transportation
- **county-funded services** for older adults
Community conversations: Future services

1. transportation
2. quality health care
3. financial security and assistance
4. nutrition, meals and help preparing meals
5. house cleaning and yard service
6. hearing aids, vision care and glasses
7. quality housing
8. Dentures and dental care
9. trustworthy people to work for older adults
10. good insurance
11. support when family is gone
12. social activities
13. access to good doctors
14. help finding services
15. navigator and advocate
16. technology training
17. help with benefits

Community referrals

Unmet needs are not represented in the chart
The big issues that we will all need to address

- now: so many people, so much need
- future: doubling of 75 and older population
- funding likely won’t increase to keep pace
- need for numerous sustainable funding streams
- Medicaid and/or placement in facilities — not sustainable and not want people want
- What are other AAAs doing?
- need for more public-private agreements
- how to leverage the AAA’s expertise in social determinants of health
- state and federal conversations about cost-saving efforts

Board Workshop preview

- introduction
- recap previous presentations: AAA programs and key issues facing AAA
- federal and state financial outlooks: learn more about the bleak funding picture
- evolution of senior health care and services: role and value of community-based health care
- short- and long-term opportunities and challenges: federal, state, local and private sector
- how Board directors can help: in your many roles
QUESTIONS?

Jayla Sanchez-Warren
Director, Area Agency on Aging
jswarren@drcog.org
303-480-6735

Brad Calvert
Director, Regional Planning and Development
bcalvert@drcog.org
303-480-6839
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>August 21, 2019</td>
<td>Informational Briefing</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
Staff presentation: Metro Vision 2020 – A retrospective analysis of goals and accomplishments

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
Background
In 2000, local governments from throughout the DRCOG region came together to sign a landmark intergovernmental agreement (IGA) called the Mile High Compact. Through this IGA, local governments recognized the role of local comprehensive/master plans, and their connection to Metro Vision 2020 (adopted by the DRCOG Board of Directors in 1997).

Today’s Presentation
The latest version of Metro Vision represents years of effort by directors and staff to arrive at a unanimous vote to adopt the plan in 2017. At the 2019 Board Workshop, directors will begin discussing the potential of a new approach to documenting opportunities for local governments to contribute to the success of Metro Vision.

Staff will provide a detailed overview of the Mile High Compact at the Board Workshop (Aug. 23-24). Today’s presentation will provide an overview of Metro Vision 2020 and progress toward the region’s aspirations as detailed in the original plan.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENTS
Staff presentation

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Brad Calvert, Division Director, Regional Planning and Development at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org.
Metro Vision 2020
A retrospective analysis of goals and accomplishments
Brad Calvert, Regional Planning and Development Director

PRIMER FOR BOARD WORKSHOP
Saturday, Aug. 24: 1:15-3:30 p.m.
Metro Vision Implementation: Mile High Compact 2.0?

Opportunities for local governments to contribute the success of Metro Vision, resulting in collective impact in the region...
Metro Vision 2020 was adopted in July 2000. The plan outlined strategies and implementation steps to preserve quality of life while also positioning the region to benefit from growth.

**METRO VISION 2020**

- **1990-1992**: GOCO Board adopts 2020 regional transportation and employment forecast
- **1993-1995**: Governor Nunn’s Smart Growth Initiative
- **1996-1999**: Metro Vision Task Force statement, principles and policies
- **1999 and beyond**: Metro Vision Framework accepted by the Board

**METRO VISION 2020: BEYOND 1997**

- Metro Vision Steering Committee
- Metro Vision Planning Committee
- Metro Vision Framework
- Metro Vision Task Force
- Metro Vision Framework accepted by the Board

Voluntary and collaborative implementation of growth, transportation and water objectives using Metro Vision developed strategies.
Metro Vision 2020 outlined goals for managing regional growth within six core elements:

- extent of development
- open space
- free-standing communities
- balanced, multimodal transportation system
- urban centers
- environmental quality

**METRO VISION 2020: PLANNING FOR GROWTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.86 million people</td>
<td>3.23 million people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.05 million jobs</td>
<td>1.98 million jobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The implications of growth are substantial and raise significant questions..."
PROJECTED VERSUS ACTUAL POPULATION

In the DRCOG region (including revised forecasts)
Number of people, number of jobs, 1990-present

Source: DRCOG, Colorado State Demography Office
Notes: 2020 and 2025 figures are forecasts, forecasts do not include southwest Weld County

PROJECTED VERSUS ACTUAL EMPLOYMENT

In the DRCOG region (including revised forecasts)
Number of people, number of jobs, 1990-present

Source: DRCOG, Colorado State Demography Office
Notes: 2020 and 2025 figures are forecasts, forecasts do not include southwest Weld County
CORE ELEMENT: Extent of development

- Take advantage of existing capacities in the service system of the urbanized area.
- Maximize and complement the efficiency of the existing and planned transportation network.
- Avoid/mitigate conflicts between urban development and environmental hazards.

