AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY, December 15, 2021
6:30 p.m. – 8:10 p.m.
VIDEO/WEB CONFERENCE
Denver, CO

1. 6:30 Call to Order
2. Roll Call and Introduction of New Members and Alternates
3. Move to Approve Agenda
4. 6:40 Report of the Chair
   - Report on Performance and Engagement Committee
   - Report on Finance and Budget Committee
5. 6:45 Report of the Executive Director
6. 6:50 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

7. 7:00 Move to Approve Consent Agenda
   i. Minutes of November 17, 2021 (Attachment A)
   ii. FY 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments (Attachment B)

ACTION ITEMS

8. 7:05 Select representatives to serve on the RTC, STAC, E-470, and the ACA (Attachment C) Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director

9. 7:20 Discussion of the Front Range Passenger Rail District Board nomination and appointment process (Attachment D) Jacob Riger, Manager, Transportation Planning and Operations

INFORMATIONAL BRIEFING

10. 7:35 Draft FY2022-2027 TIP Policy and Call for Projects applications (Attachment E) Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning and Operations

11. 8:00 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 – Ashley Stolzmann
    B. Report from Metro Mayors Caucus – Bud Starker
    C. Report from Metro Area County Commissioners – Jeff Baker
    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 – John Diak
    G. Report from CDOT – Rebecca White
    H. Report on FasTracks – Bill Van Meter

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

12. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) administrative modifications (Attachment F) Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning and Operations

13. Advanced Mobility Partnership (AMP) annual update (Attachment G) Emily Lindsey, Transportation Technology Strategist, Transportation Planning and Operations

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS


15. Other Matters by Members

16. 8:10 Adjourn
CALENDAR OF FUTURE MEETINGS

December 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee/Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Board Work Session</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Performance and Engagement Committee</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Committee</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Finance and Budget Committee</td>
<td>5:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Advisory Committee on Aging</td>
<td>Noon – 3 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee/Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Board Work Session</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Performance and Engagement Committee</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Committee</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Finance and Budget Committee</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Advisory Committee on Aging</td>
<td>Noon – 3 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

February 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee/Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Board Work Session</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Performance and Engagement Committee</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Committee</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Finance and Budget Committee</td>
<td>5:40 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Advisory Committee on Aging</td>
<td>Noon – 3 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Start time for this meeting is approximate. The meeting begins at the end of the preceding Board Work Session
SUMMARY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY, November 17, 2021

Members/Alternates Present
Ashley Stolzmann, Chair                      City of Louisville
Steve O’Dorisio                              Adams County
Jeff Baker                                   Arapahoe County
Alison Coombs                                City of Aurora
Larry Vittum                                 Town of Bennet
Aaron Brockett                               City of Boulder
Matt Jones (Alternate)                      Boulder County
William Lindstedt                           City and County of Broomfield
Deborah Mulvey                              City of Castle Pines
Tim Dietz (Alternate)                       Town of Castle Rock
Tammy Mauer                                 City of Centennial
Randy Weil                                  City of Cherry Hills Village
Craig Hurst (Alternate)                     City of Commerce City
Nicholas Williams                           City and County of Denver
Kevin Flynn                                 City and County of Denver
George Teal                                 Douglas County
Steve Conklin                               City of Edgewater
Linda Montoya                               City of Federal Heights
Josie Cockrell                              Town of Foxfield
Lynette Kelsey                              Town of Georgetown
Jamie Jeffery (Alternate)                   Gilpin County
Jim Dale                                    City of Golden
Dave Kerber (Alternate)                     City of Greenwood Village
Tracy Kraft-Tharp                           Jefferson County
Stephanie Walton                            City of Lafayette
Wynne Shaw                                  City of Lone Tree
Joan Peck                                   City of Longmont
Colleen Whitlow                             Town of Mead
Julie Duran Mullica                         City of Northglenn
John Diak                                   Town of Parker
Sally Daigle                                City of Sheridan
Neal Shah                                   Town of Superior
Jessica Sandgren                            City of Thornton
Sarah Nurmela                               City of Westminster
Bud Starker                                 City of Wheat Ridge
Rebecca White                               Colorado Department of Transportation
Sally Chafee                                Governor’s Representative
Bill Van Meter                              Regional Transportation District

Others Present: Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, Melinda Stevens, Executive Assistant, DRCOG; Bryan Weimer, Arapahoe County; Janet Lundquist, Chris Chovan, Adams County; Mac Callison, Aurora; Cindy Copeland, Boulder County; Sarah Grant, Broomfield; Brent Soderlin, Commerce City; Art Griffith, Lauren Pulver, Douglas County; Kent Moorman, Thornton; Debra Baskett, Westminster; Danny Herrmann, Jan Rowe,
Chair Ashley Stolzmann called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with a quorum present.

The Chair noted new members and alternates: Sally Chafee, Colorado Department of Transportation, representing Governor Polis. There was a new member designated on November 15 for the City of Westminster: Sarah Nurmela, Council Member. DRCOG was not notified of this designation prior to the Board meeting, so there was a discussion and vote on allowing Director Nurmela to participate at this evening’s meeting.

Director Dale moved to allow Sarah Nurmela to participate in the November 17 Board of Directors meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Move to approve agenda

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

Report of the Chair

Chair Stolzmann had nothing to report.

- Director Conklin reported the Performance and Engagement Committee met on November 3 and entered into an Executive Session to discuss Executive Director Doug Rex’s performance and evaluation. Overall, it was a very positive review and Director Conklin thanked ED Rex for all of his hard work. The committee also received an informational briefing:
  - A discussion on returning to in-person meetings. Staff compiled a return to in-person meetings proposal for review by members. Members had suggested edits for staff to change on this document before it is submitted to the entire DRCOG board.
- Director Shaw reported the Finance and Budget Committee and Regional Response, Inc. (RRI) met prior to the Board meeting and the committees were briefed on the six-month RRI 2021 audit and the DRCOG six-month 2021 audit, due to the change in fiscal year. Additionally, the Finance and Budget Committee approved three resolutions authorizing the executive director to:
  - accept execute an amendment to the contract with Enterprise Rent-A-Car Company of Pittsburgh, extending the contract termination date to June 30, 2022, with no other changes to the existing contract.
  - negotiate and execute a contract with The Sanborn Map Company, Inc. (Sanborn) in an amount not to exceed $730,000 and Nearmap in an amount not to exceed $450,000 for 2022 and 2023 aerial imagery and related products and services and to collect payment from all participating parties for the products and services purchased.
  - amend the existing Complete Streets Toolkit consultant contract in a total authorization amount not to exceed $160,000 to conduct initial implementation activities associated with DRCOG’s Regional Complete Streets Toolkit.
Report of the Executive Director

- ED Rex asked directors to please take time to review two of the informational items listed on the agenda in full:
  - Preview of 2021 state legislative session
  - Denver Region Data Brief, “The COVID-19 pandemic’s effect on construction”
- DRCOG’s Annual Awards Celebration: the event will be taking place on April 27, 2022 at Empower Field. Award nominations are now open and can be submitted until January 7, 2022.
- DOLA Affordable Housing Grants: The Department of Local Affairs is accepting applications on several new affordable housing grant programs. If any community is interested in that program, the next round of “letters of intent” are due on December 6.

Public Comment
There was no public comment.

Move to approve consent agenda

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

Items on the consent agenda included:

- Summary of the October 20, 2021 meeting

Select representative to the Nominating Committee

Executive Director Rex presented this item to the directors. The Nominating Committee consists of member representatives from the Performance & Engagement Committee, the Finance & Budget Committee, the Board, a member selected by the Board Chair, the Immediate Past Chair of the Board, and a Board member representing the City and County of Denver. At the January meeting each year, the Nominating Committee shall present to the Board nominations for Executive Committee members to be elected at the February meeting.

Director Starker moved to select Sally Daigle and Julie Duran Mullica of the Board of Directors to the Nominating Committee. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Discussion on the FY 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment

Todd Cottrell provided an overview of the amendment to the directors. This is a reconsideration of a proposed TIP amendment that came before the Board on September 15, 2021. The Town of Castle Rock expressed concerns about the location of the mobility hub and the Board postponed action on approving this amendment. The Board asked staff from the various partners to meet and develop a recommendation for further consideration by the Board. Staff met on October 14 to discuss how to move
forward. CDOT proposed a process to work with Castle Rock and other stakeholders to finalize a mobility hub area plan. Both the Transportation Advisory Committee and the Regional Transportation Committee previously recommended the project. The proposed amendment to the FY 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program has been found to conform with the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality:

- **2020-100 - Region 1 Mobility Hub Pool**
  - Add one new pool project and increase cost by $300,000 in Legislative-Transit funds. This project was previously considered by the Board but action was delayed pending further coordination between CDOT and the Town of Castle Rock.

Director Peck *moved* to adopt the attached amendment to the 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion was *seconded* and *passed* with 34 in favor and one abstention from Director Teal.

Discussion of draft DRCOG Board comments on the revised proposed greenhouse gas (GHG) transportation planning rulemaking

Ron Papsdorf provided an update regarding the rulemaking to the board. Based on the Board’s November 3 discussion, staff developed a set of draft comments on the revised proposed GHG Rule, which the directors discussed in detail. The draft comments take into account feedback from the Board and restate some of the previous comments that were not addressed in the revised Rule and new comments triggered by new concepts in the revised proposal. CDOT extended the public comment period until noon on November 18, 2021, and the Transportation Commission is now scheduled to consider the revised proposed rule at its December 16 meeting.

Director O’Dorisio *moved* to approve the DRCOG Board comments, as written, to the Transportation Commission on the revised proposed greenhouse gas reduction transportation planning requirements and direct the Chair to send the comment letter on the Board’s behalf. The motion was *seconded* and *passed* unanimously.

Committee Reports

**State Transportation Advisory Committee** – Chair Stolzmann reported that the committee met and received a presentation on the 2023 Draft Budget. They also discussed the 10-year plan update with fiscal constraints. The committee received an update on the Greenhouse Gas Rulemaking and discussed the MMOF.

**Metro Mayors Caucus** – Director Starker stated there was no report.

**Metro Area County Commissioners** – Director Baker stated that there was no report because the MACC was preparing for their Fall Retreat on December 3.

**Advisory Committee on Aging** – There was no report.

**Regional Air Quality Council** – Doug Rex stated that RAQC met on November 5 and had a discussion on the Draft 2022 Budget Work Program, which will be voted on at the December meeting. They received a presentation on the results of this this year’s public awareness campaign: Simple Steps, Better Air. The council received a presentation on
the 2020 Annual Congestion Report and had a conversation about wildfire smoke and the impacts on air quality.

**E-470 Authority** – Director Diak reported that the Board unanimously approved a three-year Toll Rate Policy, which decreases toll rates starting January 1 of 2022.

**Report from CDOT** – Director White stated that the passage of the Infrastructure Bill was a huge accomplishment for transportation funding.

**Report on FasTracks** – Director Van Meter provided an update on the Northwest Rail Line Peak Service Study. RTD received technical proposals from consultant teams to support RTD and the local jurisdictions in this study. In October, the RTD Board of Directors granted the GM/CEO the authority to negotiate and execute all documents and funding transfers necessary for the design, construction, and maintenance of the new facility at 1st & Main in Longmont.

**Next meeting – December 15, 2021**

**Other matters by members**
There were no matters by members

**Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

_____________________________________
Ashley Stolzmann, 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 #
December 15, 2021     Consent Agenda          7-ii

SUBJECT
FY 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
DRCOG staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments because they comply with the current TIP amendment procedures, as contained within the Board-adopted 2020-2023 TIP Policy.

ACTION BY OTHERS
November 15, 2021 TAC recommended approval
December 14, 2021 RTC will make a recommendation

SUMMARY
DRCOG’s transportation planning process allows for Board-approved amendments to the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) on an as-needed basis. Typically, these amendments involve the addition or deletion of projects, or adjustments to existing projects and do not impact funding for other projects in the TIP.

The TIP projects to be amended are shown below and listed in Attachment 1. The proposed amendments to the FY 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program have been found to conform with the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality.

TIP Amendments
- **2016-003** Central 70
  Increase funding.
- **2020-048** HOP Transit Service Expansion
  Revise project scope from service expansion to bus purchases.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
Move to recommend the attached amendments to the 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

ATTACHMENT
1. Proposed TIP amendments
2. Draft Resolution

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at (303) 480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Josh Schwenk, Assistant Planner, Transportation Planning and Operations Division at jschwenk@drcog.org.
**2016-003**: Increase FY 21 TIFIA funding by $15,059,000 to reflect higher than anticipated eligible costs. Increase FY 21/22 local funding by $8,901,000 to reflect updated senior debt and equity amounts

### Existing

**Title**: Central 70  
**TIP-ID**: 2016-003  
**STIP-ID**:  
**Open to Public**:  
**Sponsor**: CDOT

**Project Scope**
Replace the I-70 Viaduct, including the addition of one managed lane in each direction from I-25 to Chambers Rd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Municipality(ies)</th>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measures**
- Bridge Condition
- Congestion
- Freight Reliability
- Pavement Condition
- Safety
- Transit Assets
- Transit Safety
- Travel Time Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (TIFIA)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,896</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (FASTER-B)</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$30,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Leg)</td>
<td>$35,283</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,913</td>
<td>$46,007</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$985,239</strong></td>
<td><strong>$93,783</strong></td>
<td><strong>$137,309</strong></td>
<td><strong>$76,307</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,292,638</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount in $1,000s</td>
<td>Prior Funding</td>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>FY22</td>
<td>FY23</td>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>FY25</td>
<td>Future Funding</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (TIFIA)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$48,955</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (FASTER-B)</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$30,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Leg)</td>
<td>$35,283</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$42,435</td>
<td>$43,386</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$985,239</td>
<td>$93,783</td>
<td>$163,890</td>
<td>$73,686</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,316,598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2020-048: Revise scope to remove service expansion and replace with the purchase of 5 to 6 battery electric buses. Revise funding to add $323,000 in state FASTER-Transit funds and $1,745,000 in state settlement funds, and reduce local match. Total project cost decreases. This scope change has been recommended for approval by the Boulder Subregional Forum.

**Existing**

**Title:** HOP Electric Bus Purchases

**TIP-ID:** 2020-048  **STIP-ID:** Open to Public: 2020  **Sponsor:** Boulder

**Project Scope**
Expand the HOP transit service to connect the regional transit hub at 30th and Pearl to the business parks on the east side of town.

**Affected Municipality(ies):** Boulder  **Affected County(ies):** Boulder

**Project Phases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Initiate Bus Service - Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Initiate Bus Service - Year 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measures**
- Bridge Condition
- Congestion
- Freight Reliability
- Pavement Condition
- Safety
- Transit Assets
- Transit Safety
- Travel Time Reliability

**Amounts in $1,000s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (MMOF)</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Title:** HOP Electric Bus Purchases  
**Project Type:** Transit Vehicles  
**TIP-ID:** 2020-048  
**STIP-ID:**  
**Open to Public:** 2023  
**Sponsor:** Boulder

**Project Scope**
Purchase battery electric buses and charging equipment to further advance the electrification of the HOP fleet in Boulder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Faster-T)</td>
<td>$323</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (MMOF)</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (STF)</td>
<td>$1,745</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$875</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,343</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,343</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STATE OF COLORADO

BOARD OF DIRECTORS       RESOLUTION NO. _, 2021

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE 2022-2025 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Denver Regional Council of Governments, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, is responsible for carrying out and maintaining the continuing comprehensive transportation planning process designed to prepare and adopt regional transportation plans and programs; and

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

WHEREAS, a Transportation Improvement Program containing highway and transit improvements expected to be carried out in the period 2022-2025 was adopted by the Board of Directors on April 21, 2021; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to amend the 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Committee has recommended approval of the amendments.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Denver Regional Council of Governments hereby amends the 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Denver Regional Council of Governments hereby determines that these amendments to the 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program conform to the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality.

RESOLVED, PASSED AND ADOPTED this __ day of ________________, 2021 at Denver, Colorado.

_________________________________________
Ashley Stolzmann, 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: December 15, 2021
Agenda Category: Action
Agenda Item #: 8

SUBJECT
This item is related to selecting representatives to serve as a member or alternate on the Regional Transportation Committee, the State Transportation Advisory Committee, the E-470 Board of Directors, and the Advisory Committee on Aging.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Select representatives to serve on the Regional Transportation Committee, the State Transportation Advisory Committee, the E-470 Board of Directors, and the Advisory Committee on Aging.

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
Interest was solicited for directors to serve as DRCOG’s representatives on the Regional Transportation Committee (RTC), the State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC), E-470 Board of Directors and the Advisory Committee on Aging (ACA).

DRCOG has five seats on the RTC. Three seats are reserved for the DRCOG Board Chair, Vice Chair, and the executive director. Two at-large representatives are needed as well as several alternates to serve in the event a member cannot attend a meeting. Directors Wynne Shaw and Joan Peck currently serve as DRCOG’s at-large members.

DRCOG also has standing membership on both the STAC and E-470 Authority Board. Each year, members are solicited to serve on behalf of DRCOG for these important regional assignments. Two DRCOG members will be chosen to serve on either committee, one as the member and the other as the alternate. Chair Ashley Stolzmann and Director Tammy Maurer currently serve as the member and alternate respectively on the State Transportation Advisory Committee. Director John Diak is currently the member on the E-470 Board of Directors and Director Jessica Sandgren is the alternate.

Lastly, DRCOG’s Advisory Committee on Aging has openings for Board members to serve on this critical committee serving older adults throughout the region.

Directors were asked to submit interest in serving on any of the above committees by Tuesday, December 7, 2021.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
Move to approve Board members to serve on the Regional Transportation Committee, the State Transportation Advisory Committee, the E-470 Board of Directors, and the Advisory Committee on Aging.
ATTACHMENTS

- List of candidates
- Regional Transportation Committee guidelines
- Link to STAC webpage
- Link to E-470 webpage
- Advisory Committee on Aging guidelines

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Melinda Stevens, Executive Assistant at 303-480-6701 or mstevens@drcog.org.
ACA Candidates

Wynne Shaw

Wynne was elected to serve the City of Lone Tree as a Council Member in 2016 and was re-elected in 2020. She serves DRCOG as a member of the Board and of the Executive Committee chairing the Finance and Budget committee. She represents DRCOG as a member of the RTC (Regional Transportation Committee) and the Advisory Committee on Aging. Wynne represents the City of Lone Tree as Vice Chair of the Douglas County Subregional Transportation Forum and on the Executive Board for the Douglas County Housing Partnership. She serves as an alternate on the CML Policy Committee, and on E-470 where Lone Tree is a non-voting member. Wynne is a proud Colorado resident of over 40 years and her professional background is in Financial Services.

Steve Conklin

Steve Conklin has served on City Council in Edgewater for nearly eight years, first appointed to an unexpired term and then elected twice. He served as Mayor Pro Tem (2017-2021) and previously volunteered on the Planning and Zoning Commission. He has been Edgewater’s representative to DRCOG for nearly six years and has served as Board secretary and treasurer. Steve is self-employed, providing Executive Director services to professional associations. He is president of the non-profit Broadcast Pioneers of Colorado, preserving the history of radio and TV in Colorado.

RTC Candidates

Wynne Shaw

Wynne was elected to serve the City of Lone Tree as a Council Member in 2016 and was re-elected in 2020. She serves DRCOG as a member of the Board and of the Executive Committee chairing the Finance and Budget committee. She represents DRCOG as a member of the RTC (Regional Transportation Committee) and the Advisory Committee on Aging. Wynne represents the City of Lone Tree as Vice Chair of the Douglas County Subregional Transportation Forum and on the Executive Board for the Douglas County Housing Partnership. She serves as an alternate on the CML Policy Committee, and on E-470 where Lone Tree is a non-voting member. Wynne is a proud Colorado resident of over 40 years and her professional background is in Financial Services.

Claire Levy

I am a Boulder County Commissioner, serving my first term. As Boulder County’s delegate to DRCOG I also represent Boulder County on the Northwest Mayors and Commissioner Committee. Before being elected county commissioner, I served in the state legislature and served on the Transportation and Energy Committee in the House. I served on the Planning
Board for the city of Boulder before running for public office. Those previous experiences, together with my current service in office provide background for serving on this committee.

**STAC Candidates**

**Tammy Mauer**

I am interested in serving on the State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) in 2022. Chair Ashley Stolzmann has served as Member and I have enjoyed serving with her in the Alternate position. She has done a remarkable job but I am uncertain if she will request to remain in that position. If she does not request to remain in the Member position, I would like to serve as the Member on this board.

Serving on this board, I have been able to have a better understanding of current and future CDOT programs and projects. I have a good working knowledge of how the Committee functions as well as I enjoy working with them to achieve their goals.

I retired from CDOT as a transportation engineer and have experience with most transportation related aspects. I currently serve on the Reimagine RTD board and on the National League of Cities, Transportation Infrastructure & Services Committee.

**Deborah Mulvey**

I am in my third year as a Castle Pines City Council Member, and look forward to continuing in that role with the blessing of voters in 2023. In that role, and my prior role on Planning Commission, I have been intimately involved with the subregional transportation issues affecting our residents and South Metro residents. Geographically, our City sits between S85 and I25, along one of the connector routes between the two, and is bisected further on the north/south axis by the Quebec/Monarch/Lagae alternative route to I25. Demographically, our residents typically commute to work, going south and north, near and far. A majority of the residents in our rapidly growing City require a transportation network to reach the Springs, Denver, Boulder, Greeley, and closer, Littleton, DTC and the airport (our population will double in 15 years). Consequently, our residents and our South Metro neighbors have a tremendous stake in the outcome of regional rail and future transportation decisions, including a desire to see it to fruition in the nearest possible future with the least possible cost. Finally, our city looks to make positive and multimodal changes to and between 2 interchanges on I25 in the near future (one of which is entering NEPA with considerable non-state/fed funding in place). Our City straddles the highway and we look to ensure that those who will populate our and all South Metro attainable housing and all South Metro seniors can reach all areas of the City, and all rail options.

I have enjoyed serving on Performance and Engagement Committee in the past, and now also on the Finance and Budget Committee. More so however, I have enjoyed serving as an alternate on the Regional Transportation Committee and consistently attending the Southwest
Chief/Front Range Passenger Rail Commission meetings for over a year. As a regular user of rail transportation now and for years on the east coast, and a person who has been involved in railroad cases, I have specialized knowledge of rail scheduling and safety concerns. These issues range from grade crossings, elevation and wildlife issues affecting routes, rail speeds affecting population and rail traffic safety, scheduling for maximum commuter, short route, and traveler usage, and usage and maintenance concerns encountered when sharing freight lines. These concerns will be present all along the FRPR line throughout the DRCOG region, and my knowledge of both rural, semi-rural and urban interaction with populations will be a benefit to the Commission.

I have grown to have a keen interest in the future of our rail, multimodal, and road options, to serve our greater Denver community wisely into the future.

**Nicholas Williams**

Nicholas Williams is a Deputy Manager/Chief of Staff for the Denver Department of Transportation and Infrastructure (DOTI). In this role, he oversees the department’s policy, legislative and external relations activities as well as leads internal engagement and leadership for DOTI’s nearly 1,200 employees. Prior to joining DOTI in 2018, Nicholas worked for the Houston, TX regional Council of Governments (Houston-Galveston Area Council) for nine years in a variety of transportation roles including air quality, multimodal planning and administration. Nicholas also served as a Field Director for a member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Nicholas received an undergraduate degree from the University of Texas at Austin and a Juris Doctorate from South Texas College of Law.
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Type: Standing Committee

Authority: Memorandum of Agreement between DRCOG, the Colorado Department of Transportation, and the Regional Transportation District, dated July 10, 2001. Modified by the three agencies, June 17, 2008 Revised September 21, 2016

MEMBERSHIP

Sixteen members as follows:

- **Denver Regional Council of Governments** - Board chair and vice chair, and two designees from the Board, and the Executive Director.

- **Colorado Department of Transportation** - Three metro area Transportation Commissioners and the Executive Director.