CORE ELEMENT: Extent of development (cont.)

- Encourage balanced communities: income, housing types, affordability, employment opportunities and ethnic balance.
- Promote compact development patterns.
- Reserve areas for various types of future development.
- New growth should not stretch past the defined 747-square-mile area.
...the economic, cultural and geographic significance of downtown Denver must be recognized.

### Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Goal (2020)</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan goal</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>180,000 (approximate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Goal (2020)</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan goal</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>25,100 (approximate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CUMULATIVE GROWTH ASPIRATIONS: 1990s

- **Cumulative aspirations, late 1990s**
  - assemble local comprehensive plans

- **Desire for tool(s) to create a focused, shared outcome**
  - Metro Vision 2020
  - Mile High Compact - urban growth boundary/area

1,000-plus square mile buildout
EXTENT OF DEVELOPMENT

1990
square miles of urbanized census blocks (one unit/acre) with growth boundary

2016
square miles of urbanized census blocks (one unit/acre) with growth boundary
**CORE ELEMENT:** Freestanding communities

- Boulder, Longmont, Castle Rock and Brighton absorb significant new residents and jobs.
- Retain town centers in these areas.
- Provide diverse housing.
- Create/maintain transportation networks.
- Create open space buffers to guarantee separation.

**FREESTANDING COMMUNITIES**

**Share of region's housing units and jobs** (1990 and 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Rock</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmont</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Jobs-to-housing ratio in free-standing communities decreased from 1.4 (1990) to 1.2 (2016).*

"...remain separate from larger area... with an adequate employment-housing balance..."
FREESTANDING COMMUNITIES (CONT.)

- 1989 Boulder County tax to accelerate open space preservation inspired freestanding communities (community buffer)

- Boulder and Longmont buffered by numerous properties that remain in agricultural use, protect habitat and scenic resources.

- A large amount of unprotected agricultural land adjacent to Brighton – partnership with Adams County to manage growth, preserve farmland and reimagine food systems

- Unique topography creates buffer around Castle Rock

CORE ELEMENT: Open space

- Develop a regional open space system.
- Add 100 to 500 square miles of open space by 2020.
- Have 28% of region protected by 2020.
- Protect agricultural and natural resources.
- Guide development away from hazards.
- Provide for enjoyment of the outdoors.
- Buffer and define communities.
- Protect prominent visual features.
OPEN SPACE OWNERSHIP BY LAND AREA

1997

- 1997 federally owned (approximately 653,200 acres)
- 1997 non-federally owned (approximately 200,933 acres)

- Total open space: approximately 854,100 acres (26% of region)

2017

- 2017 federally owned (approximately 653,200 acres)
- 2017 non-federally owned (approximately 468,500 acres)

- Total open space: approximately 1,117,500 acres (34% of region)

412 square miles added

NORTH FLOYD HILL: AN EXAMPLE OF “HOW”

In partnership with Jefferson County Open Space, Clear Creek County Open Space, and Great Outdoors Colorado, and the Mountain Area Land Trust, The Trust for Public Land purchased 110 acres along Interstate 70.

Photo credit: Jim Petterson
The Trust for Public Land partnered with Adams County, Great Outdoors Colorado and the State of Colorado’s Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Colorado Natural Resources Trustees to complete the project, ensuring that the public will enjoy Willow Bay open space for years to come.

**CORE ELEMENT:** Balanced multimodal transportation system

- Restore/maintain existing facilities.
- Provide high-capital new facilities.
- Implement new rapid transit to reduce the need for additional roadway capacity.
- Implement bus service where no rapid transit exists.
- Enhance appeal of non-motorized modes.
- Improve connections between modes.
Highway and Rapid Transit Networks

Metro Vision emphasizes rapid transit and bus services in the central portion of the region. New roadway lanes will be provided primarily in the suburban areas.

Roadway Improvements

- Many projects were completed by local governments, toll authorities and CDOT.
- Some components were not completed due to lack of funding or revised priorities.
- Many “roadway” projects included multimodal elements:
  - T-Rex: I-25/I-225
  - U.S. Route 36
  - Arapahoe Road (Boulder)
- Transportation Improvement Program policies encourage multimodal elements in roadway projects.
TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS

Metro Vision 2020 rapid transit network versus present, planned and built network

“Denver Union Station... has the potential to become a major intermodal terminal... for rail lines included in this plan, or as a bus terminal to replace or supplement Market Street Station as it reaches capacity...”
### Pollutants, Vehicle Miles Traveled and Fatalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>Metro Vision 2020 Goal (or progress)</th>
<th>Actual 2020 (approximate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile source pollutants</strong>&lt;br&gt;(tons per day of volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter)</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily vehicle miles traveled</strong></td>
<td>55 million</td>
<td>77 million</td>
<td>85 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic fatalities</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>160 (in 2008)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transit and Alternative Modes of Commuting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>People taking transit to work</strong></td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People bicycling to work</strong></td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People walking to work</strong></td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People working at home</strong></td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total daily transit trips</strong></td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miles of off-street multi-use trails</strong></td>
<td>800 (approximate estimate)</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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CORE ELEMENT: Urban centers

- Develop a network of urban centers.
- Create new compact, mixed use centers that provide alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel.
- Focus growth into urban centers.
- Locate employment, services, housing and more in urban centers.
- Design for pedestrians.
- Create more usable public spaces and amenities.