- **Regional Transportation District** - Three Board members and the General Manager.

- **Other Members** - Three members appointed by the Committee chair upon unanimous recommendation of the Executive Directors of DRCOG, CDOT and the General Manager of RTD. The DRCOG Executive Director will consult with the Committee chair prior to the three agency executives forming a recommendation.

USE OF ALTERNATES

It is the clear goal of the Committee to minimize use of alternates. However, recognizing that there will be times when it is inevitable that members cannot attend, alternates will be allowed on the following basis:

- Each agency shall designate annually, in writing to the chair, standing alternates (board members/commissioners and staff).
- No more than two staff (members or designated alternates) from each agency can vote on any given issue.
- The appropriate level of staff that can be designated as alternates are:
  - DRCOG: Division Directors
  - CDOT: Regional Transportation Directors or equivalent or above
  - RTD: Senior Managers of planning and development or above
- No alternates are permitted for the Other Members.
- No proxies are permitted.
- The new Immediate Past Chair of DRCOG shall serve as an alternate until the DRCOG Board acts to designate new alternates after the February Board elections.
RESPONSIBILITIES

Through the Regional Transportation Committee, DRCOG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), administers the urban transportation planning process for the region in accordance with *The Prospectus - Transportation Planning in the Denver Region* and applicable federal regulations. Accordingly, the responsibilities of the Regional Transportation Committee shall include:

- Overall direction of current work activities established by the Unified Planning Work Program.
- Review and approval of items to be submitted to the DRCOG Board of Directors, as the MPO policy body, for adoption.
- Approval of plans, programs, documents and annual endorsements related to surface transportation as outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement. Should the DRCOG Board approve a policy action that differs from the Regional Transportation Committee's recommendation, the action shall be referred back to the Committee for reconsideration.

QUORUM

Twelve members, or designated alternates.

VOTING

Twelve votes are required to carry any action.

OTHER

DRCOG representatives will attend a briefing with the DRCOG Executive Director immediately prior to the regularly scheduled RTC meeting.
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGING (ACA)

Type: Standing Committee

Authority: Older American’s Act of 1965, as amended, and the Contract between DRCOG and the Colorado Department of Human Services, State Unit on Aging dated February 8, 1974 and revised March 15, 2006.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership shall include individuals eligible to participate in the program, minority and low-income adults, older individuals, residents of geographically isolated areas, and at least three members of the DRCOG Board who shall be appointed by the DRCOG Chair. Interested DRCOG Board alternates also may be considered for appointment to the ACA in addition to the minimum Committee membership of three Board members.

Membership on the Committee or changes to membership requires a written request to, and confirmation by, the DRCOG Chair. Membership shall be assessed annually and a member’s attendance at ACA meetings will be considered.

It is the goal of the DRCOG Board that (1) at least one-half of the members should be age 60 and older, and (2) include at least one individual from each of the counties served by the Area Agency on Aging (AAA), and (3) include five community partner representatives from areas including but not limited to: transportation, lifelong communities, foundations, financial institutions, aging, disability, LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender), elder rights, and developmental disability.

Members representing each of the counties served by the AAA shall be recommended for appointment by their respective county council/commission on aging through their respective governing body (board of county commissioners or mayor, as appropriate) and confirmed by the DRCOG Chair. Representation shall proportionately reflect the 60+ population within each county and shall be according to the graph below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>60+ Residents</th>
<th>Number of Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 – 100,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 and over</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County population shall be determined using DRCOG’s demographic estimates. There will be a maximum of four representatives per county.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Members are expected to be aware of any potential real or perceived conflicts of interest and make them known to the DRCOG AAA Division Director immediately. Members shall
abstain from any discussion of, or voting on, any funding issue in which a conflict of interest exists or may arise.

Committee members that are board members of an agency that submit requests for funding are prohibited from taking part in evaluating such requests.

OFFICERS

The ACA elects officers from among the members annually in May. The term of the office for chair and vice chair is one year, from July 1 through June 30. An individual may serve two consecutive years in the same office but only with an affirmative vote of the Committee.

In the absence of the chair, the vice chair assumes the role of the chair.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- Represent the needs of persons age 60 and older, with special emphasis on the needs of those persons in greatest social and/or economic need.
- Advocate for the enhancement and well being of the region’s current and future older adult populations.
- Assist DRCOG staff in assessing the strengths and needs of older adults and their caregivers.
- Assist DRCOG staff in developing and updating the AAA 4-Year Plan; make recommendations concerning the same to the DRCOG Board.
- Assist DRCOG staff in developing policies, procedures, and priorities for planning and funding activities; make recommendations concerning the same to the DRCOG Board.
- Assist DRCOG staff in assessing funding proposals to serve the 60 and older population pursuant to the Older Americans Act and Older Coloradans Act; make recommendations concerning the same to the DRCOG Board.
- Actively become and remain educated on the issues concerning the aging and their caregivers.
- Serve as an ambassador to the community and to the County Councils on Aging by communicating the purposes, responsibilities and functions of the AAA.

QUORUM

A quorum shall consist of one-third of the members present at a regularly scheduled ACA meeting or at a special meeting called by the Committee chair.

MEETINGS

The ACA meets monthly and shall be open to the public. Summary minutes shall be taken at Committee meetings and shall be available to the public upon request for review.
The ACA, in consultation with the AAA Division Director, may cancel regular monthly meetings or call for special meetings.

It is the responsibility of the AAA Division Director to develop the monthly agenda. The committee chair may request the AAA Division Director develop the agenda in consultation with the chair.

**SUBCOMMITTEES**

- The ACA, in consultation with DRCOG staff, shall determine the need for subcommittees.
- Duties of subcommittees include making recommendations to the ACA regarding matters pertaining to their specific interest.
- Any ACA member may serve on any of the subcommittees but shall include, whenever possible, at least one member from each county represented.
- Voting is limited to one vote per county.
- Each subcommittee shall appoint a chair and the meeting schedule for the subcommittee shall be determined by the chair and other members in consultation with DRCOG staff.
- All subcommittee activities shall be reported by the subcommittee chair or their designee at the next regular ACA meeting.
- It is the responsibility of the AAA Division Director or designee to develop the monthly agenda. The subcommittee chair may request the agenda be developed in consultation with the subcommittee chair.
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>December 15, 2021</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
Nomination and appointment process for DRCOG’s representatives to the Front Range Passenger Rail District Board

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Authorize the DRCOG Nominating Committee to recommend candidates for DRCOG’s representatives on the Front Range Passenger Rail District Board and authorize staff to work with the Nominating Committee to develop an application for the candidate solicitation process.

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
DRCOG has been a member of the Southwest Chief & Front Range Passenger Rail Commission (Rail Commission) since its inception in 2017. Senate Bill 21-238 (SB-238) will replace the Rail Commission with a Front Range Passenger Rail District in 2022. The new District has been created for the purpose of “planning, designing, developing, financing, constructing, operating, and maintaining a passenger rail system...” along Colorado’s Front Range.

The new District, whose boundary stretches from Wyoming to New Mexico along the I-25 corridor, will have a 24 member board of directors (17 voting members) comprised of:

- 6 directors appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the state Senate, including one director who is a resident of a city or county with an unfinished FasTracks rail service project.
- 10 directors appointed by metropolitan and rural transportation planning organizations, including DRCOG, and confirmed by the Senate
- 1 director appointed by the executive director of CDOT
- 3 non-voting directors appointed (one each) by BNSF, Union Pacific, and Amtrak
- 1 non-voting director appointed by RTD
- 1 non-voting director appointed by the I-70 Mountain Corridor Coalition
- 2 non-voting directors appointed (one each) by the Governors of Wyoming and New Mexico

DRCOG will appoint four directors and appointments are due by March 1, 2022. The new District will convene its first meeting no later than May 15, 2022. SB-238 specifies
the following requirements and guidelines for DRCOG’s appointment of district directors:

- Appointees must be a current or former member of the DRCOG Board of Directors representing a member local government of the DRCOG MPO area (which excludes Gilpin County, Clear Creek County, and any municipality east of Kiowa Creek in Adams and Arapahoe counties).
- When making the appointment, only members of the DRCOG Board who represent a member local government that is wholly or partly included within the District boundary may vote on the appointment (which also excludes Gilpin County, Clear Creek County, and any municipality east of Kiowa Creek in Adams and Arapahoe counties).
- Terms are four years, except that two of the initial appointments will be for two years.
- Finally, as noted, appointments are due by March 1, 2022 and subject to Senate confirmation.

DRCOG staff gathered initial input from the Performance and Engagement (P&E) Committee at its August meeting. The P&E Committee believed the now-current Nominating Committee (starting in November 2021) should be utilized to begin the appointment process and ultimately make appointment recommendations to the full DRCOG Board for its consideration.

Staff believes it will be important to develop an application of screening questions to assess candidates. In addition to specific eligibility criteria to comply with SB-238, questions may focus on the candidate’s background in transportation issues, interest in passenger rail generally, and interest in Front Range Rail specifically from a regional perspective representing DRCOG on the new District Board.

Accordingly, staff is now requesting the Board’s consideration on the following proposed actions:

- Authorize the Nominating Committee to lead the process to identify and recommend DRCOG’s Front Range Passenger Rail District Board candidates for DRCOG Board approval.
- Authorize staff to work with the Nominating Committee to develop an application for the candidate solicitation process.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**

**October 20, 2021** – Board briefing on Front Range Passenger Rail

**PROPOSED MOTION**

Authorize the DRCOG Nominating Committee to recommend candidates for DRCOG’s representatives on the Front Range Passenger Rail District Board and authorize staff to work with the Nominating Committee to develop an application for the candidate solicitation process.
ATTACHMENT
N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at (303) 480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Jacob Riger, Long Range Transportation Planning Manager, at (303) 480-6751 or jriger@drcog.org.
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 #
-------------|----------------|-------------
December 15, 2021 | Informational Briefing | 10

SUBJECT
Discussion of the draft TIP Policy and Call for Projects applications to be used for the upcoming calls covering FY2022-2027.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
In early 2021, DRCOG staff began working to develop a TIP Policy document and associated project application covering the programming of projects for FY2024-2027 with the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). Three factors led staff to consider adjustments to the “normal” TIP process: 1) new Multimodal and Mitigation Options Funds (MMOF) under SB21-260, 2) state greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction rulemaking, and 3) the total current and future anticipated funding available under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA).

This briefing will address the TIP Policy and project solicitation process and applications. Final recommendations will come to the Board for consideration at its January meeting.

**TIP Policy Document**
The TIP Policy is used to guide and instruct how the TIP process takes place. Using the adopted FY 2020-2023 TIP Policy as a template, edits have been suggested in track-changes (see Attachment 1), not including document wordsmithing (i.e., phrase adjustment, sentence structure, year changes/removals, etc.). These proposed edits have been informed by discussions with stakeholders and TAC that occurred since April. During the meeting, staff will provide a high-level overview of the suggested edits.

High-level changes from the current [2020-2023 TIP Policy](#) include:
- Capital project eligibility
- Set-aside programs
- Replaced “focus areas” with “2050 RTP project and program investment priorities”
- Regional Share:
  - Updated funding request range between $100,000 and $20 Million, with a 20% minimum match
  - Project and program eligibility
  - Parallel track applications (STBG and AQ/MM)
- Subregional Share:
  - Forum funding targets calculations updated with current data
  - Project and program eligibility
  - Parallel track applications (STBG and AQ/MM)
• Approval needed for additional calls for projects
• Revised to remove references to any specific TIP
  o The new document is now proposed to be called the “Policies for TIP Program Development”, and will be a standalone document that can be used for any future call, without the need to adopt a new document in its place. The opportunity for revision will still be provided before any call for projects.

TIP Applications
DRCOG staff proposes using a two-track TIP project solicitation process. The purpose of having two applications is to 1) better organize and utilize the funding types available to DRCOG within the years the funding is available and to help project sponsors meet the 50% matching requirement of the MMOF funds, and 2) allow the upcoming 2050 RTP amendment process and the TIP process to continue in parallel paths without interference from one another, by not allowing certain project types to be eligible during the first two TIP calls in 2022. The two applications include:

• The Air Quality and Multimodal (AQ/MM) Track for projects eligible for state Multimodal and Mitigations Options Fund (MMOF) and federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ), Transportation Alternatives (TA), and Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funding. Major project types not allowed to be submitted for this track includes roadway capacity, roadway reconstruction, and bridge projects.
• The STBG Track for projects eligible for federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding.

Staff has developed draft applications for each track (Attachments 2 and 3). Both applications are structurally the same, but depending on which call is being held for which years, one or both “tracks” (and therefore applications) may be used, and applicants will use the application that best suits the project type being submitted.

Major changes from the FY2020-2023 TIP application that apply to both tracks include:

• replacing the previous High-Medium-Low scoring with a zero-to-five-point scale,
• replacing the previous TIP Focus Areas with the 2050 MVRTP Priorities,
• adding a new project readiness section, and
• general edits and restructuring of questions.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

April 26, 2021 TAC
May 24, 2021 TAC
June 28, 2021 TAC
July 26, 2021 TAC
August 23, 2021 TAC
October 6, 2021 TAC
October 25, 2021 TAC
November 15, 2021 TAC

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A
ATTACHMENTS
1. Staff Presentation
2. Draft TIP Policy
3. Draft AQ/MM TIP Application
4. Draft STBG TIP Application

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, at (303) 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.
DRAFT TIP Policy and Application

DRCOG Board of Directors
December 15, 2021

Todd Cottrell
Overall: Track changes exclude wordsmithing, funding year changes, etc.

- TIP years removed; meant to be a document used for all future calls (no need to re-adopt, just amend). Easier on staff; will seek input for adjustments before each TIP cycle

Chapter 1 (introduction): The TIP schedule updated and generalized
Chapter 2 (roles/requirements):

- Agency roles – funding source cleaned up; meets new federal bill
- Capital project eligibility
  - Any project phase: 2020-29 staging period projects
  - Project Development: 2030-39 staging period projects
- Technology projects – clean up and expand language related to regional operations plan and systems engineering analysis
- Freight – add language related to economy, reliability, emissions
Chapter 3 (initial programming):

- Funding Assessment – Clean up language regarding funding sources
- Set-Aside Programs – Set-asides updated based on previous discussions
- Other Commitments – Removed Central 70 and FasTracks commitments
Chapter 4 (calls for projects):

- Replaced focus areas with 2050 MVRTP project and program investment priorities as previously discussed
- Financial Requirements – clarify MMOF match language
- Regional Share:
  - Updated intent – link to regional Metro Vision objectives and outcomes
  - Funding: 20% minimum match
  - Project/program eligibility requirements
  - Notes parallel track applications (STBG and AQ/MM)
Chapter 4 (calls for projects) continued:

- Subregional Share:
  - Funding targets updated with current data
  - Project/program eligibility requirements (similar style table as regional; similar open eligibility)
  - Forums: no voting via email/polling (must be during a meeting)
  - Notes parallel track applications (STBG and AQ/MM)
  - Application submittal process; to DRCOG first
Chapter 5 (TIP Development):
- Amendments and Modifications – refine and clarify criteria and triggers for TIP amendments and modifications
- Funding Increase – DRCOG Board approval for a new call for projects

Appendix A (RTD and CDOT Selection Processes):
- Updated RTD process to refer to Mid-Term Financial Plan
- Updated CDOT process to refer to 10-Year Plan and other minor program changes
TWO APPLICATIONS

- **STBG**: uses STBG funds for eligible projects; 20% match requirement

- **Air Quality and Multimodal**: uses MMOF, CMAQ, TA, CRP for eligible projects; 20% local match for federal funds
  - Example: 50% MMOF, 40% CMAQ/TA/CRP, 10% match (CMAQ/TA/CRP/local match is used to match MMOF and local funds used to match the CMAQ/TA/CRP)

- **Key differences**: AQ/MM app excludes capacity, reconstruction, bridge projects (those that do not improve congestion, AQ)
Section A: Regional Impact of Proposed Project

Section B: MVRTP Priorities (formerly Focus Areas)
  • Safety, Active Transportation, Air Quality, Multimodal Mobility, Freight, and Regional Transit

Section C: Project Leveraging

Section D: Project Readiness (NEW)
SECTION A: REGIONAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED PROJECT

• Proposed section weight: **30%**
• Similar to previous “Regional Significance” section
• Focus includes:
  • Importance of project,
  • Solving a regional problem,
  • Impact on disproportionately impacted and environmental justice populations,
  • Progress toward the Metro Vision outcomes (access/connectivity)
• Response (for some): Narrative, with quantitative information; use checkboxes and data tables to provide required additional context
SECTION B: MVRTP PRIORITIES

• Proposed section weight: 50%
• How the project addresses each of the six MVRTP priority investment areas
• Response (for all): Narrative, with quantitative information; use checkboxes and data tables to provide required additional context
SECTION C: PROJECT LEVERAGING

- Proposed section weight: **10%**
- Projects will be scored on the percent of outside funding toward the total project cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% non-Regional Share funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60% and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30-39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.1-29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% non-Regional Share funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60% and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30-39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.1-19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: PROJECT READINESS

• Proposed section weight: 10%

• Screens projects on common pitfalls; items that should ALWAYS be reviewed before submitting

• Questions: identification and mitigation of potential roadblocks, status of ROW, availability of matching funds, and public engagement to date

• Questions can be answered through both checkboxes and narrative descriptions to gather the full context of project development
PROPOSED SCORING METHODOLOGY

• Each question scored on a **scale of 0 to 5** relative to other projects received

• Checkboxes and data tables help provide context and guide the narrative answer
  
  • Complete and incorporate the data in the narrative responses to be considered for full points when directed
  
  • **Scores derived from the narrative (Sections A and B)**
OTHER THINGS TO REMEMBER

• Data app being developed to assist sponsors with project data

• Key phase milestones with dates will be needed (and should already be known)

• Cost estimate (YOE) is required to be provided

• Project Readiness (to improve score): Licensed engineer required to review and provide name on app on the project impacts and mitigation to date on utilities, RR, ROW, environmental, etc.

• Think and plan ahead to avoid cost overruns, project delays, schedule issues, etc.
  • In other words, funding/time spent now will help you later
DISCUSSION
Adopted January 19, 2022
Preparation of this report has been financed in part through grants from the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration of the U. S. Department of Transportation
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I. INTRODUCTION

The 2024-2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will specifically program the federally-funded transportation improvements and management actions to be completed by the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), the Regional Transportation District (RTD), local governments, and other project sponsors over a four-year period.

Metro Vision serves as a comprehensive guide for future development of the region with respect to growth and development, transportation, and the environment. One component of Metro Vision is the Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan, or 2050 MV RTP). It presents the vision for a multimodal transportation system that is needed to respond to future growth, as well as to influence how the growth occurs. It specifies strategies, policies, and major capital improvements that advance the objectives of Metro Vision. The Fiscally Constrained 2050 MV RTP defines the specific transportation elements and services that can be provided through the years identified in the adopted MV RTP based on reasonably expected revenues.

As required by federal and state law, the TIP must be fiscally constrained to funds expected to be available. All projects selected to receive federal and state surface transportation funds, and all regionally significant projects regardless of funding type, must be identified in the TIP.

The 2024-2027 TIP will specifically identify and program projects for federal and state funding based on the adopted MV RTP. It takes the multimodal transportation vision of the adopted MV RTP and begins to implement it through projects funded in the adopted TIP FY 2024-2027. This TIP is programmed cycle introduces using a new a dual model selection process for all funds allocated through by DRCOG—a dual model selection process FY. This process splits available funding into two shares—regional and subregional. The regional process is conducted similar to previous dual model DRCOG allocations, while the subregional process proportionally targets funding for planning purposes to each county and all the eligible applicants within, to recommend projects that meet the regional vision of DRCOG and the needs of each individual subregion. Because this is viewed as a pilot process FY, DRCOG has committed the testing of the dual model process for the next two FY TIP cycles. Due to changing federal, state, and local laws and regulations, including shifts in regional priorities, just like every TIP Policy, this document can be amended by the Board at any time during this TIP cycle, and the process will be evaluated before the document is updated for the next TIP cycle FY.

The TIP is prepared and adopted by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG), the region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), in cooperation with CDOT and RTD. This document establishes policies and direction for developing the TIP and selecting projects to be included.

A. AUTHORITY OF THE MPO

Federal law charges MPOs with the responsibility for developing and approving the TIP. DRCOG directly selects projects with federal and state funding, and reviews CDOT- and RTD-submitted projects for consistency with regional plans.

B. GEOGRAPHIC AREA OF THE TIP

The TIP is prepared for the area shown in Figure 1. Projects must be located within the MPO boundaries (the blue outline) for all funding types except MMOF, though projects within eastern Adams and Arapahoe
Counties are eligible for Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funding only. Note the MPO boundary is different than the DRCOG boundary.

C. TIME PERIOD OF THE TIP

Each TIP developed The four years of the FY 2024-2027 TIP contains four years of committed and programmed projects. TIP projects may also contain prior and future funding for years before and after the identified TIP FY 2024 and after FY 2027. Prior and future funding is not fiscally constrained, and typically is used to financially align CDOT and RTD planning products, in addition to DRCOG-selected TIP projects that were selected outside of this TIP.

D. TIP DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE

Table 1 shows the process and tentative schedule for developing the FY 2024-2027 TIP. A more detailed schedule, along with DRCOG funding request application forms and instructions, will be distributed with the solicitation for funding requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP Process Element</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIP Policy Development Revisions</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>TBD Month 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation for DRCOG Regional Share Funding Requests, Initial Evaluation, and Draft Project Listing</td>
<td>August 2018 – January 2019</td>
<td>Month 7-11 TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required TIP Trainings</td>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>TBD Month 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation for DRCOG Subregional Share Funding Requests, Initial Evaluation, and Draft Project Listing</td>
<td>February 2019 – June 2019</td>
<td>Month 13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft TIP Document Preparation</td>
<td>January – June 2019</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing on Draft TIP</td>
<td>July 2019 TBD</td>
<td>Month 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Review of Draft TIP</td>
<td>July-August 2019 TBD</td>
<td>Month 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Action for TIP Adoption</td>
<td>August 2019 TBD</td>
<td>Month 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Transportation Improvement Program Development Schedule
Figure 1. Geographic Area of Transportation Improvement Program
II. AGENCY ROLES AND REQUIREMENTS

This section identifies the funding programmed by DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD, the steps taken to integrate the three processes, and common requirements for all TIP projects, regardless of funding source.

A. AGENCY ROLES

Each of the three regional transportation planning partners—DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD—select projects for the funds over which it has authority. These three selection processes are conducted separately until they are integrated into a draft TIP by DRCOG staff. See Section V.A for additional details. All project sponsors are strongly encouraged to discuss their potential project with relevant agencies before their funding requests are submitted.

**DRCOG** selects projects to receive Federal-Aid Highway and state funding from the following **four-five** programs. Please see Appendix B for examples of projects by funding source. DRCOG **is also the Designated Recipient for FTA 5310 large urban funds, though this is conducted outside of the TIP call for projects process.**

- Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)
- Transportation Alternatives (TA)
- Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ)
- Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)
- State Multimodal Transportation and Mitigation Options Fund (MMOF)

**CDOT** selects projects for inclusion into the TIP using a variety of federal, state, and local revenues. Though not an exclusive list, the programmatic categories listed below are typically used to fund CDOT projects **and local projects via pass-through funds.** These programs and responsibilities for selecting projects typically evolve with each new federal transportation act.

- ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act)
- Bonds/Loans
- Bridge (on-system, off-system, discretionary)
- Congestion Relief Program (regional CDOT priorities to reduce congestion on the state highway system)
- FASTER (Funding Advancements for Surface Transportation and Economic Recovery Act of 2009) Projects: Bridge, Safety, and Transit (state revenues for eligible projects)
- National Highway Freight Program (NHFP)
- FTA Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities – Small urban transit capital projects for elderly & disabled services)
- FTA Section 5311 (Formula Grants for Rural Areas – transit planning, operating, and capital)
- FTA Section 5339 (Grants for Buses and Bus Facilities Program - transit capital projects improvements)
- Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Permanent Water Quality Facilities (PWQF)
  RAMP (Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships)
- RPP (Regional Priorities Program) (strategic regional priorities)
- Safe Routes to School
- Safety Projects
- Surface Treatment (repaving projects)
- SB18-001
- SB09-228
- SB17-267
- SB21-260
- TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovations Act)
- Transportation Alternatives (CDOT allocation)
- Transportation Commission Contingency
- Other projects using federal discretionary funds
RTD selects projects using a variety of federal funds and RTD revenues to fund regional transit system construction, operations, and maintenance. The projects follow their Strategic Business Plan (SBP) Mid-Term Financial Plan for the base transit system and their Annual Program Evaluation (APE) for the FasTracks Program. Projects are listed in the TIP under the following categories:

- FTA Section 5307 (transit capital, operations, capital maintenance, studies)
- FTA Section 5309 (transit New Starts Capital Investment Grants (CIG))
- FTA Section 5310 (transit capital for elderly & disabled services)
- FTA Section 5337 (transit State of Good Repair)
- FTA Section 5339 (transit capital improvements)
- FasTracks
- Other projects using federal discretionary funds

B. REQUIREMENTS AND COMMITMENTS FOR ALL TIP PROJECTS

This section outlines any specific or special requirements necessary for a project to be placed within the TIP, regardless of selection agency (DRCOG, CDOT, or RTD) or funding source.

1. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants for DRCOG-selected projects are listed in Section IV.A. CDOT and RTD establish applicant eligibility for the programs for which they select projects.

2. Project Eligibility

All projects to be granted funds through the TIP must:

- be consistent with Metro Vision and the MVRTP,
- abide by federal, state, and local laws,
- be consistent with locally-adopted plans, and
- have required matching funds (if any) available or reasonably expected to be available.

The types of projects eligible for specific funding sources have been established in the current federal transportation legislation FAST (Fixing America’s Surface Transportation) Act and state statute. Some are further defined by each selection agency. DRCOG project eligibility is defined within each Call for Projects section and further detailed in Appendix B.

3. Air Quality Commitments

The TIP must implement any submitted State Implementation Plan (SIP) Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), which are detailed in the air quality conformity finding. No TCMs are currently included within the adopted 2050 MVRTP. The TIP must also comply with any outcomes of Colorado House Bill 19-1261 (greenhouse gas pollution reduction roadmap) and Colorado Senate Bill 21-260 (pollution reduction planning framework).

4. Capacity-Capital Project Eligibility

Capital projects must be identified in particular air quality staging periods in the 2050-adopted Fiscally Constrained RTP (Table 3.1) of the 2050 current MVRTP (April 2021) as to be eligible for Regional and Subregional Share funding. Please see Appendix C of this document lists the current eligible and ineligible projects and elements. Please see Chapter IV, Sections B and C for how the currently eligible capital projects
fit into the Regional and Subregional Calls for Projects. Capital projects and eligible activities extend to the following:

- Roadway capacity capital projects (e.g., widening-lane mile changes) of one mile or greater or new interchanges,
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) capital projects involving either a fixed guideway or a bus lane one mile or greater in length, and
- Rail rapid transit projects which add a new rail station or build a new section of line connecting to a station.

This section only deals with capital projects. Roadway operational projects less than one mile in length and bus (service and operational) projects (e.g., stops, signage, Transit Signal Priority, rolling stock, queue-jump lanes, and similar project types) less than one mile in length are eligible regardless of their inclusion in the adopted MVRTP.

Bus Rapid Transit capacity projects involving either a fixed guideway or a bus lane one mile or greater in length must also be identified in the 2050 Fiscally Constrained RTP (Figure 6.2 and Appendix 4) of the 2050 MVRTP (April 2021). Note: bus transit service and operational projects (e.g., stops, signage, Transit Signal Priority, rolling stock, queue-jump lanes, and similar project types) less than one mile in length are eligible.

Rail rapid transit projects which add a new rail station or build a new section of line connecting to a station must be included in the 2050 Fiscally Constrained RTP (Figure 6.2 and Appendix 4) of the 2050 MVRTP.

5. Eligibility Requirements of Transportation Technology Projects

All transportation technology projects funded selected by DRCOG to receive federal funding with federal-aid Highway funding shall clearly help achieve the goals and objectives in an adopted DRCOG regional operations plan and must follow specific guidance outlined in the call for projects eligibility criteria. Such projects must also be based on a systems engineering analysis [23 CFR § 940.11 (a)]. A specific process for design, implementation, and operations & maintenance must be accounted for by the applicant pursuing TIP funds. The first step is the identification of portions of the DRCOG regional ITS architecture being implemented. Early coordination with DRCOG staff regarding the architecture is recommended.

6. Freight

In the DRCOG selection process, freight facility projects, freight-related pollutant reduction projects, roadway projects, and studies may benefit freight movement or freight facilities. For example, projects selected for the Fiscally Constrained 2050 MVRTP were evaluated based on several criteria, including such as improving total and/or truck travel time reliability, reducing emissions, and improving the region’s competitive position proximity to intermodal facilities and severity of traffic congestion, each of which is important to freight movement. Projects benefiting freight movement will be discussed in the interagency review of projects (See Section V.A).

7. Commitment to Implement Project

Since the TIP is dependent on a satisfactory air quality conformity finding, inclusion of a project in the TIP shall constitute a commitment to complete the project in a manner consistent with the years of funding identified in the TIP.

Any additional funding necessary to complete the project scope beyond the already identified DRCOG allocation in the TIP must be borne by the project sponsor. If any anticipated matching funds become unavailable, the project sponsor must find other non-DRCOG funds to replace them. If project costs increase on CDOT- and RTD-selected projects, CDOT or RTD may provide additional federal, state, or local funds equal
to the increase. If project costs increase on the scope elements defined within DRCOG-selected projects, sponsors must make up any shortfalls with non-DRCOG-allocated funds.

All project components (within each funded TIP phase) contained within Environmental Impact Statements (EISs)/Records of Decision (RODs), Environmental Assessments (EAs)/Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSIs), or other National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) decision documents must be funded as part of the project.

8. Public Involvement

Public involvement is expected at all stages of project development and the responsibility for seeking it lies with the project sponsor. For projects seeking DRCOG-selected funding, early public input is key as the sponsoring agency is preparing its funding request submittal in either the regional or subregional project selection process. The DRCOG committee review process through the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) and Regional Transportation Committee (RTC), and a public hearing at the regional level, provide opportunities for public comment prior to DRCOG Board action on adoption of the TIP amendments. The TIP public involvement process also serves as the public involvement process for RTD’s program of projects using FTA Section 5307 funding, and the public hearing is noticed accordingly.

9. Advance Construction

For projects selected for TIP funding, a sponsor wishing to accelerate the completion of a project with non-federal funds may do so through a procedure allowed by the FHWA referred to as advance construction.

Through advance construction, a project sponsor can independently raise upfront capital for a project and preserve eligibility for future federal funding for that project. At a later point, federal funds can be obligated for reimbursement of the federal share to the sponsor. This technique allows projects that are eligible for federal aid to be implemented when the need arises, rather than when obligation authority for the federal share has been identified. The project sponsor may access capital from a variety of sources, including its own funds and private capital in the form of anticipation notes, commercial paper, and bank loans.

If any sponsor wishes to advance construct a project in the TIP, it must seek CDOT and FHWA permission to do so.
III. DRCOG INITIAL PROGRAMMING

This section outlines the DRCOG TIP process that takes place before the Regional and Subregional Share calls are issued.

A. OVERVIEW, FUNDING ASSESSMENT, AND INITIAL PROGRAMMING

1. Dual Model Overview

The dual project selection model has two TIP project selection elements—regional and subregional. In the Regional Share, funding goes towards projects that have a regional benefit and implement elements of the MVRTP. Within the Subregional Share, funds are proportionately targeted for planning purposes to predefined geographic units (counties) for project prioritization and recommendations to the DRCOG Board. Each county subregion can add criteria specific to their subregional application accounting for local values. Additional details are provided in Section IV.

2. Funding Assessment

DRCOG staff will estimate how much funding will be available, by funding source, for the federal fiscal years 2024, 2025, 2026, and 2027 in consideration of control totals provided by CDOT and other sources. The total four-year program funding must include the federal share of all carryover projects, set-aside programs, and other funding commitments as outlined below, in addition to any new funding requests (as outlined in Section IV). Depending on the timelines and structure of certain funding types, DRCOG reserves the authority to program some FY24-27 funding before the Regional and Subregional Shares Calls for Projects of a TIP opens for the FY24-27 TIP open.

DRCOG, through its calls for projects, funds projects with:

- Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) (formerly STP-Metro). This federal funding type is the most flexible and can be used for a variety of transportation projects and programs, including roadways, bridges, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and transit.
- STBG set-aside for Transportation Alternatives (TA). Federal TA funds are primarily for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
- Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. Federal CMAQ funds are for projects and programs that provide an air quality benefit by reducing emissions and congestion. Major project type exceptions include roadway capacity and reconstruction projects.
- Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funds. Federal CRP funds are for projects that support a reduction in transportation reductions. Major project type exceptions include roadway capacity and reconstruction projects.
- State Multimodal Transportation and Mitigation Options Funds (MMOF). State MMOF funds are to be used for transit, TDM programs, multimodal mobility projects enabled with new technology, studies, modeling tools, and projects that decrease VMT or increase multimodal travel, and bicycle/pedestrian active transportation projects.

The Regional Share Calls for Projects are conducted without the applicant defining a specific funding type, though they may indicate a wish to utilize state MMOF solely within their successful application. After the Regional Share all projects have been initially recommended for inclusion into the draft TIP document, staff will assign the appropriate funding type to each project. Once allocated, the remaining amounts within
each funding type will be determined and DRCOG will inform each subregion of the targeted amount by funding type for their subregion.

3. **Carryover Projects**

DRCOG staff will continue to fund all approved projects from the previous 2020-2023 and/or 2022-2025 TIP that were delayed or were selected from a TIP wait list and receive permission from the DRCOG Board of Directors to proceed. No new FY-2024-2027 TIP funding will be used. Instead, funding for the delayed projects continuing into a TIP will be carried over from the previous TIP.

4. **Set-Aside Programs**

DRCOG will continue with the practice of taking funds “off-the-top” to fund regional programs. The 2024-2027 TIP reflects the intent to fund the following set-aside programs in the amounts shown in Table 2, totaling $49,400,000 $63,360,000 in DRCOG-allocated funds over the four years of the TIP.

### Table 2. 2024-2027 TIP Set-Aside Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set-Aside Programs</th>
<th>4-Year DRCOG-allocated Funding Allocations for the 2024-2027 TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TDM Services</strong></td>
<td>$15,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $9,600,000 for the DRCOG Way to Go program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $3,840,000 for 8 regional TMA partnerships @ $120,000/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $2,000,000 for TDM non-infrastructure projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Transportation Operations &amp; Technology</strong></td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $15,000,000 (approximately) for call(s) for projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $5,000,000 (approximately) for DRCOG staff expenses to develop traffic signal plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality Improvements</strong></td>
<td>$7,920,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $2,775,000 for ozone outreach and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $1,000,000 for localized community-based marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $3,425,000 for other focused outreach and air-quality improvement programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $720,000 for ozone modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Service Transportation</strong></td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $8,000,000 to improve service and mobility options for vulnerable populations by funding underfunded/underserved trips and rolling stock expansion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Mobility Planning &amp; Innovation</strong></td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $2,000,000 for Transportation Corridor Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $5,000,000 for Regional Planning Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◆ $5,000,000 for Innovative Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Set-Aside Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set-Aside Programs</th>
<th>4-Year DRCOG-allocated Funding Allocations for the 2024-2027 TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TDM Services</strong></td>
<td>$15,440,000&lt;br&gt;• $9,600,000 for the DRCOG Way to Go program&lt;br&gt;• $3,840,000 for 8 regional TMAs partnership @ $120,000/year&lt;br&gt;• $2,000,000 for TDM non-infrastructure projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Transportation Operations &amp; Technology (traffic signals and ITS)</strong></td>
<td>$20,000,000&lt;br&gt;• $4,000,000 for DRCOG program support to develop traffic signal plans&lt;br&gt;• $16,000,000 for capital investments (call for projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality Improvements</strong></td>
<td>$7,920,000&lt;br&gt;Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC) will receive:&lt;br&gt;• $2,775,000 for ozone outreach and education&lt;br&gt;• $1,000,000 for localized community-based marketing&lt;br&gt;• $3,425,000 for other focused outreach and air quality improvement programs&lt;br&gt;• $720,000 for ozone modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Service Transportation</strong></td>
<td>$8,000,000&lt;br&gt;• $8,000,000 to improve service and mobility options for vulnerable populations by funding underfunded/underserved trips and rolling stock expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Mobility Planning and Innovation</strong></td>
<td>$12,000,000&lt;br&gt;• $3,000,000 for Transportation Corridor Planning&lt;br&gt;• $5,000,000 for Community Mobility Planning&lt;br&gt;• $4,000,000 for Innovative Mobility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each set-aside program, apart from the Air Quality Improvements, will independently develop its own eligibility requirements and criteria, including minimum project funding requests, along with a scoring system to recommend projects to the DRCOG Board for inclusion into the TIP at appropriate times, typically every two years. All set-aside programs will be managed and Calls for Projects conducted by DRCOG, apart from the Air Quality Improvements Set-Aside, which will be managed by the RAQC.

5. **Other Commitments**

As a part of all previous TIP actions, no current commitments were made by the DRCOG Board to fund projects “off the top”, outside of the Set-Asides and Calls for Projects against FY funding. This TIP Policy intends to fund two previous commitments:

- Completion of the FasTracks “Second Commitment in Principle” allocation set by the DRCOG Board in 2008. The total to be allocated will be $2,860,000 federal from a mixture of STBG and CMAQ funding. The funding for this commitment comes from the previous TIP, and will not use any new sources of funding.
- A remaining $25,000,000 in federal funds towards the Central 70 project over fiscal years 2020-2023. For the 2016-2021 TIP, the DRCOG Board made a $50,000,000 commitment in principle towards this project, split over two DRCOG TIP cycles. The $25,000,000 will be funded from the Regional Share allocation, pending a reaffirmation by CDOT for the funds.

6. **Dual Model Funding Allocation**

After new funding is allocated to the set-aside programs and other commitments (if any), the remaining funds are designated for new projects from the requests in the regional share and subregional share processes.
For this TIP, 20% of the remaining funds will be allocated to the Regional Share process and 80% to the Subregional Share. Details regarding these calls are outlined in the next section.
IV. DRCOG CALLS FOR PROJECTS

DRCOG evaluates and selects projects through two calls for projects - one for the Regional Share and another for the Subregional Share. This dual model approach provides the desired flexibility for member governments to apply local values to the TIP process and still maintain DRCOG’s strong commitment to implementing a TIP process consistent with Metro Vision and the adopted 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (MVRTP).

A. REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL DRCOG-SELECTED TIP PROJECTS

1. Eligible Project Activities and Locations

All projects submitted through DRCOG, regardless of which call for projects, must be eligible for one of the funding types that DRCOG allocates (see Appendix B) and located in and/or provide benefits to the MPO geographical area (see Figure 1). Project eligibility is specific for each of the calls for projects (Regional and Subregional). Detailed information on each respective call is listed further on in this section.

2. Projects Requiring Concurrence by CDOT or RTD

If any eligible applicant wishes to apply for any project on a state highway or within state right-of-way, they must have the written concurrence of CDOT before the application deadline. Funding requests in need of RTD involvement (for either capital projects, service operations, or to access RTD property) must have the written concurrence of RTD. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact CDOT or RTD early in the application process.

3. Projects Requiring an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with CDOT or RTD

For any projects requiring the sponsor to contract with CDOT or RTD to receive DRCOG-allocated funds, submittal of the application is an agreement by the sponsor to use the applicable IGA without revision. It is expected that a sponsor, after receiving notification from DRCOG their project is funded, will begin the IGA process immediately.

4. Eligible Applicants

Eligible applicants for projects to be selected by DRCOG, in either the Regional or Subregional Share, include:
- county and municipal governments,
- regional agencies; specifically, RTD, the Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC), DRCOG, and transportation management organizations/areas (TMO/A’s) (non-infrastructure projects only), and
- the State of Colorado offices and agencies, including the Department of Transportation (CDOT), public colleges, and universities.

5. TIP Focus Areas

The 2050 adopted MVRTP includes project and program investment priorities. These investment priorities will guide the FY 2024-2027 TIP development. This TIP identifies three focus areas to guide investments. The intent of the focus areas is to support implementation of the policies and programs established in Metro Vision and the MVRTP. The following 2050 MVRTP priorities focus areas are part of the Regional and Subregional Share evaluation criteria and will guide project applicants in investment decisions. Applicants are not required to propose projects that meet the TIP Focus Areas as they are not a project eligibility component.

- Safety
- Increase the safety for all users of the transportation system
  - Drawn from RTP priorities, Vision Zero, federal performance measures
  - Example project types: Any type, assuming safety is improved.

- **Active Transportation**
  - Expand and enhance active transportation travel options
  - Drawn from RTP priorities, Active Transportation Plan, Metro Vision objectives
  - Example project types: Bike/Ped, TDM, first/last mile; projects can be stand alone or elements of a larger project

- **Air Quality**
  - Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions
  - Drawn from RTP, federal performance measures, Metro Vision objectives
  - Example project types: Any type, assuming the element is justified, except standalone reconstruction and a bridge rehab/replace

- **Multimodal Mobility**
  - Provide improved travel options for all modes
  - Drawn from RTP priorities, federal performance measures, Metro Vision objectives
  - Example project types: Any type

- **Freight**
  - Maintain efficient movement of goods within and beyond the region
  - Drawn from RTP priorities, Freight Plan, federal performance measures, Metro Vision objectives
  - Example project types: Any type. Projects can be location-based (improvements at a location) or projects designed to improve freight mobility

- **Regional Transit**
  - Expand and improve the region's transit network
  - Drawn from RTP priorities, Coordinated Transit Plan, Regional Bus Rapid Transit Feasibility Study
  - Example project types: BRT, new/enhanced bus service, mobility hub, stop enhancements

---

**IMPROVE MOBILITY INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES FOR VULNERABLE POPULATIONS** (including improved transportation access to health services)

Mobility is a key component of helping vulnerable populations (such as older adults, minority, low-income, individuals with disabilities, and veterans) maintain their independence and quality of life. With the region's rapidly aging population, transportation is also a key component to helping older adults age in place. Improving mobility infrastructure and services for vulnerable populations may be attained through funding transit service and other physical infrastructure that improve or expand access to regional services and/or facilities. Projects/programs may include, but are not limited to:

- sidewalk improvements that assist in fulfilling a community’s ADA transition plan,
- new or expanded transit services, including call-a-Ride,
- technology-facilitated improvements, such as shared mobility services, and
- street design elements to optimize human performance (e.g., pedestrian improvements at intersections, curb radius, signage, devices for lane assignment, etc.).
INCREASE RELIABILITY OF EXISTING MULTIMODAL TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Having a consistently reliable multimodal transportation system is essential to the individual user experience and regional mobility. Reliability may be addressed through:

- capacity improvements to any of the region’s travel modes,
- the elimination of gaps in the system, and
- operational improvements, such as traffic signal timing, bottleneck improvements, grade separations, transit service, and transportation demand management (TDM) strategies.

IMPROVE TRANSPORTATION SAFETY AND SECURITY

Safety for all users of the multimodal transportation system—and working toward reducing serious injuries and eliminating fatalities—is of paramount priority to every transportation stakeholder in the region. There are approximately 220 reported traffic crashes per day in the region, resulting in about 70 injuries per day and four traffic fatalities per week (more than 200 annually).

Transportation security supports resiliency and addresses potential vulnerabilities and risks, from terrorism to technology (such as hacking) and natural hazards. Projects/programs may include, but are not limited to:

- roadway geometric upgrades, including the improvement of design and operations of intersections,
- improved interactions between pedestrian/bicycle modes with vehicular traffic (e.g., exclusive bike lanes, pedestrian/bicycle grade separations and crossings, improve line of sight, traffic calming improvements, etc.), and
- Intelligent Transportation Systems applications.

6. Financial Requirements

Sponsors must commit a minimum of 20% match from non-federal financial resources for STBG, CMAQ, CRP, and TA funding requests submitted for consideration, and a minimum of 50% match is required for the state MMOF funds.

The State MMOF program requires a 50% non-MMOF match. MMOF will be matched with CMAQ or TA funds plus the required 20% match on those funds. Based on CDOT Transportation Commission action, local match requirements for the MMOF funding program may be reduced for certain jurisdictions and will be reviewed at the beginning of each TIP Call for Projects cycle.

Additionally, sponsors must request a minimum of $100,000 in DRCOG allocated funds to be a candidate for DRCOG selection. All submitted requests must be reflected in year of expenditure dollars using a reasonable 3% inflation factor.

Subregions may place additional restrictions on the amount of local match and the federal/state funding request. Please see the following two subsections for additional details.

7. Commitment to Implement a Project
Inclusion of a project in the TIP shall constitute a commitment by the sponsor to complete their project in a timely manner. A sponsor’s submittal of a funding request for DRCOG selection shall constitute a commitment to complete each project phase as described in the application form if the project is selected for funding. The submitted, adopted application TIP scope becomes a permanent part of the TIP project scope and, at a minimum, must be implemented.

Sponsors with funding requests selected for inclusion in the TIP shall work with CDOT or RTD to ensure that all federal and state requirements are followed, and the project follows the project phases programmed in the TIP.

8. **Next Meaningful Phase**

Most of the regionally significant roadway and transit projects in the adopted Fiscally Constrained 2050-MVRTP are quite costly. To allow more flexibility in funding consideration in the Regional Share TIP process, applicants can submit implementation funding requests for only the “next meaningful phase” of such projects. The “next meaningful phase” should be jointly established by the sponsor, CDOT or RTD, and DRCOG staff in advance of the submittal. The functional implication of a “meaningful phase” is that a completed phase creates something usable. If additional funding is allocated to an existing project for new or revised project scope elements, the new scope element(s) will be added to the existing TIP project with funding years and project phases adjusted accordingly.

9. **Required Training**

At the initiation of the Regional Share TIP Call for Projects, DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD staff shall jointly conduct two, mandatory training workshops ([a mixture of in-person and virtual, as warranted](#)) to cover and explain the submittal process, eligibility and evaluation, construction and development requirements for construction projects, sponsor responsibilities, and basic requirements for implementing federal projects for both the regional and subregional processes. Applicants are only required to attend one of the two trainings. Each training will cover the same material and include the two calls for projects, so if applicants are not anticipating submitting a Regional Share application, but are for the Subregional Share, they are required to attend one of the trainings.

During the training, CDOT, RTD, and DRCOG staff will be available to assist jurisdictions in preparing funding request applications, as needed. As an outcome of this required training, those in attendance will become “certified” to submit TIP applications for either call. Only those applications prepared by eligible sponsors in attendance at one of the mandatory trainings will be considered as “eligible” submittals.

10. **DRCOG-Selected Project Phase Initiation Delays**

DRCOG has a project tracking program that tracks the initiation of a project phase. A delay occurs when a project phase, as identified during project submittal and contained within the TIP project description, has not been initiated in the identified year. For example, a project that has only one year of DRCOG-selected funding receives a delay if the project did not go to ad (construction projects), did not hold its kick-off meeting (studies), or didn’t conduct similar project initiation activities (other types of projects) by the end of the federal fiscal year for which it was programmed. For projects that have more than one year of DRCOG-selected funding, each phase (year) will be reviewed to see if the objectives defined for that phase have been initiated.

DRCOG defines the initiation of a project phase in the following manner as of September 30 for the year with DRCOG-selected funding in the TIP that is being analyzed:

- **Design**: IGA executed with CDOT AND if consultant – consultant contract executed and Notice To Proceed (NTP) issued; if no consultant – design scoping meeting held with CDOT project staff
• **Environmental**: IGA executed with CDOT AND if consultant – consultant contract executed and NTP issued; if no consultant – environmental scoping meeting held with CDOT project staff
• **ROW**: IGA executed with CDOT AND ROW plans turned into CDOT for initial review
• **Construction**: project publicly advertised
• **Study**: IGA executed (with CDOT or RTD) AND kick-off meeting has been held
• **Bus Service**: IGA executed with RTD AND service has begun
• **Equipment Purchase (Procurement)**: IGA executed AND RFP/RFQ/RFB (bids) issued
• **Other**: IGA executed AND at least one invoice submitted to CDOT/RTD for work completed

On October 1 (beginning of the next fiscal year), DRCOG will review the project phase status with CDOT and RTD to determine if a delay has occurred. If a delay is encountered (project phase being analyzed has not been initiated by September 30), DRCOG, along with CDOT or RTD, will discuss the project and the reasons for its delay with the sponsor. The result will be an action plan enforceable by CDOT/RTD, which will be reported to the DRCOG committees and Board. For a sponsor that has a phase of any of its projects delayed, the sponsor must report the implementation status on all its DRCOG-selected projects.

Sponsors will be requested to appear before the TAC, RTC, and DRCOG Board to explain the reasons for the delay(s) and receive TAC and RTC recommendation, and ultimately DRCOG Board approval to continue. Any conditions established by the DRCOG Board in approving the delay become policy.

On the following July 1, nine months after the project phase(s) was initially delayed, DRCOG staff will review the project status with CDOT or RTD to determine if the phase is still delayed. If it’s determined the project sponsor, as identified in the adopted TIP, is the cause of the continued delay (phase not being initiated by July 1), the project’s un-reimbursed DRCOG-selected funding for the delayed phase will be returned to DRCOG for reprogramming (federal funding reimbursement requests by the sponsor will not be allowed after July 1).

If it’s determined that another agency or an outside factor beyond the control of the project sponsor not reasonably anticipated is the cause of the delay (phase not being initiated by July 1), the future course of action and penalty will be at the discretion of the Board of Directors.

Board action may include, but is not limited to:
- Establishing a deadline for initiating the phase.
- Cancel the phase or project funding and return to DRCOG for reprogramming.
- Reprogram the project funding to future years to allow other programmed projects to advance.
B. REGIONAL SHARE CALL FOR PROJECTS

1. Regional Share Intent

The intent is to select a limited number of regional, high priority projects, programs, or studies that play a crucial role in shaping and sustaining the future of individuals, cities, and counties in the DRCOG region consistent with DRCOG’s Metro Vision Plan and 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. Regional project selection should directly be guided by the established TIP Focus Areas (which supports the implementation of the policies and programs established in Metro Vision and the MVRTP) and should connect communities, greatly improve mobility and access, and provide a high return on investment to the region.

Regional Share projects and programs serve to achieve the regional outcomes and objectives of Metro Vision and the regionally-funded project and program investment priorities set by the adopted Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan.

2. Funding Availability

Once all set-aside programs and commitments are allocated, the remaining funds are designated to new projects from the requests in the regional and subregional share process. Of the available funds, the Regional Share will be comprised of 20%. The remaining $25,000,000 federal funds allocation to the Central 70 project over fiscal years 2020-2023 will be taken off the top of the determined Regional Share funding level, pending a reaffirmation by CDOT for the funds. The remaining amount (after the Central 70 allocation) will be available for the call for projects. Exact funding levels will be available before the Regional Share Call for Projects opens. Funds that remain unallocated from the Regional Share Call for Projects will be added to the total Subregional Share allocation.

For the Regional Share Call for Projects, no single requests for DRCOG-allocated funding may be less than $100,000 or exceed $20,000,000. In addition, all Regional Share project requests must require a minimum 20% match. If state MMOF funds are utilized requiring a 50% match, efforts will be taken to combine federal and state funding sources to reduce the necessary match to a minimum of 20%. Per CDOT action, some local agencies may require less than a 50% match for STBG, CMAQ, and TA funds. For DRCOG federal or state funding, may not exceed 50% of the total project cost submitted. Of the minimum 50% match for the three federal sources of funding (STBG, CMAQ, and TA), 20% must be from non-federal sources to meet federal requirements.

3. Eligibility Requirements

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

Projects funded through DRCOG’s Regional Share shall include eligible transportation improvements that implement the elements of the 2050-adopted MVRTP as specified in Table 3 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible Networks</th>
<th>Eligible Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2040 MVRTP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reference Maps/Table</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific project attributes such as start and end points, alignment, service levels, and number of lanes are subject to revision through future environmental studies.</td>
<td>As adopted in RTP at time of TIP Call for Projects in 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Rapid Transit (rail and BRT/busway guideway corridors)</th>
<th>Figure 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects</td>
<td>Projects 1) from an adopted local plan or, 2) on or in proximity of a regional corridor or key multi-use trail identified on Figure 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeways and Major Regional Arterials (MRAs) on the Regional Roadway System (NOT ELIGIBLE: stand-alone roadway reconstruction and any projects on tollways (E-470, NW Parkway, Jefferson Parkway))</td>
<td>Figure 4: Eligible Roadway Capacity projects identified in blue. Figure 5: Eligible Roadway Operational project locations identified in red (freeways) and gold major regional arterials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Managed Lanes System</td>
<td>Figure 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Freight System (new railroad grade separations at existing grade crossings that improve operations on the designated Regional Roadway System)</td>
<td>Figure 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>Any study for a project that is DRCOG eligible (including multimodal studies per MMOF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal Projects (includes projects as defined in SB18-001 Multimodal Transportation Options Fund)</td>
<td>Fixed route or on-demand transit (capital and operating costs eligible) TDM programs Multimodal mobility projects enabled by new technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For fiscally-constrained roadway and rapid transit capacity project details, see Appendix 4 of the 2040 MVRTP.
### Eligible Projects/Programs for the Regional Share

As adopted in Table 3.1 of the 2050 MV RTP at the time of TIP Call for Projects in 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any Project Phase</th>
<th>Pre-Construction Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multimodal Capital</strong> (Projects &amp; Programs DRCOG Administered Funds only)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2029 staging period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional BRT Projects</strong></td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2029 staging period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor Transit Planning</strong> (Projects &amp; Programs)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2029 staging period • Regional mobility hubs • Any other regional strategic transit improvement*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arterial Safety /Regional Vision Zero</strong> (Projects &amp; Programs)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2039 staging period • Any other safety project located on the Taking Action on Regional Vision Zero Plan High Injury Network (arterial or higher classification)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transportation</strong> (Projects &amp; Programs)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2039 staging period • Any other active transportation project that closes a gap or extends a facility on the regional active transportation corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freight</strong> (Projects &amp; Programs)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2039 staging period • Any other project located on the Tier 1 or Tier 2 Regional Highway Freight Vision Network that primarily improves freight movement or access to a Regional Freight Focus Area*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studies</strong></td>
<td>• Study limits must include the entire MPO boundary at a minimum and specifically addresses one of the following categories listed above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Must not be an air quality Regionally Significant Project as defined in the 2050 RTP.

For projects that require an Environmental Assessment (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the EA or Draft EIS Disclosure Document must be signed or be reasonably expected to be signed by the relevant federal agency within **FY 2024-2027 the TIP years being programmed**. TIP funding for a study in this TIP cycle does not constitute a commitment to expedite funding for implementation in a coming TIP cycle. Funding for implementation will be based on relevant evaluation criteria in that (future) TIP process.

4. **Regional Share Criteria**

The Regional Share criteria to be used in the evaluation of projects is contained within Appendix D.

5. **Application Form**
DRCOG staff will make TIP application materials and instructions publicly available to all those who wish to apply. For this TIP cycle, the Regional Share will utilize a parallel track application process to keep the overall match at a minimum of 20%.

- The “STBG” track will utilize an application that will solicit and select projects eligible for STBG funds.
- The “Air Quality and Multimodal” track will utilize an application that will solicit and select projects eligible for MMOF, CMAQ, CRP, and TA funds. Federal, state, and local funding types may be combined to reduce the overall required match to 10% so long as a 20% match is provided for CMAQ, CRP, and TA funds.

6. **Required Training**
Training shall be required for any eligible sponsor who wishes to submit an application in the Regional Share Call for Projects. See Section IV.A for additional details.

7. **Call for Projects and Application Submittals**
The Regional Share Call for Projects will be announced by DRCOG and will be open for 8 weeks. Regional Share project applications from individual sponsors will be due to DRCOG and must be submitted on behalf of and in concurrence of the subregional forums, and CDOT and RTD, as warranted. Each subregion will be permitted a maximum of three submittals. Two submittals will be allowed from RTD, and two from CDOT (reaffirmation of Central 70 counts as one of CDOT’s project submittals).

Any agency contemplating applying and have data questions/needs related to the completion of the application, must contact DRCOG staff at least three weeks prior to the application deadline. The information that is required by the sponsors to complete applications is noted within the application. All applications must be complete when submitted to DRCOG as candidates for selection. Incomplete applications will NOT be accepted.

Applications from eligible sponsors must be prepared by those that have been certified as attended the required training. The application must be affirmed by either the applicant’s City or County Manager, Chief Elected Official (Mayor or County Commission Chair) for local governments, or agency director or equivalent for other applicants.

8. **DCOG Review/Scoring of Applications**

*After receiving the applications, DRCOG will review project the submittals for eligibility. DRCOG will also consult and share applications with CDOT, RTD, and any other regional agencies as appropriate.*

After applications are reviewed for eligibility, DRCOG will make a comprehensive evaluation of all applications submitted, before turning the applications over to the project review panel.

9. **Project Review Panel Consideration and Recommendation**

After all projects have been evaluated by DRCOG, a project review panel will discuss and prioritize projects for a funding recommendation to the DRCOG Board. The project review panel will consist of one technical/non-DRCOG director from each of the eight subregions, one CDOT representative, one RTD representative, and up to five regional subject matter experts. As part of the panel decision-making process, project sponsors may be asked to make brief presentations to the panel to further assist in project recommendations.

Once project recommendations are made by the panel, its recommendation will be forwarded to TAC, RTC, and the Board (the MPO planning process) to incorporate the draft Regional Share projects into the draft TIP.

10. **DCOG Board Draft Project Considerations**
The action taken by the Board will be to recommend Regional Share projects into the draft TIP. Further action will be necessary, after the Subregional Share Call for Projects, to finalize the project recommendations into an adopted TIP. After the Board makes a recommendation, DRCOG staff will begin to evaluate the draft project list and assign the appropriate funding types.

C. SUBREGIONAL SHARE CALL FOR PROJECTS

1. Subregional Share Purpose

The purpose of the Subregional Share is to allow for further collaboration and local values of each geographic region to be part of the project recommendation process, while keeping the overall principles of Metro Vision and the 2050 adopted MVRTP. The geographic-units for the Subregional Share are county boundaries and all the incorporated units of governments within.

2. Funding Availability

As previously mentioned, once all programs and commitments are allocated, the remaining funds are designated to new projects from the requests in the Regional and Subregional Share process. Of the available funds, the Subregional Share will be comprised of 80%.

The 80% allocated to the Subregional Share is further proportionately targeted for planning purposes to each county. The breakdown targeted to each county is configured by the average of three factors as compared to the regional total. The three factors are population (source: 2016-2020 DOLA), employment (source: 2016-2019 DOLA), and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) (source: estimated year 2020 base year from the 2017-2020 model run for the 2050 MVRTP). The average for each county is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Avg. of Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>15.17% 15.442%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>19.37% 18.610%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>9.70% 9.9288%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>2.33% 2.441%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>24.29% 24.2237%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>10.04% 10.376%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>16.44% 16.5047%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Weld</td>
<td>2.66% 2.5049%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Subregional Share Call for Projects, sponsors must commit a minimum of 20% match from non-federal financial resources for STBG, CMAQ, CRP, and TA funding requests submitted for consideration through their subregion. The MMOF funding requests program requires a 50% match from non-MMOF funds. MMOF will be matched with CMAQ, CRP, or TA funds plus the required 20% match on those funds. Per CDOT action, some local agencies may require less than a 50% match. Additionally, sponsors must request a minimum of $100,000 in federal/state funds for any request submitted to be a candidate for DRCOG selection.

Each subregion may increase the local match and the federal/state funding request if they wish. Funding targeted to any one specific county forum can be proposed for projects outside of its boundaries, to further foster regional or subregional collaboration, as long as the project also provides benefits to DRCOG. Exact funding levels will be available before the Subregional Share Call for Projects opens.
3. **County Forums**

The sub-geographic unit being used for this call is counties and includes all the incorporated areas within. Each county shall use the established forums by inviting all DRCOG-member local governments who are partially or entirely within its boundaries to participate. DRCOG, RTD, and CDOT shall also be invited. Each forum may invite other agencies and stakeholder to participate if they wish. Each forum member may select one voting member and alternate to participate.

All standing meetings identified by a subregion (forums or subcommittees) must be open to the public and contain time in their agenda to receive public comment. DRCOG, the meetings host agency, and the host agency’s county shall post agenda materials for all standing meetings on its website and/or other appropriate locations as determined by the public meeting guidelines for the host agency.

Each forum will establish their governance structure, membership and representatives, other entities invited to attend, and quorum rules. Voting shall be established by the forum and be given to all forum members, except for CDOT and RTD. Voting rights for regional agencies and other stakeholders will be defined by each subregion. While informal discussion may take place through alternative means, such as email or online polling, official votes must be cast at a meeting (in-person or virtual) that is publicly advertised, open to the public, and contains time on the agenda to receive public comment. Forums are not specifically required to adopt an agreement outlining these items.

DRCOG encourages all forums to coordinate with CDOT, RTD, DRCOG, and other county forums in project development and for funding partnerships.

4. **Eligibility Requirements**

All projects, programs, and studies submitted for the Subregional Share Call for Projects must be eligible as outlined in Table 5 below, one of the DRCOG-allocated funding types (see Appendix B for details). Projects submitted for the Regional Share that were not recommended for funding meeting eligibility under the DRCOG-allocated funding types Subregional Share are eligible to be submitted for subregional share consideration. A new application will be required to resubmit the Regional Share application into the Subregional Share.

Notable federal or DRCOG requirements include:

- Any project located on a roadway must be on the DRCOG Regional Roadway System, which contains roadways that have a classification of a principal arterial or higher.
- Any roadway capacity capital, Bus Rapid Transit, or Rail (Fixed Guideway) Rapid Transit projects submitted must be in the Fiscally Constrained 2050 MVRTP. Additional details can be found in Section II.B.
- For projects that require an Environmental Assessment (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the EA or Draft EIS Disclosure Document must be signed, or be reasonably expected to be signed by the relevant federal agency within FY 2024-2027.
- TIP funding for a study in the Subregional Share process does not constitute a DRCOG commitment to expedite funding for implementation in a coming TIP cycle, unless decided upon by the individual subregion.
- Others as defined in Section II.B and IV.A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2050 MVRTP Eligible Categories</th>
<th>Eligible Projects/Programs for the Subregional Share</th>
<th>Pre-Construction Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any Project Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal Capital (Projects &amp; Programs DRCOG Administered Funds only)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2029 staging period</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2030-2039 staging period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional BRT Projects</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2029 staging period</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2030-2039 staging period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Transit Planning (Projects &amp; Programs)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2029 staging period</td>
<td>• Regional mobility hubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2030-2039 staging period</td>
<td>• Any other regional strategic transit improvement*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Safety/Regional Vision Zero (Projects &amp; Programs)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2039 staging period</td>
<td>• Any other safety project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation (Projects &amp; Programs)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2039 staging period</td>
<td>• Any other active transportation project*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight (Projects &amp; Programs)</td>
<td>• Listed projects in the 2020-2039 staging period</td>
<td>• Any other project improving freight movements*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>• No eligibility limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding of a study does not constitute a DRCOG commitment to expedite funding for implementation in a coming TIP cycle, unless decided upon by the individual subregion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>• Other project categories not listed, as long as they’re eligible under one of the funding types.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Projects on roadways must be on the DRCOG Regional Roadway System, which contains roadways that have a classification of a principal arterial or higher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For projects that require an Environmental Assessment (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the EA or Draft EIS Disclosure Document must be signed or be reasonably expected to be signed by the relevant federal agency within FY 2024-2027 the TIP years being programmed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Must not be an air quality Regionally Significant Project as defined in the 2050 RTP.
5. **Subregional Share Criteria**

Each subregional forum has two options for consideration in the development of its project evaluation criteria:

**Option 1:** Subregions must use the Regional Share criteria as is, including the scoring and weighting method, for their subregional process as contained within Appendix D.

**OR**

**Option 2:** Subregions must use the Regional Share criteria for the subregional process, but with an alternative scoring/weighting system and/or supplemental criteria to reflect local subregional values as agreed to by the subregional forum. Any forum who selects Option 2, must submit their criteria to DRCOG staff for review.

6. **Application Form**

DRCOG staff shall make TIP application materials and instructions available publicly to all those who wish to apply. Each subregional forum will receive the applications in advance of the Call for Projects so they can adjust their application(s) as outlined above if they choose.

Before the call is issued within each subregion *(only if option 2 is selected from above)*, each forum must present its project selection criteria and application packet to the DRCOG Board to ensure a fair and competitive process for all stakeholders and project sponsors.

Similar to the Regional Share, the Subregional Share will utilize a parallel track application process to keep the overall match at a minimum of 20%.

- The “STBG” track will utilize an application that will solicit and select projects eligible for STBG funds.
- The “Air Quality and Multimodal” track will utilize an application that will solicit and select projects eligible for MMOF, CMAQ, CRP, and TA funds. Federal and state funding types may be combined to reduce the overall required match to 20%.

7. **Required Training**

Training shall be required for any eligible sponsor who wishes to submit an application in the Subregional Share Call for Projects. The training will take place soon after the Regional Share Call for Projects is issued. See Section IV.A for additional details.

8. **Call for Projects and Application Submittals**

The Subregional Share Call for Projects will be announced by DRCOG and will be open for 8 weeks. Subregional Share project applications from individual eligible sponsors must be submitted to DRCOG first. DRCOG staff will review for eligibility, post the applications, develop the scoring sheets, and then return the eligible applications to each appropriate through their subregional forum. While there is no limit on the number of applications any one sponsor can submit for funding to a subregion, each subregion can restrict to a manageable number. If any subregions request to have DRCOG staff assist with application review and scoring, the following table outlines the maximum number of applications from each subregion that DRCOG will aid on prior to subregions formally submitting their project recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Max. Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any agency contemplating applying and having data questions or requests to complete the application must contact DRCOG staff at least three weeks prior to the application deadline. The information required by the sponsors to complete applications is noted within the application.

Applications from eligible sponsors must be prepared by individuals certified as having attended one of the required training opportunities. The application must be affirmed by either the applicant’s City or County Manager, Chief Elected Official (Mayor or County Commission Chair) for local governments, or agency director or equivalent for other applicants.

9. **Application Review**

DRCOG will review project submittals from each subregion for eligibility, post to the website, and develop the scoring sheets. DRCOG will also consult and share application information with CDOT, RTD, and any other regional agencies as appropriate. After applications are reviewed for eligibility, each subregion will make a comprehensive evaluation of all eligible applications.

10. **Application Evaluations and Project Selection**

After each subregion has reviewed and evaluated submitted and eligible applications, they will rank order their submittals. Each subregional forum will identify their recommended projects for funding up to their funding target. The remaining rank-ordered submittals will become the subregions wait list should additional revenues become available during the TIP timeframe.

Once project recommendations are made by each subregion, each set of forum recommendations will be forwarded to DRCOG staff and compiled together for TAC, RTC, and Board (the MPO planning process) recommendation to incorporate the draft Subregional Share projects into the draft TIP. Each forum will have time allotted at a preceding Board meeting to present their portfolio of project recommendations.

11. **DRCOG Board Draft Project Considerations**

The action taken by the Board will be to recommend Subregional Share projects into the draft TIP. Further action will be necessary to finalize both sets of project recommendations (Regional and Subregional Share) into an adopted TIP.

After the Board makes a recommendation, DRCOG staff will begin to evaluate the draft project list and assign potential funding types.
V. TIP DEVELOPMENT, ADOPTION, AND REVISIONS

This section describes the processes for developing the draft TIP, adoption, and how amendments to the adopted TIP happen.

A. TIP DEVELOPMENT

1. Peer and Interagency Discussion

Applicants are encouraged to discuss potential funding requests with CDOT and/or RTD as appropriate as early as possible. As a minimum, this discussion should take place for any submittal for which CDOT or RTD concurrence is required (see Section IV.A). Sponsors may also benefit from discussing other potential submittals that do not need their concurrence to better understand the implications of federal and state requirements on a specific submittal.

After the completion of both the Regional and Subregional Share Calls for Projects, staff from DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD will discuss preliminary recommendations, as well as requests not selected. The objective of this discussion is to look for conflicts, synergies, and opportunities among projects. Each agency may consider feedback to revise selection decisions or adjust implementation scheduling.

2. Wait List

Projects not funded for the Regional Share and each Subregional Forum will be incorporated into the TIP via a wait list. Wait list projects may be funded in the event additional funding becomes available during the TIP time period. Wait lists are maintained as part of an adopted TIP and also posted on the DRCOG TIP website.

3. Draft TIP Preparation

After the Board has made preliminary funding recommendations on regional and subregional share projects, DRCOG staff will prepare a draft TIP. The draft program will be referred to the TAC and RTC for recommendations, and made available for public comment at a public hearing by the DRCOG Board of Directors.

The draft TIP will include:
- all DRCOG-selected, RTD, and CDOT federally-funded projects,
- all CDOT state-funded projects, and
- any regionally significant transportation projects, regardless of funding source.

The draft TIP will demonstrate adequate resources are available for program implementation. It will indicate public and private resources that are reasonably expected to be available to carry out the program. The document will also include all other federally required elements.

The Clean Air Act requires that DRCOG find that the TIP conforms to the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality. The finding must be based on the most recent forecasts of emissions determined from the latest population, employment, travel, and congestion estimates by DRCOG. DRCOG staff will prepare the technical documentation supporting a conformity finding coinciding with preparation of the draft TIP. The conformity document will list regionally significant non-federally funded projects anticipated to be implemented within
the TIP time horizon. After the Governor approves the TIP, FHWA/EPA make a conformity determination approval that allows the TIP to be incorporated in the STIP. The approval letter is the start of the clock for the four-year expiration date of the TIP.

**B. ADOPTION**

1. **Public Involvement and Hearings**
   A public hearing to consider the draft TIP and the air quality conformity finding will be held at the Board meeting one month prior to anticipated Board action in adopting a new TIP or making major amendments to an existing TIP. Other public outreach opportunities may also take place as warranted to collect input on the process and proposed projects to be funded.

2. **Appeals**
   Applicants can appeal the draft Regional Share and/or Subregional Share list of recommended projects to be included within the draft TIP. Time will be set aside within the TAC meeting agenda when each share’s draft recommendation is to be considered. Applicants may also make an appeal during the public hearing of the draft TIP, or during any public comment opportunity in which the recommended projects is being discussed. Applicants are strongly encouraged to work with their subregions first before considering an appeal.

3. **TIP Adoption**
   Adoption of the TIP by the Board of Directors shall be upon recommendation of the RTC, following consideration by the TAC.

Once the TIP is approved by DRCOG, and air quality conformity is demonstrated, federal law requires the TIP also be approved by the Governor and incorporated directly, without modification, into the STIP by CDOT.

**C. TIP REVISIONS**

The TIP is subject to revision, either by an administrative modification by staff, or through TIP amendments (commonly referred to as Policy Amendments) adopted by the DRCOG Board of Directors. Revisions reflect project changes that may affect the TIP’s programming. Listed below are two levels of revisions that can be made to the TIP.