URBAN CENTERS

105 urban centers covering 60 square miles (1% of regional land area)
**Share of housing growth**

- **Region: new housing units**
  - 1990-2017: 493,000 added
- **Urban centers: new housing units**
  - 53,300 added

  *11% of new housing in urban centers*

**Share of employment growth**

- **Region: “new” jobs**
  - 2005-2017: + 1,076,600
- **Urban Centers: “new” jobs**
  - +115,900

  *11% of “new” jobs in urban centers*

- **105 urban centers covering 60 square miles**
  - (1% of regional land area)

---

**CORE ELEMENT: Environmental quality**

- Provide water quality protection and water resource management.
- Restore and maintain watershed health.
- Identify and implement wastewater treatment strategies.
- Achieve stormwater and nonpoint source management through local implementation.
- Develop resource management programs to provide effective water quality management and water supply.
WATER QUALITY PLANNING AT DRCOG

- DRCOG previously responsible under state and federal statute for regional water quality planning
- prepared and updated *Clean Water Plan* pursuant to Section 208 of the federal Clean Water Act
- *Clean Water Plan* used in state and federal decision-making (wastewater permitting)
- DRCOG de-designated as regional planning agency in 2010

COLORADO WATER PLAN

- **May 2013:** Governor Hickenlooper issues executive order to create Colorado’s first water plan.
- **November 2015:** Colorado Water Conservation Board delivers plan.
- **July 2019:** preliminary release of draft technical update
NEXT STOP: BOARD WORKSHOP

Saturday, Aug. 24: 1:15-3:30 p.m.

Metro Vision Implementation: Mile High Compact 2.0?

Opportunities for local governments to contribute the success of Metro Vision, resulting in collective impact in the region...

THANK YOU!

QUESTIONS?

Brad Calvert
Regional Planning and Development Director
bcalvert@drcog.org
303-480-6839
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>August 21, 2019</td>
<td>Informational Item</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
DRCOG Board Director Collaboration Assessment Results – 2019 and historical data.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
The DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment is a feedback mechanism that allows Board Directors to voice their opinions about their experience at DRCOG as it relates to Board Director collaboration and the achievement of desired results. In May of 2015, the first collaboration assessment was completed. Numeric scores and an analysis by the assessment developer, Dr. Carl E. Larson, are provided annually to the Performance & Engagement committee as well as all other Board Directors. The assessment is based on a 4-point scale where the highest score is scored as four points and the lowest scored as one point. The mid-point is 2.5 so any score above 2.5 is in positive territory. Note: Authenticity items are reverse coded where a score of ‘false’ is given four points and a score of ‘True’ is given one point. There is a total of 52 items in the assessment.

The most recent collaboration assessment was completed in June 2019. There are two attachments for the collaboration results. One shows current 2019 results and the other shows the historical results over five years. The historical results attachment uses ‘sparklines’ to indicate the overall trend for each item and the entire section of the assessment. As you look at the trend, note the actual scores in the data table to the left as context for any changes in the trend. On the sparkline, the highest score is noted in green, the lowest score is noted in red and all other scores are noted in yellow. In summary, the lowest scores for every item occur in prior years indicating steady improvement with the exception of the Sub-Regional Forum section which was added in 2019. From the first assessment in 2015, all scores in the assessment have increased as of 2019. For most items, small changes in scores can be attributed to normal variance.

SUMMARY
The DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment is a feedback mechanism to allow Board Directors to voice their opinions about their experience at DRCOG as it relates to Board Director collaboration and the achievement of desired results.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A
ATTACHMENTS
Attachments:
- Dr. Carl Larson analysis of results
- DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment Results – 2019
- DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment Historical results

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you have questions about the results, please contact Ashley Stolzmann, Chair of the Performance and Engagement Committee at ashleys@louisvilleco.gov. If you have questions about the assessment, please contact Jerry Stigall at jstigall@drcog.org or 303-480-6780.
A LONGITUDINAL VIEW OF YOUR DATA

CARL LARSON

About 20 years ago, the U.S. Congress commissioned a study of the processes employed by MPOs. Some of you may remember the controversies surrounding “the new regionalism,” which followed in the wake of the federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. DRCOG was, in my opinion, deeply immersed in those controversies. I was a member of the three-person team (along with Professors Andrew Goetz and Paul Dempsey) selected to conduct the study.

What I would like you to realize and appreciate is the incredible difference between what we observed and concluded about the functioning of DRCOG back then and what your data suggests is the functioning of DRCOG now. The improvement is among the most impressive I have ever seen. More remarkable is that this improvement has occurred even as the Denver metropolitan area has seen increases in growth, stress, complexity, and competition for resources all within a broader cultural change toward divisiveness, incivility, increased contempt for “the other,” and I’m sure, many other difficulties that you are in unique positions to observe.

With apologies for the lengthy introduction, now let us consider your data.

Your Data

You have so much data over the last five years, I recommend that you focus on the three most important issues identified in our research on MPO success.

1) EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP.

MPOs require a special type of leadership. Building consensus among individuals with diverse interests, creating and managing a fair process for distributing valuable resources, integrating multiple priorities that reflect different and often conflicting realities, these demands make collaborative leadership the kind of leadership that almost all theorists agree is the most difficult to do well.

Your data indicates a steadily increasing positive evaluation of your leadership to an extraordinary high of 3.8 on a 4.0 scale. It is the highest rated dimension in all of your data. In contexts which rely heavily on “distributive justice” and “fair process effects” this rating of leadership is rare. This kind of leadership is the foundation for the other factors critical to MPO success.
2) MPO STAFF COMPETENCE AND CREDIBILITY.

The competence and credibility of DRCOG’s staff is reflected in the overwhelmingly positive ratings of all aspects of the COG’s functioning. These positive ratings also are reinforced by the open-ended comments about the staff. In an attempt to be helpful, I have looked obsessively for any evidence of potential problems in the overall functioning of this MPO. You might want to discuss three issues that may be important in sustaining this remarkably high evaluation of your overall functioning.

First, last year’s data (2017-2018) showed major positive change in almost all the process evaluations. This year’s data shows a leveling off and slight downward trend in process ratings (#4, #5, #7, #8, #9, #10). I think this shift is a result of a rating plateau that was reached last year. You can’t reasonably expect all the process ratings to continue upward indefinitely. Still, you may want to discuss this pattern. Second, one item (#11, significant opportunities to challenge decisions) dropped by .35 this year. Though still reasonably high (3.32) it is the kind of process variable that warrants a discussion. You don’t want to let this important process feature continue to drop at the same rate next year.

Third, some of the open-ended comments imply that you may want to discuss your process for orienting new members. Some confusion, uncertainty, and hesitancy always accompany new members joining a group or team. This has become a stock issue in most organizations. Your new members don’t seem to be any worse off than most new members, but this might be another issue worth discussing.

All of these issues are very minor when compared to the usual problems with staff competence/credibility. The serious, even catastrophic problems occur when a staff invests more mental, physical, and emotional energy into the politics of the organization, rather than the technical or professional issues directly relevant to the organization’s mission. A staff can become “seduced” by the COG’s members to invest time and energy into helping members navigate the politics of the organization, especially when the rewards for such investment of time and energy are tangible and often considerable. Some more recent research documents the disastrous consequences when energies are drained away from the mission of the organization. DRCOG’s staff clearly focuses most of its energies on the technical/professional demands of its mission, and the staff’s ratings are unusually high.

3) AGGRESSIVE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAMS

My recent comments on your data from 2017 and 2018 suggested that strengths as a collaborative may be expanding into the community, perhaps even creating or impacting relationships outside the COG.
This year’s data continues to suggest this conclusion, or rather, this hope. (Community Involvement and Collaboration remains high at 3.51, Member Value stays very high at 3.73). Your organization is certainly within the range of values where this spontaneous outward movement of collaboration occurs.

Successful MPOs frequently exhibit this quality. I was extremely impressed by the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) in the Dallas-Ft. Worth area with respect to this quality. That COG had citizen groups which formed to monitor its efforts and to advocate for the NCTCOG at the state legislature. Indeed, NCTCOG was asked by the state to provide assistance in a resource allocation process (Urban Streets). The state took this unusual action because the staff enjoyed such high credibility as planning professionals. I have not stayed abreast of the NCTCOG after Michael Morris was its leader, but I hope that organization has enjoyed some “legacy effects “of his remarkable leadership.

An aggressive public involvement strategy is a characteristic not only of successful MPOs, but of almost all successful public sector organizations we have studied. If a positive, action-oriented, optimistic energy is built within an organization, it often spreads spontaneously outward from that organization.

You may already have an aggressive public involvement strategy at work. At this point in time, given the harsh realities confronting our communities and the apparent readiness of DRCOG to deal effectively with those realities, perhaps additional support for these public involvement activities is worth considering.
Q1 Please indicate the length of time you have been a DRCOG Board Director.