DRCOG staff will process any TIP revision by:
- requesting TIP revisions at the end of every month, typically the 4th Monday of the month,
- entering and processing the requested draft revisions into the TIP project database (TRIPS) and appropriate committee agenda materials,
- posting the revisions on the DRCOG website, and
- emailing a summary to the TIP notification list.

If a sponsor submits a TIP revision and DRCOG staff denies it, the sponsor may appeal DRCOG staff’s decision to the Board of Directors. To do so, the sponsor shall have its DRCOG Board representative transmit a letter to the DRCOG Board Chair and DRCOG’s Executive Director requesting its appeal be put on a future Board agenda. The letter shall identify the specifics of the appeal and the sponsor’s justification.

1. **TIP (Policy) Amendments**
   TIP amendments are required for the following actions:
   - Adding a new project or changing an existing project that would affect the air quality conformity finding,
• Changing a regionally significant project:
  o delete or significantly change a feature (for example, change the project termini)
  o delete or defer it from the four years of the TIP,
• Changing a project to be inconsistent with Metro Vision or the adopted MVRTP,
• Adding or deleting Net funding changes for any project or individual pool project by more than $5 million over the four years of the TIP,
• Changes as deemed by the DRCOG Transportation Planning and Operations Director and/or Executive Director.

TIP amendments will be processed as soon as possible after they are received, considering committee schedules. TIP amendments will be recommended by the TAC and RTC for DRCOG Board consideration and action. Public input (in person, writing, email, etc.) will be accepted per the adopted DRCOG Public Involvement Plan, and during the public comment period of any of the committee or Board meetings considering the amendments.

TIP amendments requiring a new conformity finding may only be processed once a year as necessary, but only concurrent with the a MVRTP amendment process. These major amendments are subject to formal public hearings by the DRCOG Board prior to TAC and RTC recommendation and Board adoption.

2. Administrative Modifications

Administrative modifications include all revisions other than those listed under TIP Amendments and will be processed as they are received by DRCOG staff, typically monthly. Administrative modifications do not require committee review or approval. However, administrative modifications are presented to the Board as informational items.

As stated in Section IV.A.7, there is an expectation that DRCOG-selected projects will be implemented, at a minimum, with the scope defined in the funding request application (and in the adopted TIP). Sometimes sponsors desire to remove change scope elements within the same budget. If this is the case, projects selected in the Regional Share must have confirmation by a majority from the Regional Share project review panel to remove change scope elements. If the project was recommended from the Subregional Share process through a subregional forum, the forum must agree confirm by a vote to the scope change. If the project review panel or subregional forum agrees to the scope changes, DRCOG staff will process the request as an administrative modification. If scope changes are deemed significant by the DRCOG TPO or Executive Director (i.e., the new proposed scope is vastly different than the approved scope), DRCOG reserves the right to reject the scope change all together or bring the scope change through the TIP amendment process (see above).

In circumstances when the revisions are to add items to the scope within the current project budget (i.e., when project costs were less than expected), or if the request to add scope is a meaningful addition to the project and the cost is modest (in comparison to the overall budget), DRCOG staff will concur with the request and may (if necessary) process the request as an administrative modification. In either instance, if the proposed revisions affect air quality conformity, they will be treated as TIP amendments.

3. Project Cancelations

In the event a TIP project is cancelled by the project sponsor or project savings are realized and funding is returned to DRCOG for reprogramming, the funding will return to where it was originally funded (Regional Share, Subregional Share forum, or set-aside).

D. CHANGES IN FUNDING ALLOCATIONS
Under federal law and state statute, actual allocations are determined annually with no guaranteed amount. The 2024-2027 A TIP is being prepared under the best estimate of available funds to CDOT, DRCOG, and RTD. As funds change, it may be necessary to add, advance, or postpone projects through TIP revisions.

1. **Funding Increase**

   If revenues increase, the additional revenues will be allocated to projects as follows:
   - First, existing funds will be advanced for projects already awarded funds in the TIP, as applicable. In some circumstances, funds may be flexed between types to advance projects.
   - After options for advancing currently funded projects have been exhausted, new projects will be selected from the established wait lists with remaining monies in the following way:
     - All new revenues will be split according to the established funding split; 20% to the Regional Share and 80% to the Subregional Share processes. Subregional funds will be further broken down and targeted according the established breakdown in Section IV.C.
   - **A new Call for Projects may be necessary to select new projects if the wait list projects are exhausted or if the amount of new funding greatly exceeds the wait list funding requests. DRCOG Board approval will be required to issue a new call beyond the Regional and Subregional calls outlined in this document.**

2. **Funding Decrease**

   If revenues decrease, some TIP projects will need to be deferred to maintain fiscal constraint. The method to obtain deferrals is as follows:

   **Step 1 - Voluntary Deferrals**

   DRCOG staff will first query project sponsors to discern if they will voluntarily defer one or more of their current TIP projects. Any project deferred will NOT be subject to involuntary deferral at a later date.

   **Step 2 - Involuntary Deferrals**

   If voluntary deferrals are insufficient, involuntary deferrals will be necessary.
   A. DRCOG staff will FIRST create lists of relevant projects that will be EXEMPT from involuntary deferral according to the following:
      - Previously granted project immunity
      - Project readiness (projects, regardless of sponsor, that are or will be ready for ad in the next 3 months, as jointly determined by CDOT/RTD and the sponsor)
   B. DRCOG staff will query the Regional Share project review panel and each subregional forum to submit to DRCOG projects that either were the lowest scored or have the lowest priority to be deferred. Any project deferral, either voluntary or involuntary, will not be counted as a project delay.
APPENDIX A
RTD and CDOT Selection Processes

This section describes the processes that RTD and CDOT undertake to include projects into the TIP.

A. RTD PROCESS

All projects submitted by RTD for inclusion into the TIP first must be included in RTD’s adopted Strategic Business Plan (SBP) Mid-Term Financial Plan (MTFP). The fiscally constrained SBP-MTFP documents RTD’s six-year capital and operating plan. It is updated and adopted each year by the RTD Board of Directors. The one exception to this process is the FasTracks projects, which are reported in the FasTracks SB-208 plan as described below.

1. RTD Solicits SBP-MTFP Projects

RTD solicits projects both internally and from local governments. The project form requires a detailed project description and project justification as well as the respective capital and or operating and maintenance costs per year of the SBP-MTFP cycle.

INTERNAL PROJECTS—In January of each year, RTD solicits SBP-MTFP projects from each division. Project applications are submitted to the Finance department for review of completeness. The majority of internally submitted projects are projects necessary to keep the existing transit system in a state of good repair and are not regionally significant from a TIP standpoint.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS—Often, local governments will request small-scale projects for RTD consideration. Furthermore, when financial conditions allow, RTD will solicit SBP project applications from local governments through the Local Government Meetings. Project applications are reviewed by the Planning and Capital Programs departments.

FASTRACKS PROJECTS—Since the FasTracks plan was approved by the voters in the RTD District in 2004 and since prior to the election the DRCOG Board approved the FasTracks SB-208 plan, RTD will automatically submit all FasTracks corridor projects for inclusion in the TIP. However, because of the FasTracks commitments made to the voters and pursuant to the DRCOG SB-208 approval, FasTracks capital projects will not be included in the regular RTD SBP process and they will not be subject to SBP evaluation. Rather, all FasTracks projects are budgeted and tracked separately by RTD and will be reported annually to DRCOG.

2. Regionally Significant Projects are Identified

RTD staff will compile a list of all submitted projects. Using the criteria noted below, the project list is reviewed to determine which projects can be classified as Regionally Significant Projects or as being required to be in the TIP.

- Does the project enhance or advance the goals of FasTracks?
- Is the project required to be put into the TIP? (This would include projects that rely on grant funding.)
- Does the project serve more than one facility or corridor?
- Does the project serve several jurisdictions or a large geographic area?
Will the project have a positive impact on regional travel patterns?

Upon completion of the SBRMTFP process, those projects identified as Regionally Significant will then be submitted to DRCOG for inclusion in the TIP. As noted above, because of the regionally significant nature of FasTracks, all FasTracks corridors will be submitted for inclusion into the TIP, but will not be subject to the regular SBR review process. Projects that are not considered to be regionally significant will be considered in RTD’s internal SBRMTFP process.

3. **Projects Subjected to Screening Criteria**

RTD staff compiles all regionally significant projects into two lists: one for capital projects and one for operating projects. Items in the lists are grouped according to the category of the project, such as park-n-Rides, Information Technology, Vehicle Purchases, etc. The projects are then scored based on the following screening criteria by RTD’s Senior Leadership:

- Does the project conform to RTD’s mission statement?
- Safety Benefit
- Provision of Reliable Service
- Provision of Accessible Service
- Provision of Cost-Effective Service
- Meets Future Needs
- Operational Benefit
- Business Unit Benefit
- Risk of No-Action

4. **Subject Projects to Fiscal Constraints/Develop Cash Flow**

RTD’s Finance Division subjects the remaining project list to a cash flow analysis. Since cash flow will vary from year-to-year depending on availability of federal funds, grants, outstanding capital and operating commitments, and debt, available project funds may vary considerably by year. Typically, additional cuts or project adjustments must be made to satisfy the cash flow requirements. Lower rated projects are deleted while others may be reduced in scope or deferred in order for them to be carried forward into the final SBRMTFP.

5. **Title VI Review**

After the cash flow analysis has been completed, the project list is then reviewed by RTD’s Disadvantaged Business-Enterprise (DBE) officer Manager of Transit Equity. The DBE officer manager evaluates the project list for environmental justice considerations. The primary focus is to ensure projects are distributed in a manner that provides benefit to all segments of the RTD district population, including low-income and minority neighborhoods.

6. **Board Review and Adoption**

Following final review by RTD’s senior staff, financial review and DBE Title VI review, the complete SBRMTFP is presented first to the RTD Finance Committee for review and then to RTD’s Local Governments group. Following completion of the Local Governments group review, the SBR is presented to the full RTD Board for review and adoption.
B. CDOT PROCESS

1. Basic Underlying Premises

Projects that are currently funded in the TIP and/or CDOT’s 10-year Plan, along with ones that are part of a NEPA decision document commitment, will have a top priority for funding and will continue to be funded.

CDOT Region 1 and 4 will provide documentation to DRCOG, as requested, describing the factors considered, assumptions used, and underlying rationale for projects selected for inclusion for the TIP document (adoption or amendment). This documentation will be submitted to DRCOG when projects are submitted for inclusion in the TIP.

2. Detail by Funding Program

REGIONAL PRIORITY PROGRAM—CDOT uses a qualitative assessment to determine RPP funding priorities. The assessment is based on several factors, including but not limited to the priorities discussed at the county hearings, availability of funding, project readiness (design, environmental and right of way clearances), pertinent Transportation Commission policies, coordination with the CDOT 10-year plan, and geographic equity. CDOT Regions have a need for a small, unplanned pool of RPP funds to address unplanned needs that require relatively small funding investments. Therefore, CDOT also may choose to reserve a small pool of RPP funds to address these needs. For every RPP project selected, CDOT will also consider how well the project supports the elements of Metro Vision adopted by the MVRTP. The CDOT region will prepare documentation describing the factors used for RPP projects selected for inclusion in the TIP.

BRIDGE—The selection of projects eligible for bridge pool funding is performance-based. Other factors that affect bridge project selection include public safety, engineering judgment, and other funding sources available to repair/replace selected bridge, project readiness, and funding limits.

SAFETY—CDOT TSM&O Traffic & Safety Branch selects hazard elimination safety projects based on a variety of factors including cost/benefit ratios, recent public safety concerns, engineering judgment, and funding limits. The projects constitute the Colorado Integrated Safety Plan. The TSM&O Traffic & Safety Branch also selects projects for the Federal Rail-Highway Safety Improvement Program. This grant program covers at least 90% of the costs of signing and pavement markings, active warning devices, illumination, crossing surfaces, grade separations (new and reconstruction), sight distance improvements, geometric improvements to the roadway approaches, and closing and/or consolidating crossings. Projects are selected based on accident history, traffic counts and engineering judgment.

CDOT Regions are also provided safety funds for hot spot and traffic signal programs.

SURFACE TREATMENT—The selection of projects for surface treatment funding is based on a performance management system known as the Drivability Life. CDOT regions work to select project locations and appropriate treatments as identified by the statewide system. Projects considered for selection will be based upon management system recommendations, traffic volumes, severe pavement conditions, preventative maintenance that delays or eliminates further major investments in the near future, public safety, and funding limitations/efficiencies.

FASTER BRIDGE PROJECTS—This program is comprised of bridge replacement projects for bridges statewide that are considered to be structurally deficient and have a sufficiency rating below 50. Factors that affect bridge project selection include public safety, engineering judgment, project readiness, and funding limits. The
funding for this program comes from the fees generated through the FASTER legislation and is directed by the Bridge Enterprise.

FASTER SAFETY PROJECTS–The Transportation Commission adopted guidelines for the selection of FASTER Safety projects based on the FASTER legislation. The guiding principles for selection of these projects include a focus on safety, preservation of the system and optimizing system efficiency, and enhancing multi-modal and intermodal mobility. Projects selected must address a safety need.

FASTER TRANSIT PROJECTS–The FASTER legislation required a portion of the state and local FASTER revenues totaling $15 million/year be set aside for transit projects. The Transportation Commission adopted guidelines for the selection of projects using the $5 million/year designated for local transit grants. The evaluation criteria are: criticality, financial capacity, financial need, project impacts, and readiness. Project calls and recommendations are conducted by the Division of Transit and Rail (DTR). DRCOG and the CDOT regions may jointly review and recommend these eligible projects as part of DTR’s calls for projects process.

TRANSIT PROGRAM–CDOT administers Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grants through its Division of Transit and Rail (DTR). The program is expansive in what it can support. There are multiple programs covering a variety of eligible project types and subrecipients in both rural and small-urbanized areas. RTD and DRCOG administer their respective FTA funds in the large-urbanized areas.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) COMPLIANCE–CDOT is pursuing an aggressive strategy of upgrading curb ramps through regular program delivery as well as committing dedicated funding toward curb ramp upgrading to achieve ADA compliance.

BRIDGE OFF-SYSTEM (BRO)–CDOT administers the Bridge Off-System local agency bridge program. This program provides bridge inspection and inventory services to cities and counties, as well as, grants for bridge replacement or bridge rehabilitation projects. CDOT maintains a select list of local agency bridges to determine eligibility for bridge replacement and major rehabilitation grants. The grants are authorized by the Special Highway Committee.

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS)–CDOT uses advanced technology and information systems to manage and maintain safe and free-flowing state highways and to inform motorists in Colorado about traffic and roadway conditions. Travel information is provided to the public by a variety of methods including:

- The COTrip.org website and app displaying Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) images, speed maps and travel times, weather conditions, construction information, alerts (including Amber Alerts), and more
- 511 Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system providing up-to-date road and weather conditions, construction, special events, travel times, and transfers to bordering states and other transportation providers
- Automated email and text messages using GovDelivery as third-party provider
- CDOT App: official CDOT endorsed Smartphone application developed through a public-private partnership
- Variable Message Signs (VMS) providing travel messages including: closures, alternative routes, road condition information, special events, and real-time trip travel time information

PERMANENT WATER QUALITY FACILITIES (PWQF)–CDOT’s Permanent Water Quality Facilities Program is both federally and state mandated as part of CDOT’s Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit, which requires CDOT to control pollutants from entering the storm sewer system and state waterways. As part of the MS4 permit CDOT must implement the New Development and Redevelopment (NDRD) program that requires CDOT install PWQF Best Management Practices (BMPs) to treat CDOT’s MS4 area. The PWQF program is funded by reductions in Surface Treatment, which contributes 75% of the funding and the Regional Priorities Program, which contributes 25%.
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES (TA)—The TA program was established under Section 1122 of MAP-21 and continued as a set-aside under Section 1109 of the FAST Act. The TA program set-aside provides funding for bicycle, pedestrian, historic, scenic, and environmental mitigation transportation projects. The program replaces the funding from pre-MAP-21 programs including Transportation Enhancements, Scenic Byways, Safe Routes to School, and Recreational Trails by wrapping some elements of those programs into a single funding source. CDOT receive 50% of the funding allocated to the state, with the remaining split among the MPO’s.

REGION DESIGN PROGRAM (RDP)—Funds from the Transportation Commission Contingency Reserve Fund were used to establish this new program. This pool of preconstruction funds will allow achievement of selected significant preconstruction milestones in order to advance future projects.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SRTS)—Since 2005, Congress has passed several transportation bills that have impacted SRTS. Currently the program does not have dedicated federal funding, but it’s eligible for federal funding from other programs. Additionally, in 2015, CDOT’s Transportation Commission resolved to commit $2.5 million annually for the program ($2 million to infrastructure projects that are within 2 miles of a school and $0.5 million for non-infrastructure projects). This program enables and encourages children to walk and bicycle to school. Eligible applicants include any political subdivision of the state (school district, city, county, state entity). Nonprofits may also apply by partnering with a state subdivision as the administrator. Funds are awarded through a statewide competitive process for projects impacting students in K-8 grades. Projects are selected by a 9-member appointed panel consisting of bicyclists, pedestrians, educators, parents, law enforcement, MPO, and TPR representatives.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY FREIGHT PROGRAM (NHFP)—Projects submitted for consideration must be related to commercial vehicle safety, mobility, or truck parking. A multi-objective decision analysis tool with peer review will evaluate all submitted projects. Input related the direct impact of freight movement provided by Colorado Freight Advisory Council is also considered. Other considerations include project readiness, additional funding sources, and programmatic balance.
APPENDIX B

Eligible Projects by Funding Source

The funding categories established by the FAST Act federal transportation legislation and the types of projects eligible for funding within each category, provided they are consistent with the RTP, are summarized below.

1. **Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ)**

   All CMAQ projects must have a transportation focus and reduce congestion and improve air quality. The following are example projects, methods, strategies, and transportation system management actions that are eligible:

   - Those likely to contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard
   - Those described in section 108(f) of the Clean Air Act (except clauses (xii) and (xvi))
   - Those included in an approved State Implementation Plan for air quality
   - Traffic signal coordination
   - Intelligent transportation systems
   - Vehicle to infrastructure communication equipment
   - Arranged ridesharing
   - Trip reduction programs
   - Travel demand management
   - Vehicle inspection and maintenance programs
   - Variable work hours programs
   - Bicycle and pedestrian travel projects
   - Rapid and bus transit improvements (new/expanded/capital service)
   - HOV/HOT lanes
   - Traffic flow improvements
   - Extreme low-temperature cold start programs
   - Alternative fuels infrastructure and vehicles
   - Diesel engine retrofits
   - Truck stop electrification
   - Idle reduction projects
   - Intermodal freight facilities that reduce truck VMT or overall pollutant emissions (examples include: transportation-focused rolling stock, ground infrastructure, rail, etc.)
   - Studies as necessary to plan and implement the above

   Detailed guidance is available at: [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/cmaqfs.pdf](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/cmaqfs.pdf)

2. **Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program**

   The following types of projects are eligible:

   - Construction/reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, preservation, and operational improvements of the existing system (located on the DRCOG Regional Roadway System; roadway classification of principal arterial and higher)
   - Capital costs for transit projects
   - Vehicle to infrastructure communication equipment
   - Carpool projects
   - Fringe and corridor parking facilities and program
   - Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs
   - Highway and transit research programs
   - Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control
   - Transportation alternatives activities
   - Transportation control measures listed in the Clean Air Act
• Wetland mitigation associated with project construction
• Transportation system management actions
• Studies as necessary to plan and implement the above

Detailed guidance is available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/stbgfs.pdf

3. Transportation Alternatives (TA)

The following types of projects are eligible:
• Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities and related infrastructure
• Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails
• Turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas
• Community improvement activities (outdoor advertising, historic transportation facilities, vegetation management practices, archaeological activities)
• Environmental mitigation activity (stormwater management, vehicle-caused wildlife mortality)
• Recreational trails program
• Safe routes to school program

Detailed guidance is available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/factsheets/surftransfundaltfs.pdf

4. Carbon Reduction Program (CRP).

Details to be provided at a future date.

4.5. SB-1 State Multimodal Transportation and Mitigation Options Funds (MMOF)

The following types of projects are eligible:
• Capital or operating costs for fixed route and on-demand transit
• Transportation Demand Management programs
• Multimodal mobility projects enabled by new technology
• Multimodal transportation studies
• Modeling tools
• GHG mitigation projects that decrease VMT or increase multimodal travel
• Bicycle or pedestrian projects
APPENDIX C

Eligible **2050 MVRTP** Projects

The following projects from the currently-adopted DRCOG 2050 MVRTP are eligible to be submitted in the 2024-2027 TIP. If a project is listed as “Preconstruction Activities Only” it is not eligible to submit for construction, but all other phases are eligible. Note that this table only includes the major projects listed in the 2050 MVRTP, other projects may be eligible as long as they are not regionally significant in regard to air quality. Projects or project segments already funded with DRCOG funds in previous TIPs have been removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Name/Corridor</th>
<th>Project Location/Limits</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Cost (000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRCOG-funded Multimodal Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(Project must be listed to be eligible for TIP funding)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Project Phases Eligible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>88th Ave.</td>
<td>I-76 northbound ramps to SH-2</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 4 lanes</td>
<td>$21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>104th Ave.</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd. to McKay Rd.</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 4 lanes</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>120th Ave.</td>
<td>US-85 to E-470</td>
<td>Widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>SH-7</td>
<td>164th Ave. to Dahlia St.</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 4 lanes</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>Gun Club Rd.</td>
<td>Quincy to Aurora Pkwy.</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 6 lanes</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>I-225/Yosemite</td>
<td>DTC Blvd. to I-25 on-ramp</td>
<td>Interchange and ramp reconstruction</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>US-287/120th Ave.</td>
<td>Midway Blvd. to Lowell Blvd.</td>
<td>Improve circulation, safety, active transportation access, business access, congestion and transit operations</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Interchange capacity</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Lincoln Ave.</td>
<td>Interchange capacity</td>
<td>$49,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Happy Canyon Rd.</td>
<td>Interchange reconstruction</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Crystal Valley Pkwy.</td>
<td>New interchange and south frontage road</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>US-6</td>
<td>Heritage Rd.</td>
<td>New interchange</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preconstruction Activities Only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>Gun Club Rd.</td>
<td>SH-30 to 6th Ave.</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 4/6 lanes, includes stream crossing upgrade at Coal Creek</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>SH-30</td>
<td>Airport Blvd. to Quincy Ave.</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 6 lanes</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>SH-66</td>
<td>US-287/Main St. to E. County Line Rd. (WCR-1)</td>
<td>Capacity, operations and bicycle/pedestrian</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Peña Blvd.</td>
<td>I-70 to 64th Ave.</td>
<td>Add 1 managed lane in each direction</td>
<td>$139,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Peña Blvd.</td>
<td>64th Ave. to E-470</td>
<td>Add 1 managed lane in each direction</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Lincoln Ave.</td>
<td>Oswego to Keystone</td>
<td>Widen 4 to 6 lanes</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Indiana (SH-72)</td>
<td>W. 80th Ave. to W. 86th Pkwy.</td>
<td>Widen to 4 lanes</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Name/Corridor</td>
<td>Project Location/Limits</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Cost (000s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>SH-93</td>
<td>SH-58 to SH-170</td>
<td>Widen to 4 lanes and safety/transit improvements</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>SH-7</td>
<td>SH-66 to SH-119</td>
<td>Widen from 3 to 4 lanes (add 1 southbound lane)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>US-6-285</td>
<td>Wadsworth Blvd.</td>
<td>Interchange capacity</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>US-285</td>
<td>Kings Valley Dr.</td>
<td>New interchange</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weld</td>
<td>I-25 North (Segment 5)</td>
<td>SH-66 to WCR-38 (DRCOG boundary)</td>
<td>Add 1 toll/managed lane each direction</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CDOT-funded Multimodal Capital Projects**
*(Project must be listed to be eligible for TIP inclusion)*