Answered: 31   Skipped: 0

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER CHOICES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 years but less than 4 years</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 years</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 1. Structural Integrity refers to how Board Directors perceive the fairness of the collaborative process. A process that has high structural integrity applies criteria for making decisions and allocating resources in a fair and consistent manner, treats all members equitably, and allows sufficient opportunity for members to challenge and revise decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>MORE TRUE THAN FALSE</th>
<th>MORE FALSE THAN TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>DON’T KNOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The people involved in the process usually are focused on broader goals (outcomes) of the region, rather than individual agendas.</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>58.06%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is free of favoritism.</td>
<td>48.39%</td>
<td>48.39%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, everyone has an equal opportunity to influence decisions.</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process responds fairly to the needs of its members.</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made in the process are based on fair criteria.</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of resources is decided fairly.</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The criteria for allocations are fairly applied.</td>
<td>48.39%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, there is sufficient opportunity to challenge decisions.</td>
<td>70.97%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decisions made in the process are consistent.</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions are based on accurate information.</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 2. Authenticity refers to the extent Board Directors perceive the collaborative process is free from undue outside influence. An authentic process is one where members are confident the group has the power to make independent judgments and evaluations of the issues, and can make decisions on how to respond to those issues that will be respected by all members as well as those in positions of authority.
Q4 3. Strong Leadership reflects the perception the Board has an effective organizing/coordinating body and, is led by committed and effective leaders. The role of the organizing/coordinating body is to provide a convening location, collaborative environment and relevant information for Board Director deliberation and decision-making. Note: The first item below regarding Organizer/coordinator refers to DRCOG’s role as the convener/convening location. The second item refers to Board Director leadership. Our collaborative...
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---

**TRUE MORE THAN FALSE MORE FALSE THAN TRUE FALSE DON’T KNOW TOTAL WEIGHTED AVERAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>MORE TRUE THAN FALSE</th>
<th>MORE FALSE THAN TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>DON’T KNOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...has an effective organizer/coordinator.</td>
<td>83.87%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...is led by individuals who are strongly dedicated to the Mission and Vision of DRCOG.</td>
<td>77.42%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5.4. Members refers to how Board Directors perceive other Director’s capacity to collaborate: Are they willing to devote their efforts to furthering the goals of the collaborative rather than simply garner additional resources for their individual programs? Will they support the ideas that have the most merit even at the expense of their own interests? And, do they think there is sufficient trust among members to honestly share information and feedback?

Members...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...are effective liaisons between their home organizations and our group.</td>
<td>41.94%</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...trust each other sufficiently to honestly and accurately share information, perceptions, and feedback.</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are willing to let go of an idea for one that appears to have more merit.</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are willing to devote the effort necessary to achieve Metro Vision Outcomes.</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>58.06%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 5. Structure refers to the clarity members have about the scope of the Board's authority and the roles and responsibilities assigned to its Directors. Note: This section also pertains to Board Committees. Please use the space below to provide comments on committees as they relate to (Board) Structure.

Answered: 31 Skipped: 0

Our group has set ground rules and norms about how we will work together. 77.42% 19.35% 3.23%
We have a method for communicating the activities and decisions of the group to all members. 70.97% 19.35% 9.68%
There are clearly defined roles for group members. 54.84% 38.71% 3.23%
Q7 6. General Success reflects the perceived level of success achieved by the collaborative and assesses the extent to which members accomplished the objectives set out for the most recent performance period. The term objectives in this section refers to for example; Reduce VMT, Improve Air Quality, Reduce GHG, etc. as opposed to 'outcomes' that describe an end state or destination point. Our Collaborative...

Answered: 31  Skipped: 0
Q8 7. Community Involvement & Collaboration refers to the extent to which the collaborative has engaged a wider or more diverse set of partners, or has stimulated greater commitment to collaboration among communities/jurisdictions. Our Collaborative...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>MORE TRUE THAN FALSE</th>
<th>MORE FALSE THAN TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has led to broader and more meaningful engagement of diverse partners.</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in the emergence of new leaders committed to collaboration.</td>
<td>41.94%</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has helped improve the way our participating jurisdictions work together.</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has increased my knowledge of resources outside of my agency/organization.</td>
<td>70.97%</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has increased my access to resources outside of my agency/organization for my community.</td>
<td>61.29%</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 8. Outcomes refer to the extent to which members believe the collaborative has had an impact on the outcomes it is targeting. For example an outcome is; The built environment accommodates the needs of residents of all ages, incomes, and abilities; Development patterns are easy to navigate, enhance multimodal connectivity, and maximize the ability for all people to access opportunities. (Metro Vision)

Our Collaborative...

Answered: 31  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>MORE TRUE THAN FALSE</th>
<th>MORE FALSE THAN TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>DON’T KNOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is committed to a “no wrong door” approach where any idea can be considered.</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has had an impact on the outcomes it is targeting.</td>
<td>48.39%</td>
<td>35.48%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in improved outcomes for the population served.</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 9. Quality of Services assesses members’ perceptions about the level of improvement in the quality of services for the population served, in areas such as access to needed services, navigating the system of services, time to obtain services, etc. Our Collaborative...

Answered: 31  Skipped: 0

70.97% 48.39% 32.26% 38.71% 46.67%
19.35% 35.48% 48.39% 36.67% 36.67%
3.23% 3.23% 0.00% 6.45% 6.45%
0.00% 0.00% 1.00% 12.90% 12.90%
6.45% 12.90% 16.13% 16.13% 16.13%
3.23% 3.23% 3.23% 6.45% 6.45%
0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 12.90% 12.90%
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

TRUE MORE THAN FALSE MORE FALSE THAN TRUE FALSE DON'T KNOW TOTAL WEIGHTED AVERAGE
has improved the quality of services for the population served. 70.97% 19.35% 3.23% 0.00% 6.45% 2 2 31 3.72
has resulted in more streamlined service provision across participating jurisdictions/orrganizations. 48.39% 35.48% 3.23% 0.00% 12.90% 4 4 31 3.52
has resulted in the creation of a system that is easier for the population served to navigate. 32.26% 48.39% 0.00% 3.23% 16.13% 5 5 31 3.31
has resulted in a system that makes it easier for population served to access needed services. 38.71% 41.94% 6.45% 0.00% 12.90% 4 4 31 3.37
has resulted in improved quality of services within my agency/organization due to our participation on the DRCOG Board. 46.67% 36.67% 6.67% 0.00% 10.00% 3 3 30 3.44
Q11 10. Fragmentation of Services refers to the extent to which members of the collaborative perceive a reduction in the fragmentation of services for the population served. This reduced fragmentation may result from increased availability of continuous and uninterrupted services, greater integration of services, more comprehensive service plans, or other improvements. Our Collaborative...

Answered: 31  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>MORE TRUE THAN FALSE</th>
<th>MORE FALSE THAN TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has increased the availability of continuous and uninterrupted services</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td>51.61%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the population served by DRCOG, regardless of the funding source.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has generally led to the creation of more comprehensive services plans</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the population served.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12 11. Duplication of Services refers to two qualities of duplication: a reduction in the duplication of services; and a reduction in the number of professionals providing services for the population served by DRCOG. Our Collaborative...

Answered: 31  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has led to a reduction in the duplication of overlapping services across all participating jurisdictions/organizations when serving the region's population.</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has led to a reduction in the number of professionals providing overlapping services for the population served.</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>41.94%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in greater integration of services for the population served.</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>29.03%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 12. Costs refers to the extent to which members view the collaborative as reducing costs, either by reducing the costs of delivering services to the population served or by promoting a sharing of costs between jurisdictions/organizations participating in the collaborative. Our Collaborative...

Answered: 31  Skipped: 0

The chart shows the distribution of responses:

- **Has reduced the costs of:**
  - True: 25.81%
  - More True than False: 38.71%
  - More False than True: 12.90%
  - False: 22.58%

- **Has resulted in the sharing of costs:**
  - True: 43.33%
  - More True than False: 33.33%
  - More False than True: 6.67%
  - False: 16.67%

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>MORE TRUE THAN FALSE</th>
<th>MORE FALSE THAN TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has reduced the costs of...</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(population served)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has resulted in the sharing of</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(costs between jurisdictions)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(organizations participating)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 13. Sub Regional Forums refers to the jurisdictional forums that began in 2018 for communities to come together to strategize on the best way to use transportation and other funds for their communities' collective good. The sub-regional forums:

Answered: 31 Skipped: 0

TRUE MORE TRUE THAN FALSE MORE FALSE THAN FALSE FALSE DON'T KNOW TOTAL WEIGHTED AVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>MORE TRUE THAN FALSE</th>
<th>MORE FALSE THAN FALSE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...increased collaboration between jurisdiction organizations/partners.</td>
<td>64.52%</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...improved perceptions of equity among jurisdiction organizations/partners.</td>
<td>74.19%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...improved funding leverage for jurisdiction organizations/partners.</td>
<td>70.97%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>9.68%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...was a positive change to our TIP allocation process.</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15 14. Membership Value

Answered: 31  Skipped: 0

My community receives value from being a member of DRCOG.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.97%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRUE MORE TRUE THAN FALSE MORE FALSE THAN TRUE FALSE DON’T KNOW TOTAL WEIGHTED AVERAGE

My community receives value from being a member of DRCOG.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2015-2019 trend (High score - green Low score - red)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>I. Structural Integrity</strong> refers to how Board Directors perceive the fairness of the collaborative process. A process that has high structural integrity applies criteria for making decisions and allocating resources in a fair and consistent manner, treats all members equitably, and allows sufficient opportunity for members to challenge and revise decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The people involved in the process usually are focused on broader goals (outcomes) of the region, rather than individual agendas.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The process is free of favoritism.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In the process, everyone has an equal opportunity to influence decisions.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The process responds fairly to the needs of its members.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Decisions made in the process are based on fair criteria.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The allocation of resources is decided fairly.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The criteria for allocations are fairly applied.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>In the process, there is sufficient opportunity to challenge decisions.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The decisions made in the process are consistent.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Decisions are based on accurate information.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Scale/section average</strong></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Responses</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Authenticity</strong> refers to the extent Board Directors perceive the collaborative process is free from undue outside influence. An authentic process is one where members are confident the group has the power to make independent judgments and evaluations of the issues, and can make decisions on how to respond to those issues that will be respected by all members as well as those in positions of authority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process gives some people more than they deserve, while shortchanging others.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, some people’s opinions are accepted while other people are asked to justify themselves.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, strings are being pulled from outside Board discussions which influence important decisions.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In discussions about decisions or procedures, some people are discounted because of the organizations/jurisdictions that they represent.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale/section average</strong></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Quality Process Score = Structural Integrity &amp; Authenticity</strong></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Strong Leadership