All Project Phases Eligible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Name/Corridor</th>
<th>Project Location/Limits</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Cost (000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>US-85</td>
<td>120th Ave.</td>
<td>New interchange</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>US-85</td>
<td>104th Ave.</td>
<td>New interchange</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Santa Fe Dr. (US-85) to Alameda Ave.</td>
<td>Interchange capacity</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>US-6</td>
<td>Wadsworth Blvd.</td>
<td>Interchange capacity</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>US-285</td>
<td>Shaffers Crossing to Kings Valley Dr.</td>
<td>Widen from 3 to 4 lanes (add 1 southbound lane)</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>US-285</td>
<td>Kings Valley Dr.</td>
<td>New interchange</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>US-285</td>
<td>Kings Valley Dr. to Richmond Hill Rd.</td>
<td>Widen from 3 to 4 lanes (add 1 southbound lane)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weld</td>
<td>I-25 North (Segment 5)</td>
<td>SH-66 to WCR-38 (DRCOG boundary)</td>
<td>Add 1 toll/managed lane each direction</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preconstruction Activities Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Name/Corridor</th>
<th>Project Location/Limits</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Cost (000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>I-270</td>
<td>I-25/US-36 to I-70</td>
<td>New managed lanes</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>I-270</td>
<td>I-25/US-36 and I-70</td>
<td>New freeway “direct connects” at each end of I-270</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Interchange reconstruction and pedestrian connections</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe/Douglas</td>
<td>SH-83 (Parker Rd.)</td>
<td>SH-86 to E. Mississippi Ave.</td>
<td>Corridor planning/investment for multimodal mobility, operations and safety</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>SH-66</td>
<td>Lyons to Main St. (US-287)</td>
<td>Widen from 2 to 4 lanes (Hover St. to Main St.) and operational/safety improvements from Lyons to Longmont in alignment with PEL</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>I-25 North</td>
<td>E-470 to SH-7</td>
<td>Managed lanes, SH-7 interchange reconstruction and SH-7 mobility hub</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>I-25 North (Segment 4)</td>
<td>SH-7 to SH-66</td>
<td>Managed lanes, SH-119 mobility hub (Firestone-Longmont Mobility Hub), ITS, bicycle and pedestrian trail connections</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>C-470</td>
<td>Wadsworth to I-70</td>
<td>New managed lanes</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>C-470</td>
<td>US-285/Morrison/Quincy</td>
<td>Interchange complex reconstruction</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>US-285</td>
<td>Pine Valley Rd. (County Rd. 126)/ Mt. Evans Blvd.</td>
<td>New interchange</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>US-285</td>
<td>Parker Ave.</td>
<td>New interchange</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Name/Corridor</td>
<td>Project Location/Limits</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Cost (000s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Project Phases Eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams/Arapahoe/Denver</td>
<td>Colfax Ave. BRT</td>
<td>Osage to I-225</td>
<td>Bus rapid transit service (dedicated lanes) and supporting safety/multimodal</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd. BRT</td>
<td>RTD University of Colorado A Line to I-25</td>
<td>Bus rapid transit service and supporting safety/multimodal improvements</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>New bus maintenance facility</td>
<td>TBD (RTD northern area)</td>
<td>Construction of a new bus maintenance facility in RTD’s northern service area</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preconstruction Activities Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams/Denver</td>
<td>Federal Blvd. BRT</td>
<td>120th to Santa Fe/Dartmouth</td>
<td>Bus rapid transit service and supporting safety/multimodal improvements</td>
<td>$94,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe/Denver</td>
<td>Speer/Leetsdale/Parker BRT</td>
<td>Colfax to I-225</td>
<td>Bus rapid transit service and supporting safety/multimodal improvements</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe/Denver/Jefferson</td>
<td>Alameda BRT</td>
<td>Wadsworth to RTD R Line</td>
<td>Bus rapid transit service and supporting safety/multimodal improvements</td>
<td>$61,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>SH-119 BRT</td>
<td>Downtown Boulder to downtown Longmont</td>
<td>Bus rapid transit service and supporting safety/multimodal corridor improvements</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder/Weld</td>
<td>SH-119 BRT Extension</td>
<td>Downtown Longmont to I-25/SH-119 mobility hub</td>
<td>Bus rapid transit service and supporting safety/multimodal improvements</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Transit Planning Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Project Phases Eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Golden/Mines autonomous circulator</td>
<td>Downtown Golden, School of Mines, RTD W Line</td>
<td>Autonomous circulator</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preconstruction Activities Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams/Boulder/Broomfield</td>
<td>SH-7</td>
<td>Boulder to Brighton</td>
<td>Multimodal corridor improvements</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder/Broomfield</td>
<td>US-287</td>
<td>US-36 to Larimer County Line</td>
<td>Safety, operational and multimodal improvements</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Castle Pines transit mobility corridor</td>
<td>Castle Pines to RidgeGate RTD Station</td>
<td>Transit corridor</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial safety/Regional Vision Zero Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Project Phases Eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Name/Corridor</td>
<td>Project Location/Limits</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Cost (000s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Federal Blvd. multimodal improvements</td>
<td>52&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Ave. to 120&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave.</td>
<td>Bicycle/pedestrian/transit improvements; turn lanes; bus/business access lanes</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe/Denver</td>
<td>US-285 congestion mitigation improvements</td>
<td>Knox Ct./Lowell Blvd. (west) to Havana (east)</td>
<td>Speed and reliability corridor and Vision Zero improvements</td>
<td>$88,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>US-36</td>
<td>Boulder to Lyons</td>
<td>Corridor safety improvements</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>US-36/28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St. and SH-93/Broadway</td>
<td>US-36/28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St. and SH-93/Broadway</td>
<td>Corridor safety improvements</td>
<td>$15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Chambers Rd.</td>
<td>E. 56&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave. to E. 40&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Ave.</td>
<td>Vision Zero corridor improvements</td>
<td>$16,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver/Jefferson</td>
<td>Sheridan safety improvements</td>
<td>52&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; to Hampden</td>
<td>Vision Zero corridor improvements</td>
<td>$17,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Coffax safety improvements</td>
<td>Wadsworth to Sheridan</td>
<td>Multimodal arterial safety</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weld</td>
<td>US-85 operational and safety improvements</td>
<td>WCR-2 to WCR-10</td>
<td>Safety and operational improvements</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preconstruction Activities Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>SH-42</td>
<td>Louisville and Lafayette</td>
<td>Safety and operational improvements</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>US-36/28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St. and SH-93/Broadway</td>
<td>US-36/28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; St. and SH-93/Broadway</td>
<td>Corridor safety improvements</td>
<td>$15,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Active Transportation Projects**
(Other projects are eligible for TIP funding as long as they’re not regionally significant for air quality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Name/Corridor</th>
<th>Project Location/Limits</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Cost (000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Smith Rd. bicycle/pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>Peoria St. to Powhaton Rd.</td>
<td>New shared-use path</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>McCaslin Regional Trail</td>
<td>Rock Creek Pkwy. to SH-128</td>
<td>Regional trail</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>RTD Rail Trail</td>
<td>Boulder to Erie</td>
<td>Regional trail</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>St. Vrain Greenway</td>
<td>Longmont to Lyons</td>
<td>Regional trail</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preconstruction Activities Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>S. Platte River Trail</td>
<td>(not specified)</td>
<td>Complete missing links and upgrade trail section</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Freight Projects**
(Other projects are eligible for TIP funding as long as they’re not regionally significant for air quality)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Name/Corridor</th>
<th>Project Location/Limits</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Cost (000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Peoria St. Bridge</td>
<td>Sand Creek</td>
<td>Bridge reconstruction</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Project Name/Corridor</td>
<td>Project Location/Limits</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Cost (000s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>Alameda Pkwy. Bridge over I-225</td>
<td>Between Potomac St. and Abilene St.</td>
<td>Bridge reconstruction</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Ward Rd./BNSF</td>
<td>I-70 frontage road north and Ridge Rd.</td>
<td>Multimodal grade separation</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

**TIP Regional Share Applications**

Applications to be placed in Appendix D once policy is approved
APPLICATION OVERVIEW

The Air Quality & Multimodal (AQ/MM) Regional Share Call for Projects will open on xxxx, with applications due no later than 3 p.m. on xxxx. Submit applications online at Dropbox link.

- To be eligible to submit an application, at least one person from your agency must have attended one of the two mandatory TIP training workshops (add dates here; anticipated for February 2022).
- If required, CDOT and/or RTD concurrence must be provided with the application submittal. The CDOT/RTD concurrence request is due to CDOT/RTD no later than xxxx, with CDOT/RTD providing a response no later than xxxx.
- Each Subregional Forum may submit up to three applications from eligible project sponsors. Both CDOT and RTD may submit up to two applications.
- Data to help the sponsor fill out the application, can be found here (to be updated).
- Requests for additional data or calculations from DRCOG staff should be submitted to tcottrell@drcog.org no later than xxxx.
- The application must be affirmed by either the applicant’s City or County Manager, Chief Elected Official (Mayor or County Commission Chair) for local governments, or agency director or equivalent for other applicants.

Submittal instructions:

1. Submit a single PDF document containing 1) this application form, 2) the CDOT-supplied cost estimate form (located here), 3) one location map or graphic, 4) any required documentation (i.e., FHWA calculators) 5) CDOT/RTD concurrence response (if applicable), and 6) project support letters. Please DO NOT attach additional cover pages, embed graphics in the application, or otherwise change the format of the application form.
2. OPTIONAL: Submit one additional PDF document containing any supplemental materials, if applicable.

- Further details on project eligibility, evaluation criteria, and the selection process are defined in the Policies for TIP Program Development, which can be found online here (to be updated).

EVALUATION PROCESS

DRCOG staff will review submitted applications for eligibility and provide an initial score to a Project Review Panel. The panel will review and rank eligible applications that request funding. Sponsors may be invited to make presentations to the Project Review Panel to assist in the final recommendation to the TAC, RTC, and DRCOG Board.
APPLICATION FORMAT

The AQ/MM Regional Share application contains two parts: project information and evaluation questions.

**Project Information**

Applicants enter foundational information for the project/program/study (hereafter referred to as project), including a problem statement, project description, and concurrence documentation from CDOT and/or RTD, if applicable. This section is not scored.

**Evaluation Questions**

This part includes four sections (A-D) for the applicant to provide qualitative and quantitative responses to use for scoring projects. The checkboxes and data entry fields should guide the applicant’s responses. They are not directly scored but provide context as reviewers consider the full response to each question. Applicants may access an online mapping tool here to assist them in gathering data for several of the quantitative fields. Datasets are also available for download from DRCOG’s website here.

**Scoring Methodology**: Each section will be scored on a scale of 0 to 5, relative to other applications received. All questions will be factored into the final score, with any questions left blank receiving 0 points. The four sections are weighted and scored as follows:

**Section A. Regional Impact of Proposed Projects** ................................................................. 30%

Projects will be evaluated on the degree to which they address a significant regional problem or benefit people throughout the Denver region. Relevant quantitative data should be included within narrative responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The project benefits will substantially address a major regional problem and benefit people and businesses in multiple subregions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The project benefits will significantly address a major regional problem primarily benefiting people and businesses in one subregion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The project benefits will either moderately address a major regional problem or significantly address a moderate-level regional problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The project benefits will moderately address a moderate-level regional problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The project benefits will address a minor regional problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The project does not address a regional problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section B. Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan Priorities** ...........................................50%

The TIP’s investments should implement the 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2050 MVRTP) regional project and program investment priorities, which contribute to addressing the Board-adopted Metro Vision objectives and the federal performance-based planning framework required by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration as outlined in current federal transportation legislation and regulations. Therefore, projects will be evaluated on the degree to which they address the six priorities identified in the 2050 MVRTP: safety, active transportation, air quality, multimodal mobility, freight, and regional transit. It is anticipated that projects may not be able to address all six priorities, but it’s in the applicant’s interest to address as many priority areas as possible. Relevant quantitative data should be included within narrative responses. The table below demonstrates how each priority area will be scored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable substantial benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area and is determined to be in the top fifth of applications based on the magnitude of benefits in that priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable significant benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable moderate benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area and is determined to be in the middle fifth of applications based on the magnitude of benefits in that priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable modest benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable slight benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area and is determined to be in the bottom fifth of applications based on the magnitude of benefits in that priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The project does not provide demonstrable benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C. **Project Leveraging** ("overmatch") ..................................................................................... 10%
Scores are assigned based on the percent of other funding sources (non-Regional Share funds).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% non-Regional Share funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60% and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20-39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.1-19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D. **Project Readiness** ........................................................................................................ 10%
Be sure to answer **ALL** questions. While “Yes” answers will generally reflect greater readiness, opportunities are given to provide additional details to assist reviewers in fully evaluating the readiness of your project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Substantial</strong> readiness is demonstrated and all known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Significant</strong> readiness is demonstrated and several known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong> readiness is demonstrated and some known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Slight</strong> readiness is demonstrated and some known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Few mitigation or readiness activities have been demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No mitigation or readiness activities have been demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Information

**1. Project Title**

**2. Project Location**
*Provide a map, as appropriate (see Page 1)*
- Start point:
- End point:
- OR Geographic Area:

**3. Project Sponsor** *(entity that will be financially responsible for the project)*

**4. Project Contact Person:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**5. Required CDOT and/or RTD Concurrence:** Does this project touch CDOT Right-of-Way, involve a CDOT roadway, access RTD property, or request RTD involvement to operate service?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

*If yes, provide applicable concurrence documentation*

**6. What planning document(s) identifies this project?**

- ☐ DRCOG 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2050 MVRTP)

*Provide MVRTP staging period, if applicable capital project:*

- ☐ Local/Regional plan:

*Planning Document Title:*
- Adopting agency (local agency Council, CDOT, RTD, etc.):
- Provide date of adoption by council/board/commission, if applicable:

*Please describe public review/engagement to date:*

*Other pertinent details:*

*Provide link to document/s and referenced page number if possible, or provide documentation in the supplement*

**7. Identify the project’s key phases and the anticipated schedule of phase milestones.** *(phases and dates should correspond with the Funding Breakdown table below)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases to be included:</th>
<th>Major phase milestones:</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date (based on.xxx approval date):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOR ALL PHASES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Design</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) executed (with CDOT/RTD; assumed process is 4-9 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Design</td>
<td>Design contract Notice to Proceed (NTP) issued (if using a consultant):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Environmental</td>
<td>Design scoping meeting held with CDOT (if no consultant):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Environmental</td>
<td>Environmental contract Notice to Proceed (NTP) issued (if using a consultant):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Design scoping meeting held with CDOT (if no consultant):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Initial set of ROW plans submitted to CDOT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROW acquisition completed: Estimated number of parcels to acquire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>FIR (Field Inspection Review):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR (Final Office Review):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required clearances:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project publicly advertised:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Kick-off meeting held after consultant NTP (or internal if no consultant):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus Service</th>
<th>Service begins:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Purchase (Procurement)</th>
<th>RFP/RFQ/RFB (bids) issued:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other:</th>
<th>First invoice submitted to CDOT/RTD:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. **Problem Statement**: What specific regional problem/issue will the transportation project address?

9. **Identify the project’s key elements.** A single project may have multiple project elements.

- **Roadway**
  - Operational Improvements

- **Grade Separation**
  - Roadway
  - Railway
  - Bicycle
  - Pedestrian

- **Regional Transit**
  - Rapid Transit Capacity (2050 MV RTP)
  - Mobility Hub(s)
  - Transit Planning Corridors
  - Transit Facilities/Service (Expansion/New)

- **Safety Improvements**

- **Active Transportation Improvements**
  - Bicycle Facility
  - Pedestrian Facility

- **Air Quality Improvements**

- **Improvements Impacting Freight**

- **Multimodal Mobility** (i.e., accommodating a broad range of users)
  - Complete Streets Improvements

- **Study**

- **Other**, briefly describe:

---

1For any project with transit elements, the sponsor must coordinate with RTD to ensure RTD agrees to the scope and cost. Be sure to include RTD’s concurrence in your application submittal.
10. Define the **scope** and **specific elements** of the project (including any elements checked in #9 above). *Note that the merits and benefits of the project are addressed later. Please keep the response to this question tailored to details of the scope only and no more than five sentences.*

11. What is the current status of the proposed scope as defined in Question 10 above? *Note that overall project readiness is addressed in more detail in Section D below.*

12. Would a smaller DRCOG-allocation than requested be acceptable, while maintaining the original intent of the project?  
   □ Yes □ No

   *If yes, smaller meaningful limits, size, service level, phases, or scopes, along with the cost, **MUST** be defined.*

   Smaller DRCOG funding request:
   
   Outline the differences between the scope outlined above and the reduced scope:

---

### Project Financial Information and Funding Request (all funding amounts in $1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount of Regional Share Funding Request</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(No greater than <strong>$20 million</strong> and not to exceed <strong>90% of the total project cost</strong>)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Check box if requesting <strong>only state MMOF funds</strong> <em>(requires minimum 50% local funds)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>% of total project cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Funding Sources (other than Regional Share funds)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List each funding source and contribution amount.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution Amount</td>
<td>% Contribution to Overall Total Project Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount of funding provided by other funding sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(private, local, state, subregional, or federal)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Per CDOT action, the following jurisdictions are only required to provide 25% match on the MMOF funds: Englewood and Wheat Ridge.  
The following jurisdictions are not required to provide a match on the MMOF funds: Federal Heights, Larkspur, and Sheridan.  
All sponsors will still be required to have 20% match on any added federal funds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase to be Initiated</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRCOG Requested Funds</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT or RTD Supplied Funds²</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds (Funding from sources other than DRCOG, CDOT, or RTD)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Program years are October 1 through September 30 (e.g., FY 2024 is October 1, 2023 through September 30, 2024). The proposed funding plan is not guaranteed if the project is selected for funding. While DRCOG will do everything it can to accommodate the applicants’ request, final funding will be assigned at DRCOG’s discretion within fiscal constraint. Funding amounts must be provided in year of expenditure dollars using a 3% inflation factor.

2. Only enter funding in this line if CDOT and/or RTD specifically give permission via concurrence letters or other written source.
Evaluation Questions

A. Regional Impact of Proposed Project

Provide **qualitative and quantitative** responses to the following questions on the regional impact of the proposed project. Be sure to provide all required information for each question. Quantitative data from DRCOG is available here.

1. Why is this project regionally important? Relevant quantitative data in your response is required.

2. How will the proposed project address the specific transportation problem described in the **Problem Statement** (as submitted in Project Information, #8)? Relevant quantitative data in your response is required.

3. Does the proposed project benefit multiple municipalities and/or subregions? If yes, which ones and how? Also describe any funding partnerships (other subregions, regional agencies, municipalities, private, etc.) established in association with this project.

4. Describe how the project will improve access and mobility for each of the applicable disproportionately impacted and environmental justice population groups identified in the table below. Completing the below table and referencing relevant quantitative data in your response is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use 2015-2019 American Community Survey Data</th>
<th>Disproportionately Impacted and EJ Population Groups</th>
<th>Population within ½ mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Individuals of color</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Low-Income households</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Individuals with limited English proficiency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Adults age 65 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Children age 5-17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Individuals with a disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Households without a motor vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Households that are housing cost-burdened</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Lines a. – g. use definitions in the DRCOG Title VI Implementation Plan. For Line h., as defined in C.R.S. 24-38.5-302(3)(b)(l): "'cost-burdened' means a household that spends more than thirty percent of its income on housing."

Describe, including the required quantitative analysis:

5. How will this project move the region toward achieving the shared **regional transportation outcomes** established in **Metro Vision**?
6. Describe how the project will improve access to and/or connectivity between DRCOG-defined urban centers, multimodal corridors, mixed-use areas, Transit Oriented Development (transit near high-density development), or locally defined priority growth areas.

- Is there a DRCOG designated urban center within ½ mile of the project limits?  
  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  If yes, please provide the name:
- Does the project connect two or more urban centers?  
  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  If yes, please provide the names:
- Is there a transit stop or station within ½ mile of the project limits?  
  [ ] Yes  [ ] No
- Is the project in a locally-defined priority growth and development area?  
  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  
  If yes, provide a link to the relevant planning document:
  If yes, provide how the area is defined in the relevant planning document:
- Is the project in an area with zoning that supports compact, mixed-use development patterns and a variety of housing options?  
  [ ] Yes  [ ] No  If yes, please provide the zoning district designation(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide households and employment data</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households within ½ mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs within ½ mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household density (per acre) within ½ mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density (per acre) within ½ mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe, including the required quantitative analysis:

7. Describe how this project will improve access and connections to key employment centers or regional destinations, including health services; commerce, educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities; or other important community resources. In your answer, define the key destination(s) and clearly explain how the project improves access and/or connectivity.
B. MVRTP Priorities

- **Qualitative and quantitative** responses are REQUIRED for the following items on how the proposed project contributes to the project and program investment priorities in the adopted 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan. To be considered for full points, you must fully answer all parts of the question, including incorporating quantitative data into your answer. (see scoring section for details)
- Checkboxes and data tables help to provide context and guide responses, but do not account for the full range of potential improvements and are not directly scored, but are required to be completed.
- Not all proposed projects will necessarily be able to answer all questions, however it is in the applicant’s interest to address as many priority areas as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Increase the safety for all users of the transportation system. (drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities, Taking Action on Regional Vision Zero, CDOT Strategic Transportation Safety Plan, &amp; federal safety performance measures) Examples of Project Elements: bike/pedestrian crossing improvements, vehicle crash countermeasures, traffic calming, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does this project implement safety improvements (roadway, active transportation facility, etc.), particularly improvements in line with the recommendations in <strong>Taking Action on Regional Vision Zero</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does this project address a location on the <strong>High-Injury Network or Critical Corridors</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does this project implement a safety countermeasure listed in the <strong>countermeasure glossary</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide the current number of crashes involving motor vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians (using the 2015-2019 period)</td>
<td>Sponsor must use industry accepted crash reduction factors (CRF) or accident modification factor (AMF) practices (e.g., NCHRP Project 17-25, NCHRP Report 617, or DiExSys methodology).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Injury crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated reduction in crashes applicable to the project scope (per the five-year period used above)</td>
<td>Provide the methodology below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes reduced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury crashes reduced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Injury crashes reduced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only crashes reduced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe, include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Transportation</th>
<th>Expand and enhance active transportation travel options. (drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities; Denver Regional Active Transportation Plan; &amp; Metro Vision objectives 10 &amp; 13) Examples of Project Elements: shared use paths, sidewalks, regional trails, grade separations, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does this project help expand the active transportation network, close gaps, improve comfort, and/or improve connections to key destinations, particularly improvements in line with the recommendations in the <strong>Denver Regional Active Transportation Plan</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does this project close a gap or extend a facility on a <strong>Regional Active Transportation Corridor</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does this project improve pedestrian accessibility and connectivity in a <strong>pedestrian focus area</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does this project improve active transportation choices in a <strong>short trip opportunity zone</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does this project include a high-comfort bikeway (like a sidepath, shared-use path, separated bike lane, bicycle boulevard)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bicycle Use

1. **Current Weekday Bicyclists:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle Use Calculations</th>
<th>Year of Opening</th>
<th>2050 Weekday Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Enter estimated additional weekday one-way bicycle trips on the facility after project is completed.