Reflects the perception the Board has an effective organizing/coordinating body and is led by committed and effective leaders. The role of the organizing/coordinating body is to provide a convening location, collaborative environment and relevant information for Board Director deliberation and decision-making. Note: The first item below regarding Organizer/coordinator refers to DRCOG's role as the convener/convening location. The second item refers to Board Director leadership. **Our collaborative...**

- ...has an effective organizer/coordinator.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ...is led by individuals who are strongly dedicated to the Mission and Vision of DRCOG.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale/section average**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses**  
| 25 | 35 | 34 | 26 | 31 |
**IV. Members** refers to how Board Directors perceive other Director’s capacity to collaborate: Are they willing to devote their efforts to furthering the goals of the collaborative rather than simply garner additional resources for their individual programs? Will they support the ideas that have the most merit even at the expense of their own interests? And, do they think there is sufficient trust among members to honestly share information and feedback? **Members...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...are effective liaisons between their home organizations and our group.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...trust each other sufficiently to honestly and accurately share information, perceptions, and feedback.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are willing to let go of an idea for one that appears to have more merit.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are willing to devote the effort necessary to achieve Metro Vision Outcomes.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale/section average</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**V. Structure**

refers to the clarity members have about the scope of the Board's authority and the roles and responsibilities assigned to its Directors. Note: This section also pertains to Board Committees. Please use the space below to provide comments on committees as they relate to (Board) Structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our group has set ground rules and norms about how we will work together.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a method for communicating the activities and decisions of the group to all members.</td>
<td><strong>3.40</strong></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td><strong>3.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clearly defined roles for group members.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale/section average</strong></td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2015-2019 trend (High score - green Low score - red)**
VI. General Success reflects the perceived level of success achieved by the collaborative and assesses the extent to which members accomplished the objectives set out for the most recent performance period. The term objectives in this section refers to for example; Reduce VMT, Improve Air Quality, Reduce GHG, etc. as opposed to 'outcomes' that describe an end state or destination point. **Our Collaborative...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has accomplished its specific objectives</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has achieved more than its original objectives.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has led to new projects or efforts.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has achieved extraordinary success.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale/section average</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015-2019 trend (High score - green Low score - red)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII. Community Involvement &amp; Collaboration refers to the extent to which the collaborative has engaged a wider or more diverse set of partners, or has stimulated greater commitment to collaboration among communities/jurisdictions. Our Collaborative...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has led to broader and more meaningful engagement of diverse partners.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in the emergence of new leaders committed to collaboration.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has helped improve the way our participating jurisdictions work together.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has increased my knowledge of resources outside of my agency/organization.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has increased my access to resources outside of my agency/organization for my community.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale/section average</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment - 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. Outcomes refer to the extent to which members believe the collaborative has had an impact on the outcomes it is targeting. For example an outcome is; The built environment accommodates the needs of residents of all ages, incomes, and abilities; Development patterns are easy to navigate, enhance multimodal connectivity, and maximize the ability for all people to access opportunities. (Metro Vision) <strong>Our Collaborative...</strong></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is committed to a “no wrong door” approach where any idea can be considered.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has had an impact on the outcomes it is targeting.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in improved outcomes for the population served.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale/section average</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IX. Quality of Services

Assesses members’ perceptions about the level of improvement in the quality of services for the population served, in areas such as access to needed services, navigating the system of services, time to obtain services, etc. **Our Collaborative...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has improved the quality of services for the population served.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in more streamlined service provision across participating jurisdictions/organizations.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in the creation of a system that is easier for the population served to navigate.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in a system that makes it easier for population served to access needed services.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in improved quality of services within my agency/organization due to our participation on the DRCOG Board.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale/section average</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X. **Fragmentation of Services** refers to the extent to which members of the collaborative perceive a reduction in the fragmentation of services for the population served. This reduced fragmentation may result from increased availability of continuous and uninterrupted services, greater integration of services, more comprehensive service plans, or other improvements.