3. Enter number of the bicycle trips (in #2 above) that will be diverting from a different bicycling route.
   (Example: \(\#2 \times 50\%) \) or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)

4. = Initial number of new bicycle trips from project (\#2 – \#3)  

5. Enter number of the new trips produced (from \#5 above) that are replacing an SOV trip.
   (Example: \(\#4 \times 30\%) \) or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)

6. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (\#4 - \#5)

7. Enter the value of \(\#6 \times 2 \text{ miles} \) (\(=\) the VMT reduced per day)
   (Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor on line 10 below)

8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced \(\#7 \times 0.95 \text{ lbs.}\)

9. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:

10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

### Pedestrian Use

1. **Current Weekday Pedestrians** (including users of non-pedaled devices such as scooters and wheelchairs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian Use Calculations</th>
<th>Year of Opening</th>
<th>2050 Weekday Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Enter estimated additional weekday pedestrian one-way trips on the facility after project is completed

3. Enter number of the new pedestrian trips (in \#2 above) that will be diverting from a different walking route.
   (Example: \(\#2 \times 50\%) \) or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)

4. = Number of new trips from project (\#2 – \#3)

5. Enter number of the new trips produced (from \#5 above) that are replacing an SOV trip.
   (Example: \(\#4 \times 30\%) \) or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)

6. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (\#4 - \#5)

7. Enter the value of \(\#6 \times .4 \text{ miles} \) (\(=\) the VMT reduced per day)
   (Values other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor on line 10 below)

8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced \(\#7 \times 0.95 \text{ lbs.}\)

9. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:

10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

Describe, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response*:  

11
| Air Quality | Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.  
(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities; state greenhouse gas rulemaking; federal congestion & emissions reduction performance measures; Metro Vision objectives 2, 3, & 6a)  
Examples of Project Elements: active transportation, transit, or TDM elements; vehicle operational improvements; electric vehicle supportive infrastructure; etc. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does this project help reduce congestion and air pollutants, including but not limited to, carbon monoxide, ground-level ozone precursors, particulate matter, and greenhouse gas emissions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Does this project reduce congestion?  
  □ Yes □ No  
- Does this project reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT)?  
  □ Yes □ No  
- Does this project reduce single-occupant vehicle (SOV) travel?  
  □ Yes □ No  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Reduced (kg/day)</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>PM 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Use FHWA CMAQ Calculators to determine emissions reduced. Please attach a screenshot of the calculator showing the inputs and outputs as part of your submittal packet.  
Note: for project types not covered by the FHWA Calculators, such as education and outreach, please note your methodology in your narrative below. |

Describe, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*  

| Multimodal Mobility | Provide improved travel options for all modes.  
(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities; federal travel time reliability, infrastructure condition, & transit asset management performance measures; & Metro Vision objective 4)  
Examples of Project Elements: combinations of improvements that support options for a broad range of users, such as complete streets improvements, or a bicycle/pedestrian access to transit, etc. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does this project help increase mobility choices for people, goods, and/or services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- What modes will project improvements directly address?  
  □ Walking □ Bicycling □ Transit □ Roadway Operations □ Other:  
- List the elements of this project which will address the above modes (i.e., sidewalk, shared use path, bus stop improvements, signal interconnection, etc.):  
- Will the completed project be a complete street as described in the Regional Complete Streets Toolkit?  
  □ Yes □ No If yes, describe how it implements the Toolkit’s strategies in your response.  
- Does this project improve travel time reliability?  
  □ Yes □ No  
- Does this project improve asset management of active transportation facilities and/or transit vehicle fleets?  
  □ Yes □ No  
- Does this project implement resilient infrastructure that helps the region mitigate natural and/or human-made hazards?  
  □ Yes □ No |

Describe, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*
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### Freight

Maintain efficient movement of goods within and beyond the region.

(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities; Regional Multimodal Freight Plan; Colorado Freight Plan, federal freight reliability performance measure; Metro Vision objective 14)

Examples of Project Elements: roadway operational improvements, etc.

How does this project improve the efficient movement of goods, specifically improvements identified in the Regional Multimodal Freight Plan?

- Is this project located in a Freight Focus Area?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  If yes, please provide the name:

- Is the project located on the Tier 1 or Tier 2 Regional Highway Freight Vision Network?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- If this project is located in a Freight Focus Area does it address the relevant Needs and Issues identified in the Plan (see text located within each Focus Area)?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  If yes, please describe in your response.

- Check any items from the Inventory of Current Needs which this project will address:
  - [ ] Truck Crash Location  
  - [ ] Rail Crossing Safety  
  - [ ] Truck Delay  
  - [ ] Truck Reliability

  Please provide the location(s) being addressed:

- Does this project include any innovative or non-traditional freight supportive elements (i.e., curb management strategies, cargo bike supportive infrastructure, etc.)?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  If yes, please describe:

Describe, include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:

### Regional Transit

Expand and improve the region’s transit network.

(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities, Coordinated Transit Plan, RTD’s Regional Bus Rapid Transit Feasibility Study)

Examples of Project Elements: transit lanes, station improvements, new/expanded service, etc.

Note: For any project with transit elements, the sponsor must coordinate with RTD to ensure RTD agrees to the scope and cost. Be sure to include RTD’s concurrence in your application submittal.

How does this project improve connections to or expand the region’s transit system, as outlined in the 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan?

- Does this project implement a portion of the regional bus rapid transit (BRT) network?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  If yes, which specific corridor will this project focus on?

- Does this project involve a regional transit planning corridor?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  If yes, which specific corridor will this project focus on?

- Does this project implement a mobility hub as defined in the 2050 MVRTP?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- Does this project improve connections between transit and other modes?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  If yes, please describe in your response.

- Is this project adding new or expanded transit service?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  If yes, who will operate the service?

- Does this project add and/or improve transit service to or within a DRCOG-defined urban center?  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No  
  If yes, provide the name of the urban center:

Describe, include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:
## C. Project Leveraging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What percent of outside funding sources (non-Regional Share funding) does this project have?</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%+ outside funding sources</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59.9%</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49.9%</td>
<td>3 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39.9%</td>
<td>2 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-19.9%</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0 pts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D. Project Readiness

Weight: 10%

Provide responses to the following items to demonstrate the readiness of the project. DRCOG is prioritizing those projects that have a higher likelihood to move forward in a timely manner and are less likely to experience a delay.

### Section 1. Avoiding Pitfalls and Roadblocks

**a.** Has a licensed engineer (CDOT, consultant, local agency, etc.) reviewed the impact the proposed project will have on utilities, railroads, ROW, historic and environmental resources, etc. and have those impacts and pitfalls been mitigated as much as possible within the project submittal?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] N/A (for projects which do not require engineering services)

If yes, please type in the engineer’s name below which certifies their review and that impacts have been evaluated and mitigated as much as possible before your application is submitted:

Please describe the anticipated specific pitfalls/roadblocks and the mitigation activities taken to date:

**b.** Is this application for a single project phase only (i.e., design, environmental, ROW acquisition, construction only, study, bus service, equipment purchase, etc.)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, are the other prerequisite phases complete?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] N/A

If this project is for construction, please note the NEPA status:

**c.** Has all required ROW been identified?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] N/A

Has all required ROW already been acquired and cleared by CDOT?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] N/A

**d.** Based on the current status provided in Project Information, question 11, do you foresee any reason why your IGA will not be executed by Oct 1 of your first year of funding, so you can begin your project on time?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**e.** Have other stakeholders in your project been identified and involved in project development?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] N/A

If yes, who are the stakeholders?

Please provide any additional details on any of the items in Section 1, if applicable.
## Section 2. Local Match

**a.** Is all the local match identified in your application currently available, and if a partnering agency is also committing match, do you have a commitment letter?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Please describe:

**b.** Is all funding for this project currently identified in the sponsor agency’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Please describe:

## Section 3. Public Support

**a.** Has the proposed project previously been through a public review process (public comment period, public hearing, etc.)?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**b.** Has the public had access to translated project materials in relevant languages for the local community?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Please describe:

**c.** Have any adjacent property owners to the proposed project been contacted and provided with the initial project concept?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] N/A

Please provide any additional details on the items in Section 3, if applicable.
APPLICATION OVERVIEW

The Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Regional Share Call for Projects will open on xxxx, with applications due no later than 3 p.m. on xxxx. Submit applications online at Dropbox link.

- To be eligible to submit an application, at least one person from your agency must have attended one of the two mandatory TIP training workshops (add dates here; anticipated for February 2022).
- If required, CDOT and/or RTD concurrence must be provided with the application submittal. The CDOT/RTD concurrence request is due to CDOT/RTD no later than xxxx, with CDOT/RTD providing a response no later than xxxx.
- Each Subregional Forum may submit up to three applications from eligible project sponsors. Both CDOT and RTD may submit up to two applications.
- Data to help the sponsor fill out the application, can be found here (to be updated).
- Requests for additional data or calculations from DRCOG staff should be submitted to tcottrell@drcog.org no later than xxxx.
- The application must be affirmed by either the applicant’s City or County Manager, Chief Elected Official (Mayor or County Commission Chair) for local governments, or agency director or equivalent for other applicants.

Submittal instructions:

1. Submit a single PDF document containing 1) this application form, 2) the CDOT-supplied cost estimate form (located here), 3) one location map or graphic, 4) any required documentation (i.e., FHWA calculators) 5) CDOT/RTD concurrence response (if applicable), and 6) project support letters. Please DO NOT attach additional cover pages, embed graphics in the application, or otherwise change the format of the application form.

2. OPTIONAL: Submit one additional PDF document containing any supplemental materials, if applicable.

Further details on project eligibility, evaluation criteria, and the selection process are defined in the Policies for TIP Program Development, which can be found online here (to be updated).

EVALUATION PROCESS

DRCOG staff will review submitted applications for eligibility and provide an initial score to a Project Review Panel. The panel will review and rank eligible applications that request funding. Sponsors may be invited to make presentations to the Project Review Panel to assist in the final recommendation to the TAC, RTC, and DRCOG Board.
APPLICATION FORMAT

The STBG Regional Share application contains two parts: project information and evaluation questions.

Project Information

Applicants enter foundational information for the project/program/study (hereafter referred to as project), including a problem statement, project description, and concurrence documentation from CDOT and/or RTD, if applicable. This section is not scored.

Evaluation Questions

This part includes four sections (A-D) for the applicant to provide qualitative and quantitative responses to use for scoring projects. The checkboxes and data entry fields should guide the applicant’s responses. They are not directly scored but provide context as reviewers consider the full response to each question. Applicants may access an online mapping tool here to assist them in gathering data for several of the quantitative fields. Datasets are also available for download from DRCOG’s website here.

Scoring Methodology: Each section will be scored on a scale of 0 to 5, relative to other applications received. All questions will be factored into the final score, with any questions left blank receiving 0 points. The four sections are weighted and scored as follows:

Section A. Regional Impact of Proposed Projects ................................................................. 30%

Projects will be evaluated on the degree to which they address a significant regional problem or benefit people throughout the Denver region. Relevant quantitative data should be included within narrative responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The project benefits will substantially address a major regional problem and benefit people and businesses in multiple subregions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The project benefits will significantly address a major regional problem primarily benefiting people and businesses in one subregion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The project benefits will either moderately address a major regional problem or significantly address a moderate-level regional problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The project benefits will moderately address a moderate-level regional problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The project benefits will address a minor regional problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>The project does not address a regional problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B. Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan Priorities ............................................50%

The TIP’s investments should implement the 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2050 MVRTP) regional project and program investment priorities, which contribute to addressing the Board-adopted Metro Vision objectives and the federal performance-based planning framework required by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration as outlined in current federal transportation legislation and regulations. Therefore, projects will be evaluated on the degree to which they address the six priorities identified in the 2050 MVRTP: safety, active transportation, air quality, multimodal mobility, freight, and regional transit. It is anticipated that projects may not be able to address all six priorities, but it’s in the applicant’s interest to address as many priority areas as possible. Relevant quantitative data should be included within narrative responses. The table below demonstrates how each priority area will be scored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable substantial benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area and is determined to be in the top fifth of applications based on the magnitude of benefits in that priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable significant benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable moderate benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area and is determined to be in the middle fifth of applications based on the magnitude of benefits in that priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable modest benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The project provides demonstrable slight benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area and is determined to be in the bottom fifth of applications based on the magnitude of benefits in that priority area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C. Project Leveraging ("overmatch") ................................................................. 10%
Scores are assigned based on the percent of other funding sources (non-Regional Share funds).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>% non-Regional Share funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60% and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30-39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.1-29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D. Project Readiness ................................................................. 10%
Be sure to answer ALL questions. While “Yes” answers will generally reflect greater readiness, opportunities are given to provide additional details to assist reviewers in fully evaluating the readiness of your project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Substantial</strong> readiness is demonstrated and all known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Significant</strong> readiness is demonstrated and several known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Moderate</strong> readiness is demonstrated and some known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Slight</strong> readiness is demonstrated and some known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Few</strong> mitigation or readiness activities have been demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>No</strong> mitigation or readiness activities have been demonstrated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Information

### 1. Project Title

### 2. Project Location

*Provide a map, as appropriate (see Page 1)*

- Start point:
- End point:

*OR Geographic Area:

### 3. Project Sponsor (entity that will be financially responsible for the project)

### 4. Project Contact Person:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 5. Required CDOT and/or RTD Concurrence: Does this project touch CDOT Right-of-Way, involve a CDOT roadway, access RTD property, or request RTD involvement to operate service?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

*If yes, provide applicable concurrence documentation*

### 6. What planning document(s) identifies this project?

- [ ] DRCOG 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2050 MVRTP)

- [ ] Local/Regional plan:

  - Planning Document Title:
  - Adopting agency (local agency Council, CDOT, RTD, etc.):
  - Provide date of adoption by council/board/commission, if applicable:

- Please describe public review/engagement to date:

- Other pertinent details:

  *Provide link to document/s and referenced page number if possible, or provide documentation in the supplement*

### 7. Identify the project’s key phases and the anticipated schedule of phase milestones.

*(phases and dates should correspond with the Funding Breakdown table below)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases to be included</th>
<th>Major phase milestones</th>
<th>Anticipated completion date (based on XXX approval date): (MM/YYYY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR ALL PHASES</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) executed (with CDOT/ RTD; assumed process is 4-9 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Design</td>
<td>Design contract Notice to Proceed (NTP) issued (if using a consultant):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Design</td>
<td>Design scoping meeting held with CDOT (if no consultant):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Environmental</td>
<td>Environmental contract Notice to Proceed (NTP) issued (if using a consultant):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Environmental</td>
<td>Design scoping meeting held with CDOT (if no consultant):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Initial set of ROW plans submitted to CDOT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROW acquisition completed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated number of parcels to acquire:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Construction</td>
<td>FIR (Field Inspection Review):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOR (Final Office Review):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required clearances:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project publicly advertised:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Study</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting held after consultant NTP (or internal if no consultant):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Bus Service</td>
<td>Service begins:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Equipment Purchase (Procurement)</td>
<td>RFP/RFQ/RFB (bids) issued:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other:</td>
<td>First invoice submitted to CDOT/RTD:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Problem Statement:** What specific regional problem/issue will the transportation project address?

9. Identify the project’s **key elements.** A single project may have multiple project elements.

- **Roadway**
  - Operational Improvements
  - General Purpose Capacity (2050 MVRTP)
  - Managed Lanes (2050 MVRTP)
  - Pavement Reconstruction/ Rehab
  - Bridge Replace/Reconstruct/Rehab

- **Grade Separation**
  - Roadway
  - Railway
  - Bicycle
  - Pedestrian

- **Regional Transit**
  - Rapid Transit Capacity (2050 MVRTP)
  - Mobility Hub(s)
  - Transit Planning Corridors
  - Transit Facilities/Service (Expanded/New)

- **Safety Improvements**

- **Active Transportation Improvements**
  - Bicycle Facility
  - Pedestrian Facility

- **Air Quality Improvements**

- **Improvements Impacting Freight**

- **Multimodal Mobility** (i.e., accommodating a broad range of users)
  - Complete Streets Improvements

- **Study**

- **Other**, briefly describe:

---

¹For any project with transit elements, the sponsor must coordinate with RTD to ensure RTD agrees to the scope and cost. Be sure to include RTD’s concurrence in your application submittal.
10. Define the scope and specific elements of the project (including any elements checked in #9 above). Note that the merits and benefits of the project are addressed later. Please keep the response to this question tailored to details of the scope only and no more than five sentences.

11. What is the current status of the proposed scope as defined in Question 10 above? Note that overall project readiness is addressed in more detail in Section D below.

12. Would a smaller DRCOG-allocation than requested be acceptable, while maintaining the original intent of the project? □ Yes □ No

   If yes, smaller meaningful limits, size, service level, phases, or scopes, along with the cost, MUST be defined.

   Smaller DRCOG funding request:

   Outline the differences between the scope outlined above and the reduced scope:

---

### Project Financial Information and Funding Request (all funding amounts in $1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount of Regional Share Funding Request</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(No greater than $20 million and not to exceed 80% of the total project cost)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Funding Sources (other than Regional Share funds)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List each funding source and contribution amount.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution Amount</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Contribution to Overall Total Project Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total amount of funding provided by other funding sources</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(private, local, state, subregional, or federal)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Breakdown in $1,000s (by program year)¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRCOG Requested Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2024</td>
<td>FY 2025</td>
<td>FY 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **CDOT or RTD Supplied Funds**²               |
| FY 2024 | FY 2025 | FY 2026 | FY 2027 | Total  |
| $        | $        | $        | $        | $0     |

| **Local Funds (Funding from sources other than DRCOG, CDOT, or RTD)** |
| FY 2024 | FY 2025 | FY 2026 | FY 2027 | Total  |
| $        | $        | $        | $        | $0     |

| **Total Funding**                             |
| FY 2024 | FY 2025 | FY 2026 | FY 2027 | Total  |
| $0      | $0      | $0      | $0      | $0     |

| **Phase to be Initiated**                     |
| **Choose from Design, ENV, ROW, CON, Study, Service, Equip. Purchase, Other** |
| Choose an item | Choose an item | Choose an item | Choose an item |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Notes:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program years are October 1 through September 30 (e.g., FY 2024 is October 1, 2023 through September 30, 2024). The proposed funding plan is not guaranteed if the project is selected for funding. While DRCOG will do everything it can to accommodate the applicants’ request, final funding will be assigned at DRCOG’s discretion within fiscal constraint. Funding amounts must be provided in year of expenditure dollars using an 3% inflation factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Only enter funding in this line if CDOT and/or RTD specifically give permission via concurrence letters or other written source.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Questions

**A. Regional Impact of Proposed Project**

Provide **qualitative and quantitative** responses to the following questions on the regional impact of the proposed project. Be sure to provide all required information for each question. Quantitative data from DRCOG is available [here](#).

1. Why is this project regionally important? Relevant quantitative data in your response is required.

2. How will the proposed project address the specific transportation problem described in the [Problem Statement](#) (as submitted in Project Information, #8)? Relevant quantitative data in your response is required.

3. Does the proposed project benefit multiple municipalities and/or subregions? If yes, which ones and how? Also describe any funding partnerships (other subregions, regional agencies, municipalities, private, etc.) established in association with this project.

4. Describe how the project will improve access and mobility for each of the applicable disproportionately impacted and environmental justice population groups identified in the table below. Completing the below table and referencing relevant quantitative data in your response is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disproportionately Impacted and EJ Population Groups</th>
<th>Population within ½ mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Individuals of color</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Low-Income households</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Individuals with limited English proficiency</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Adults age 65 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Children age 5-17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Individuals with a disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Households without a motor vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Households that are housing cost-burdened</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Use 2015-2019 American Community Survey Data*

*For Lines a. – g. use definitions in the DRCOG Title VI Implementation Plan. For Line h., as defined in C.R.S. 24-38.5-302(3)(b)(I): “cost-burdened’ means a household that spends more than thirty percent of its income on housing.”*

Describe, including the required quantitative analysis:

5. How will this project move the region toward achieving the shared [regional transportation outcomes](#) established in [Metro Vision](#)?
6. Describe how the project will improve access to and/or connectivity between DRCOG-defined urban centers, multimodal corridors, mixed-use areas, Transit Oriented Development (transit near high-density development), or locally defined priority growth areas.

- Is there a DRCOG designated urban center within ½ mile of the project limits?
  - Yes  [ ] No  [ ] If yes, please provide the name:

- Does the project connect two or more urban centers?
  - Yes  [ ] No  [ ] If yes, please provide the names:

- Is there a transit stop or station within ½ mile of the project limits?
  - Yes  [ ] No

- Is the project in a locally-defined priority growth and development area?
  - Yes  [ ] No
  - If yes, provide a link to the relevant planning document:
  - If yes, provide how the area is defined in the relevant planning document:

- Is the project in an area with zoning that supports compact, mixed-use development patterns and a variety of housing options?
  - Yes  [ ] No  If yes, please provide the zoning district designation(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide households and employment data</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2050</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households within ½ mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs within ½ mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household density (per acre) within ½ mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job density (per acre) within ½ mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe, including the required quantitative analysis:

7. Describe how this project will improve **access** and **connections** to key employment centers or regional destinations, including health services; commerce, educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities; or other important community resources. In your answer, define the key destination(s) and clearly explain how the project improves **access** and/or **connectivity**.
B. MVRTP Priorities

- **Qualitative and quantitative** responses are REQUIRED for the following items on how the proposed project contributes to the project and program investment priorities in the adopted 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan. **To be considered for full points, you must fully answer all parts of the question, including incorporating quantitative data into your answer.** (see scoring section for details)
- Checkboxes and data tables help to provide context and guide responses, but do not account for the full range of potential improvements and are not directly scored, but are required to be completed.
- Not all proposed projects will necessarily be able to answer all questions, however it is in the applicant’s interest to address as many priority areas as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Increase the safety for all users of the transportation system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities, Taking Action on Regional Vision Zero, CDOT Strategic Transportation Safety Plan, &amp; federal safety performance measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of Project Elements: bike/pedestrian crossing improvements, vehicle crash countermeasures, traffic calming, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How does this project implement safety improvements (roadway, active transportation facility, etc.), particularly improvements in line with the recommendations in Taking Action on Regional Vision Zero?

- Does this project address a location on the High-Injury Network or Critical Corridors?
  - Yes  No
- Does this project implement a safety countermeasure listed in the countermeasure glossary?
  - Yes  No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide the current number of crashes involving motor vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians (using the 2015-2019 period)</th>
<th>Sponsor must use industry accepted crash reduction factors (CRF) or accident modification factor (AMF) practices (e.g., NCHRP Project 17-25, NCHRP Report 617, or DiExSys methodology).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Injury crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only crashes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated reduction in crashes applicable to the project scope (per the five-year period used above)</th>
<th>Provide the methodology below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal crashes reduced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury crashes reduced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Injury crashes reduced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage Only crashes reduced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe, include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Transportation</th>
<th>Expand and enhance active transportation travel options.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities; Denver Regional Active Transportation Plan; &amp; Metro Vision objectives 10 &amp; 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of Project Elements: shared use paths, sidewalks, regional trails, grade separations, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How does this project help expand the active transportation network, close gaps, improve comfort, and/or improve connections to key destinations, particularly improvements in line with the recommendations in the Denver Regional Active Transportation Plan?

- Does this project close a gap or extend a facility on a Regional Active Transportation Corridor?
  - Yes  No
- Does this project improve pedestrian accessibility and connectivity in a pedestrian focus area?
  - Yes  No
- Does this project improve active transportation choices in a short trip opportunity zone?
  - Yes  No
- Does this project include a high-comfort bikeway (like a sidepath, shared-use path, separated bike lane, bicycle boulevard)?
  - Yes  No  If yes, please describe:
### Bicycle Use

1. **Current Weekday Bicyclists:** 0

#### Bicycle Use Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year of Opening</th>
<th>2050 Weekday Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Enter estimated additional weekday one-way bicycle trips on the facility after project is completed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enter number of the bicycle trips (in #2 above) that will be diverting from a different bicycling route. (Example: #2 X 50% or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. = Initial number of new bicycle trips from project (#2 – #3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enter number of the new trips produced (from #5 above) that are replacing an SOV trip. (Example: #4 X 30% or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#4 - #5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enter the value of (#6 x 2 miles). (= the VMT reduced per day) (Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor on line 10 below)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#7 x 0.95 lbs.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

### Pedestrian Use

1. **Current Weekday Pedestrians (including users of non-pedaled devices such as scooters and wheelchairs):** 0

#### Pedestrian Use Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year of Opening</th>
<th>2050 Weekday Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Enter estimated additional weekday pedestrian one-way trips on the facility after project is completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enter number of the new pedestrian trips (in #2 above) that will be diverting from a different walking route (Example: #2 X 50% or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. = Number of new trips from project (#2 – #3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enter number of the new trips produced (from #5 above) that are replacing an SOV trip. (Example: #4 X 30% or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#4 - #5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enter the value of (#6 x .4 miles). (= the VMT reduced per day) (Values other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor on line 10 below)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#7 x 0.95 lbs.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

Describe, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*
### Air Quality

**Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.**
(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities; state greenhouse gas rulemaking; federal congestion & emissions reduction performance measures; Metro Vision objectives 2, 3, & 6a)
Examples of Project Elements: active transportation, transit, or TDM elements; vehicle operational improvements; electric vehicle supportive infrastructure; etc.

How does this project help reduce congestion and air pollutants, including but not limited to, carbon monoxide, ground-level ozone precursors, particulate matter, and greenhouse gas emissions?

- Does this project reduce congestion?  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Does this project reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT)?  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Does this project reduce single-occupant vehicle (SOV) travel?  
  - Yes  
  - No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Reduced (kg/day)</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>VOC</th>
<th>PM 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use [FHWA CMAQ Calculators](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/cmaq/calculator.cfm) to determine emissions reduced. Please attach a screenshot of the calculator showing the inputs and outputs as part of your submittal packet.

*Note: for project types not covered by the FHWA Calculators, such as education and outreach, please note your methodology in your narrative below.*

Describe, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*

### Multimodal Mobility

**Provide improved travel options for all modes.**
(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities; federal travel time reliability, infrastructure condition, & transit asset management performance measures; Metro Vision objective 4)
Examples of Project Elements: combinations of improvements that support options for a broad range of users, such as complete streets improvements, or a roadway capacity project that incorporates transit and freight improvements, etc.

How does this project help increase mobility choices for people, goods, and/or services?

- What modes will project improvements directly address?  
  - Walking  
  - Bicycling  
  - Transit  
  - SOV  
  - Freight  
  - Other:
- List the elements of this project which will address the above modes (i.e., sidewalk, shared use path, bus stop improvements, new general purpose or managed lanes, etc.):
- Will the completed project be a complete street as described in the [Regional Complete Streets Toolkit](https://www.dot.state.ca.us/rscpd/complete-street-toolkit.html)?  
  - Yes  
  - No  
  If yes, describe how it implements the Toolkit’s strategies in your response.
- Does this project improve travel time reliability?  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Does this project improve asset management of roadway infrastructure, active transportation facilities, and/or transit facilities or vehicle fleets?  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Does this project implement resilient infrastructure that helps the region mitigate natural and/or human-made hazards?  
  - Yes  
  - No

Describe, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*
### Freight

Maintain efficient movement of goods within and beyond the region.

(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities; Regional Multimodal Freight Plan; Colorado Freight Plan; federal freight reliability performance measure; Metro Vision objective 14)

Examples of Project Elements: bridge improvements, improved turning radii, increased roadway capacity, etc.

How does this project improve the efficient movement of goods, specifically improvements identified in the Regional Multimodal Freight Plan?

- **Is this project located in a Freight Focus Area?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, please provide the name:
- **Is the project located on the Tier 1 or Tier 2 Regional Highway Freight Vision Network?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐
- **If this project is located in a Freight Focus Area does it address the relevant Needs and Issues identified in the Plan (see text located within each Focus Area)?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☐ If yes, please describe in your response.
- **Check any items from the Inventory of Current Needs which this project will address:**
  - Truck Crash Location ☐ Rail Crossing Safety ☐
  - Truck Delay ☐ Truck Reliability ☐ Highway Bottleneck ☐
  - Low-Clearance or Weight-Restricted Bridge ☐

Please provide the location(s) being addressed:

- **Does this project include any innovative or non-traditional freight supportive elements (i.e., curb management strategies, cargo bike supportive infrastructure, etc.)?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, please describe:

Describe, include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:

### Regional Transit

Expand and improve the region’s transit network.

(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities, Coordinated Transit Plan, RTD’s Regional Bus Rapid Transit Feasibility Study)

Examples of Project Elements: transit lanes, station improvements, new/expanded service, etc.

Note: For any project with transit elements, the sponsor must coordinate with RTD to ensure RTD agrees to the scope and cost. Be sure to include RTD’s concurrence in your application submittal.

How does this project improve connections to or expand the region’s transit system, as outlined in the 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan?

- **Does this project implement a portion of the regional bus rapid transit (BRT) network?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, which specific corridor will this project focus on?
- **Does this project involve a regional transit planning corridor?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, which specific corridor will this project focus on?
- **Does this project implement a mobility hub as defined in the 2050 MVRTP?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐
- **Does this project improve connections between transit and other modes?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, please describe in your response.
- **Is this project adding new or expanded transit service?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, who will operate the service?
- **Does this project add and/or improve transit service to or within a DRCOG-defined urban center?**
  - Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, provide the name of the urban center:

Describe, include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:
### C. Project Leveraging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What percent of outside funding sources (non-Regional Share funding) does this project have?</th>
<th>WEIGHT 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>60%+ outside funding sources ..... 5 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59.9% ........................................ 4 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49.9% ........................................ 3 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39.9% ........................................ 2 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.1-29.9% ................................... 1 pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%................................................. 0 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Project Readiness

*Provide responses to the following items to demonstrate the readiness of the project. DRCOG is prioritizing those projects that have a higher likelihood to move forward in a timely manner and are less likely to experience a delay.*

#### Section 1. Avoiding Pitfalls and Roadblocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Has a licensed engineer (CDOT, consultant, local agency, etc.) reviewed the impact the proposed project will have on utilities, railroads, ROW, historic and environmental resources, etc. and have those impacts and pitfalls been mitigated as much as possible within the project submittal?</th>
<th>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A (for projects which do not require engineering services)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please type in the engineer’s name below which certifies their review and that impacts have been evaluated and mitigated as much as possible before your application is submitted:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe the anticipated specific pitfalls/roadblocks and the mitigation activities taken to date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Is this application for a single project phase only (i.e., design, environmental, ROW acquisition, construction only, study, bus service, equipment purchase, etc.)?</th>
<th>☐ Yes ☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, are the other prerequisite phases complete?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If this project is for construction, please note the NEPA status:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Has all required ROW been identified?</th>
<th>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has all required ROW already been acquired and cleared by CDOT?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| d. Based on the current status provided in Project Information, question 11, do you foresee any reason why your IGA will not be executed by Oct 1 of your first year of funding, so you can begin your project on time? | ☐ Yes ☐ No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e. Have other stakeholders in your project been identified and involved in project development?</th>
<th>☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, who are the stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any additional details on any of the items in Section 1, if applicable.
### Section 2. Local Match

a. Is all the local match identified in your application currently available, and if a partnering agency is also committing match, do you have a commitment letter?  
   - [ ] Yes  [ ] No  
   Please describe:  

b. Is all funding for this project currently identified in the sponsor agency’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)?  
   - [ ] Yes  [ ] No  
   Please describe:  

### Section 3. Public Support

a. Has the proposed project previously been through a public review process (public comment period, public hearing, etc.)?  
   - [ ] Yes  [ ] No  

b. Has the public had access to translated project materials in relevant languages for the local community?  
   - [ ] Yes  [ ] No  
   Please describe:  

c. Have any adjacent property owners to the proposed project been contacted and provided with the initial project concept?  
   - [ ] Yes  [ ] No  [ ] N/A  
   Please provide any additional details on the items in Section 3, if applicable.
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>December 15, 2021</td>
<td>Informational Item</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
December administrative modifications to the 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
No action requested. This item is for information.

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
Per the DRCOG Board-adopted 2020-2023 TIP Policy, administrative modifications to the 2022-2025 TIP are reviewed and processed by staff. Administrative modifications represent revisions to TIP projects that do not require formal action by the DRCOG Board.

After the Board is informed of the administrative modifications, the TIP adjustments are processed and posted on the DRCOG 2022-2025 TIP web page. Then they are emailed to the TIP Notification List, which includes members of the Transportation Advisory Committee, the Regional Transportation Committee, TIP project sponsors, staff of various federal and state agencies, and other interested parties.

The December 2021 administrative modifications are listed and described in the attachment. Highlighted items in the attachment depict project revisions.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
2022-2025 TIP Administrative Modifications (December 2021)

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, at (303) 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.
**2007-164: Remove one pool project and funding and transfer into a separate TIP project**

**Existing**

**Design Pool: CDOT Region 1 Misc/Design**

- **TIP-ID:** 2007-164
- **STIP-ID:**
- **Project Type:** Other
- **Sponsor:** CDOT Region 1
- **Open to Public:**

**Project Scope**

The design pool prepares CDOT for future construction opportunities. Projects to be approved for pool funding by Region 1 Director.

**Performance Measures**

- Bridge Condition
- Congestion
- Freight Reliability
- Pavement Condition
- Safety
- Transit Assets
- Transit Safety
- Travel Time Reliability

**Affected County(ies)**

- Regional

All pool project funding depicts federal and/or state funding only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kings Valley Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>US-85</td>
<td>Daniels to Meadows</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionwide Bottleneck Reductions</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>I-25/Greenland Wildlife Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amounts in $1,000s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Leg)</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (R P P)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kings Valley Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>US-85</td>
<td>Daniels to Meadows</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionwide Bottleneck Reductions</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>I-25/Greenland Wildlife Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amounts in $1,000s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Leg)</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (R P P)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2008-076: Add one new pool project using available funds. Project funding remains the same

**Existing**

Title: Region 1 FASTER Pool
TIP-ID: 2008-076  STIP-ID: SR17002  Open to Public:  Sponsor: CDOT Region 1

**Project Scope**
Pool contains safety-related improvements and upgrades based on the new FASTER-Safety funding program (Colorado Senate Bill 108) in CDOT Region 1.

**Affected County(ies):**
- Adams
- Arapahoe
- Broomfield
- Denver
- Douglas
- Jefferson

**Performance Measures**
- Bridge Condition
- Congestion
- Freight Reliability
- Pavement Condition
- Safety
- Transit Assets
- Transit Safety
- Travel Time Reliability

All pool project funding depicts federal and/or state funding only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-95 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>64th Ave</td>
<td>$861</td>
<td>Aurora Signals 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SH-60 @ Jewell and Yale</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-121/72nd Ave</td>
<td>Right turn accelerates</td>
<td>$961</td>
<td>Lakewood Safety Package 2020</td>
<td>I-70 @ Colfax, Colfax @ Qual, and SH121 @ 1st Ave</td>
<td>$2,060</td>
<td>I-76 Lighting Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-177 Sidewalks</td>
<td>Mineral Ave to Orchard Rd</td>
<td>$521</td>
<td>I-70 and Kipling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SH-68 &amp; Exposition Ave Signal Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>$630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadsworth TOD left turn protection</td>
<td>Gilpin, Eastman and Yale</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>US-285/SH-30 Resurfacing</td>
<td>Dahlia to Parker</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>SH-7 &amp; Colorado Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASTER Safety Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>Broadway Signal Replacement</td>
<td>at 62nd and 70th</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>SH-74 &amp; Bear Creek Rd Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-2 Traffic Signal Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>SH-53 Signal Package</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>SH-50 and Yale Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadsworth</td>
<td>Right Turn Lane Extensions</td>
<td>$1,521</td>
<td>I-70 at Harlan</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>US-40 Pedestrian Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 between MP 252 &amp; 256</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>SH-75 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Bowles and Mineral</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>SH-121 Signal Upgrades for Three Intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-121 @ Deer Creek Canyon, C-470 @ Kipling, SH-35 @ WB I-76 Ramp Mod, SH-69 @ US-290, SH-35 @ Washington St, SH-177 @ Olino, SH-121 @ Chautauki</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Replacements</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>C-470 and Ken Caryl Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>US-65 Expansion: Happy Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program

### Revised

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000$)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-95 @ 1st Ave, 32nd Ave, 36th Ave, 40th Ave, Wellington Ave</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Replacements</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>SH-40 and SH-121</td>
<td>CDOT Traffic Signal Improvements</td>
<td>$1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-65 @ Darlington</td>
<td>Hampden to Florida SUR</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Denver West Runway Truck Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabouts at C-470 @ Ken Caryl and I-70 @ Harlan</td>
<td>Roundabouts - design</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>I-70 VSL Concept of Operations and Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS for I-25 south of Denver</td>
<td>VMS Installation</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Dartmouth Mini Roundabouts</td>
<td>Logan, Downing, Clarkston</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long mast arm signal design (3 locations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I-70 Mountain Express Lane VSL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Signal Package</td>
<td>I-70 at Tower</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>US-6</td>
<td>SH-119 to SH-58/SH-33</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 1224 @ Dahlia St.</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Replacement</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>SH-74 VMS Sign Installation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Metering</td>
<td>I-76</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>SH-7 Widening</td>
<td>I-25 to Sheridan</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-265/SH-30</td>
<td>Resurfacing</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>SH-224 &amp; Washington St Intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Signal Reconfiguration Package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SH-7 &amp; Holy Cross Interchange Reconfiguration</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-126 @ Eldorado, SH-287 @ Midway, 69th, and SH-121 @ 81st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Caryl Roundabouts</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 191 (Kipling) @ 13th Ave and 13th Place</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>SH-121 &amp; Brook Dr. Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 EB Aux Lanes</td>
<td>Ward Rd to Kipling</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>SH-74 &amp; Evergreen Parkway VMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Federal Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 2 &amp; SH 505 Traffic Signals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1223 Parker Rd</td>
<td>Safety Project</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Kings Valley Underpass</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-25 SB Bottleneck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amounts in $1,000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Faster-S)</td>
<td>$38,104</td>
<td>$26,990</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$241,563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$116,469</td>
<td>$39,104</td>
<td>$26,990</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$241,563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Facility Name | Start-At and End-At | Cost (1,000s) | Facility Name | Start-At and End-At | Cost (1,000s) | Facility Name | Start-At and End-At | Cost (1,000s)
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
SH 121 @ Deer Creek Canyon, C-470 @ Kipling, SH-96 @ WB I-76 Ramp Mod, SH-88 @ US 265, SH-90 @ Washington St, SH-177 @ Otero, SH-121 @ Chatfield | Traffic Signal Replacements | $2,500 | C-470 and Ken Caryl | Intersection Improvements | $5,000 | US-85 Expansion: Happy Canyon |  | 
SH-96 @ 1st Ave, 32nd Ave, 38th Ave, 4th Ave, Wellington Ave | Traffic Signal Replacements | $2,000 | SH-40 and SH-121 | CDOT Traffic Signal Improvements | $1,720 | SH-224 (70th) & SH-53 Signal Replacement |  | 
US-85 @ Dartmouth | Hampden to Florida SUR | $2,500 |  | Denver West Runaway Truck Ramp | $6,000 | SH-53 & 62nd Ave Signal Replacement |  | 
Roundabouts at C-470 @ Ken Caryl and I-70 @ Harlan | Roundabouts - design | $500 | I-70 VSL Concept of Operations and Implementation | $630 | I-25 South Gap Wildlife Crossing | $7,500 | 
VMAS for I-25 south of Denver | VMAS Installation | $500 | Dartmouth Mini Roundabouts | Logan, Downing, Clarkson | $1,200 | Federal Blvd & 88th Signal Realignment | $1,500 | 
Long mast arm signal design (3 locations) | 88 @ Revere, 121 @ Ken Caryl, 121 @ C-470 (2) | $2,000 | I-70 Mountain Express Lane VSL |  | $1,980 | I-70 EB VSL & Queue Warning | $9,300 | 
Aurora Signal Package | I-70 at Tower | $600 | US-6 | SH-119 to SH-58/SH-93 | $10,000 | Dry Creek Rd @ I-25: SB On-Ramp & Metering |  | 
SH224 @ Dahlia St | Traffic Signal Replacement | $450 | SH-74 VMS Sign Installation |  | $101 | Bellevue & Prince St Median & Signal Improvements | $2,400 | 
Ramp Metering | I-70 | $1,500 | SH-7 Widening | I-25 to Sheridan | $500 | I-70 EB @ E Colfax Vertical & Horizontal Curve Realignment | $5,000 | 
US-285/SH-30 | Resurfacing | $1,400 | SH-224 & Washington St Intersection |  | $700 | C-470 & Quincy Ave Terminal Roundabouts | $8,000 | 
North Signal Replacement Package | SH-128 @ Eldorado, SH-287 @ Midway, 6th, and SH-121 @ Ralph | $1,000 | SH-7 & Holly Intersection Reconstruction | $2,800 | Ken Caryl Roundabouts | $3,700 | 
SH91 (Kipling) @ 13th Ave and 13th Place | Intersection Improvements | $800 | SH-121 & Brook Dr. Intersection Improvements | $500 | 60th and Vasquez Intersection Reconstruction | $5,000 | 
I-70 EB Aux Lanes | Ward Rd to Kipling | $2,300 | SH-74 & Evergreen Parkway VMS |  | $600 | SH-83 Turn Lanes at Rafter Rd. & E. Park Dr. | $2,700 | 
South Federal Blvd | safety improvements | $300 | Peona St Intersection Improvements |  | $1,770 | US40A Resurfacing MP 252-258.3 | $960 | 
SH2 and SH95 Traffic Signals | SH2@Arizona, Kentucky, Bayaud, 1st SH95@14th, 16th, 44th, 38th, 1st | $1,500 | I-76: York to Dahlia (SH-224 WB On-Ramp) |  | $4,000 | I-70 Center Barrier Gaps & Mesh Upgrades to Outside Barrier | $915 | 
SB I-25 Parker Rd Ramp | safety project | $2,000 | Kings Valley Underpass |  | $3,720 | I-25 Concrete Pavement Rehab | $2,100 | 
I-25 SB Bottleneck | restripe from I-76 to I-70 | $1,200 | SH-119 Shoulder Widening |  | $11,650 |  |  |
2018-011: Add one new pool project. Project funding remains the same

**Existing**

**Title:** R1 Permanent Water Quality Pool  
**TIP-ID:** 2018-011  
**STIP-ID:**  
**Open to Public:**  
**Project Type:** Other Enhancement Projects  
**Sponsor:** CDOT Region 1

**Project Scope**

CDOT R1 pool for permanent water quality projects.

**Affected County(ies):**

- Adams
- Arapahoe
- Broomfield
- Denver
- Douglas
- Jefferson

**Performance Measures**

- Bridge Condition
- Congestion
- Freight Reliability
- Pavement Condition
- Safety
- Transit Assets
- Transit Safety
- Travel Time Reliability

All pool project funding depicts federal and/or state funding only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000$)</th>
<th>Facility Name (Cont)</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer's Lake Trailhead</td>
<td>74th Ave adjacent to the South Platte River</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>Federal Blvd</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure/Water Quality Facilities</td>
<td>$1,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Littleton Skunk Hollow Regional Water Quality Facility</td>
<td>Design for 2300 ft of NB Santa Fe Drive</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amounts in $1,000s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Water Qty)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,397</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000$)</th>
<th>Facility Name (Cont)</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer's Lake Trailhead</td>
<td>74th Ave adjacent to the South Platte River</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>Littleton Skunk Hollow Regional Water Quality Facility</td>
<td>Design for 2300 ft of NB Santa Fe Drive</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Blvd</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure/Water Quality Facilities</td>
<td>$1,995</td>
<td>I-70 Water Quality Facilities</td>
<td>York St. to Dahlia St.</td>
<td>$1,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**New Project:** Remove the I-70 Escape Ramp project from the CDOT Region 1 Misc/Design Pool (see previous amendment), create a new project, and add $500,000 in federal Freight funding

**New Project**

**Title:** I-70 Escape Ramp

**Project Type:** Safety

**Project Scope**
Design an emergency runaway truck ramp to improve motor vehicle safety for eastbound I-70 between Floyd Hill and Denver West. This segment of I-70 is comprised of steep, mountainous terrain with winding curves and varying shoulder widths between MP 256.71 and 264.32.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Bridge Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Freight Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pavement Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transit Assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transit Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Travel Time Reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Municipality(ies)</th>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (FR8)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Leg)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</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>December 15, 2021</td>
<td>Informational Item</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT**  
Advanced Mobility Partnership (AMP) annual update

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**  
N/A

**ACTION BY OTHERS**  
N/A

**SUMMARY**  
The Advanced Mobility Partnership (AMP) was established in late 2019.¹ This partnership was formalized to support the implementation of the Mobility Choice Blueprint.² Staff from the partner agencies at DRCOG, CDOT, RTD and the Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce have been working alongside stakeholders to begin work on priority tactical actions.³

For information on AMP work over the past year, including an update from the latest collaboration between AMP partner agency staff and the Harvard Kennedy School to conduct a three-part mobility data workshop series, please see the attached deck.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**  
N/A

**PROPOSED MOTION**  
N/A

**ATTACHMENT**  
Annual Update

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**  
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at (303) 480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Emily Lindsey, Transportation Technology Strategist, at 303-480-5626 or elindsey@drcog.org.

---

¹ [https://advancedmobilitypartnership.org](https://advancedmobilitypartnership.org)  
² [https://advancedmobilitypartnership.org/resource__tax_1/mobility-choice-blueprint/](https://advancedmobilitypartnership.org/resource__tax_1/mobility-choice-blueprint/)  
³ [https://advancedmobilitypartnership.org/resource__tax_1/general-resources/](https://advancedmobilitypartnership.org/resource__tax_1/general-resources/)
AMP was established for **partner agencies** and **stakeholders** to **coordinate, collaborate** and **advance transportation technology** in the Denver region in support of the **Mobility Choice Blueprint** (2019).

Supportive of the AMP, there are two groups to support this mission:
- Executive Committee
- Working Group
Regional Collaboration
System Optimization
Shared Mobility
Data Security and Sharing
Mobility Electrification
Driverless Vehicle Preparation
New Transportation Funding
**Shared Mobility**
- Develop a universal mobility app for trip planning and payment.
- Implement curbside management standards.
- Pilot neighborhood-scale mobility hubs.

**System Operations**
- Implement transit priority on all major bus corridors.
- Implement smart traffic signal control technology on all major regional arterial corridors.
- Pilot integrated corridor management on ten arterial corridors.
- Coordinate traffic management center systems and operations.

**Data and Data Sharing**
- Establish a regional mobility data platform.
- Establish data sharing requirements for private sector roadway users.
Mobility data collaboration

Can help us understand how our programs, projects and services relate to **shared goals/outcomes** like:

- Safety
- Equity
- Sustainability
- Access

Can inform and help us collaboratively address some of our **shared challenges** like:

- Data access/availability
- Privacy
- Analysis
- Decision-making
In Spring 2021, staff released three data and data sharing discovery reports in support of regional transportation and mobility related data and data sharing:

1. Discovery Report
2. Case Study Report
3. Stakeholder Survey Report

Available on the AMP website
www.advancedmobilitypartnership.org
Data and Data Sharing Workshop Series

AMP Workshop Series
October – November 2021

- Build on previous work by stakeholders in this area
- Leverage stakeholder knowledge to better understand challenges
- Create consensus around the impact of addressing these challenges
Challenges and Use Cases

Understand how people move throughout the region
- Volumes, travel times, delays, O/D
- Trip behavior and mode choice

Ensure safe mobility and situational awareness
- Crash data improvements
- Real-time operations information

Preparation for new modes
- Partnerships, standards and systems for integration
- Measuring benefits/costs of pilots and new modes
Other items:

- Working Group continues to serve as a **monthly forum for coordination, briefings and discussion** on transportation technology-related efforts in and around the Denver region and has covered topics like:
  - CDOT Statewide Electrification Efforts
  - Xcel Energy Transportation Electrification Plan
  - CDOT Transit Emissions Dashboard
  - RTD AIM Grant
  - Connected Colorado
  - CSU Mobility and Energy Project
  - Transit Priority at RTD
  - CDOT Open GIS
  - RTD Mobility Hub Guidelines
  - City of Aspen Smart Zone Pilot
  - Colorado CarShare
  - CSU Drone Center
Interested in participating or learning more?

Reach out to Emily at elindsey@drcog.org