Our Collaborative...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has increased the availability of continuous and uninterrupted services for the population served by DRCOG, regardless of the funding source.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has generally led to the creation of more comprehensive services plans for the population served by participating jurisdictions/organizations.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale/section average</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**XI. Duplication of Services** refers to two qualities of duplication: a reduction in the duplication of services; and a reduction in the number of professionals providing services for the population served by DRCOG. Our Collaborative...

has led to a reduction in the duplication of overlapping services across all participating jurisdictions/organizations when serving the region's population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

has led to a reduction in the number of professionals providing overlapping services for the population served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

has resulted in greater integration of services for the population served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale/section average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**XII. Costs** refers to the extent to which members view the collaborative as reducing costs, either by reducing the costs of delivering services to the population served or by promoting a sharing of costs between jurisdictions/organizations participating in the collaborative. **Our Collaborative**...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2016-2019 trend (High score - green Low score - red)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2016-2019 trend (High score - green Low score - red)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2016-2019 trend (High score - green Low score - red)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XIII. Sub Regional Forums** refers to the jurisdictional forums that began in 2018 for communities to come together to strategize on the best way to use transportation and other funds for their communities’ collective good. **The sub-regional forums**:

- increased collaboration between jurisdiction organizations/partners. 3.58
- improved perceptions of equity among jurisdiction organizations/partners. 3.63
- improved funding leverage for jurisdiction organizations/partners. 3.57
- was a positive change to our TIP allocation process. 3.55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XIV. Membership Value**

My community receives value from being a member of DRCOG. **N/A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>August 21, 2019</td>
<td>Informational Item</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT**
Providing the second *Denver Region Data Brief*, “The increasing cost of a home.”

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**
N/A

**ACTION BY OTHERS**
N/A

**SUMMARY**
In 2017 and 2018, regional stakeholders and the Board provided input on programs and initiatives that better coordinate local and regional planning for growth. This is the second data briefing under the pilot phase of the Regional Growth Initiative. Additional briefings will be provided to the Board over the coming months.

To support regional decision-making, DRCOG staff maintains and analyzes various data sets. This data brief is an opportunity to highlight insights from some of these data sets. This briefing’s sources include the Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University’s *The State of the Nation’s Housing 2019* and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Consumer Expenditure Survey.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**
N/A

**PROPOSED MOTION**
N/A

**ATTACHMENT**
*Denver Region Data Brief*, “The increasing cost of a home.”

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Brad Calvert, Division Director, Regional Planning & Development at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org.
HOME PRICE COMPARED TO INCOME

Buying a home today is significantly more expensive than it was three decades ago. In 1990, the median home price in the Denver metro area was two-and-a-half times greater than its median household income. In 1990, the national median home price was more than three times median household income.

By 2018, the Denver metro area’s median home price was more than five-and-a-half times greater than median household income – well above the national median home price of four times median household income. Over 30 years, the change reflected the 12th-highest increase among 382 U.S. metro areas, with the Denver metro area rising from a rank of 192nd-highest median price to income in 1990 to 34th-highest in 2018. The Boulder metro area experienced the fifth-highest increase. Western states are home to the 20 metro areas that experienced the highest increases in median home price to household income ratio between 1990 and 2018.

Just the numbers

- The median home price in the Denver metro area is more than five-and-a-half times the median household income.
- Among 382 metro areas, Denver had the 12th-highest increase of median home prices to household income, rising from a rank of 192 in 1990 to 34 in 2018; the Boulder metro area experienced the fifth-highest increase.
- A majority of the nation’s renters and homeowners have moved or made changes to their spending over the past two years because of increasing rent or mortgage payments.

1990 median home price to median income ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer metro area</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2018 median home price to median income ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer metro area</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: The Denver region falls into three separate metropolitan statistical areas as delineated by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget.

Analysis geography

For the purposes of this analysis, the Denver metro area corresponds with the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood metropolitan statistical area. Boulder is a distinct metropolitan statistical area.
THE EFFECTS

Housing is already one of the largest costs in a household’s budget. When housing costs rise faster than incomes, households must make housing-related changes or decrease other spending. A recent Freddie Mac survey found rising housing costs had affected 51% of the nation’s households – including both renters and homeowners – over the past two years.¹ Beyond the effects on their quality of life, household spending cuts may hamper local governments’ ability to maintain local sales tax revenue. Additionally, to minimize housing costs, people may choose to live farther from work or other destinations, increasing vehicle travel.

IN PRACTICE: PRESERVING EXISTING AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Statewide, approximately 22,000 units of existing affordable housing funded through tax credits and other financial incentives are in jeopardy over the next decade, as initial contracts guaranteeing affordability expire. The Colorado Housing Preservation Network is a public-private partnership of state, federal, local and nonprofit entities. The network’s priority is to establish a database to identify, track and monitor properties most at risk of losing rental assistance or income and occupancy restrictions. Using the database, network partners will proactively identify and protect existing affordable housing.


The Denver Regional Council of Governments is a forum where local governments collaborate to make the region a great place to live, work and play. To support decision-making, DRCOG staff maintains and analyzes various data sets. This briefing is an opportunity to highlight insights from the data sets.

Questions? Ideas for topics? Contact Andy Taylor at ataylor@drcog.org. For more data, visit data.drcog.org.


Average annual expenditures in the Denver metro area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal insurance and pensions</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>