

**Board Officers**

Jackie Millet, Chair  
Elise Jones, Vice Chair  
Doug Tisdale, Secretary  
Bob Roth, Treasurer  
Sue Horn, Immediate Past Chair  
Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

**AGENDA**  
**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2014**  
**4:00 P.M. – 6:00 P.M.**  
**1290 Broadway**  
**First Floor Independence Pass Conference Room**

1. 4:00 Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call and Introduction of New Members and Alternates
4. \*Motion to Approve Agenda
5. 4:05 Report of the Chair
  - Presentation of Five Year Service Awards
    - Ron Rakowsky, Greenwood Village
    - Joyce Thomas, Federal Heights
    - Jim Benson, Commerce City
    - Val Vigil, Thornton
  - Chair Action to Set Public Hearing
6. 4:15 Report of the Executive Director
7. 4:20 Public Comment

Up to 45 minutes is allocated at this time 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.

**STRATEGIC INFORMATIONAL BRIEFING**

8. 4:40 Metro Vision 2040 – Project Briefing and Review Schedule  
(Attachment A) Brad Calvert

**\*Motion Requested**

**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.

*We make life better!*



### **CONSENT AGENDA**

9. 5:00 \*Move to Approve Consent Agenda  
• Minutes of November 12, 2014  
(Attachment B)

### **ACTION AGENDA**

10. 5:05 \*Move to amend the Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  
Preparation: Procedures for preparing the 2016-2021 TIP to include second phase project selection  
(Attachment C) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations
11. 5:15 \*Move to approve allocation of First Phase funds and the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program First Phase Projects  
(Attachment D) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations
12. 5:25 \*Move to approve an amendment to the 2012-2017 and 2016-2021 Policy on TIP Preparation related to delayed projects  
(Attachment E) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations
13. 5:35 \*Move to adopt the Draft 2015 Policy Statement on State Legislative Issues  
(Attachment F) Rich Mauro, Senior Legislative Analyst

### **INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS**

14. 5:45 Committee Reports  
The Chair requests these reports be brief, reflect decisions made and information germane to the business of DRCOG
- A. Report on State Transportation Advisory Committee – Elise Jones
  - B. Report from Metro Mayors Caucus – Doug Tisdale
  - C. Report from Metro Area County Commissioners– Don Rosier
  - D. Report from Advisory Committee on Aging – Jayla Sanchez-Warren
  - E. Report from Regional Air Quality Council – Joyce Thomas/Jackie Millet
  - F. Report on E-470 Authority – Ron Rakowsky
  - G. Report on FasTracks – Bill Van Meter

### **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

15. Transmittal of Policy on Federal Legislation  
(Attachment G) Rich Mauro, Senior Legislative Analyst
16. Relevant clippings and other communications of interest  
(Attachment H)  
Included in this section of the agenda packet are news clippings which specifically mention DRCOG. Also included are selected communications that have been received about DRCOG staff members.

**\*Motion Requested**

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

17. **Next Meeting –January 21, 2015**
18. Other Matters by Members
19. 6:00 Adjournment

### **SPECIAL DATES TO NOTE**

DRCOG Open House	December 17, 2015
DRCOG Board Orientation	January 22, 2015
DRCOG Board Workshop	February 27/28, 2015
DRCOG Awards Celebration	April 22, 2015

For additional information please contact Connie Garcia at 303-480-6701 or [cgarcia@drcog.org](mailto:cgarcia@drcog.org)

### **CALENDAR OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

#### **December 2014**

16	Regional Transportation Committee	CANCELLED
17	Administrative Committee	CANCELLED
	Board of Directors	<b>4:00</b> p.m.
19	Advisory Committee on Aging	Noon – 3 p.m.
29	Transportation Advisory Committee	1:30 p.m.

#### **January 2015**

7	Metro Vision Issues Committee	4:00 p.m.
16	Advisory Committee on Aging	Noon – 3:00 p.m.
20	Regional Transportation Committee	8:30 a.m.
21	Administrative Committee	6:00 p.m.
	Board of Directors	6:30 p.m.
26	Transportation Advisory Committee	1:30 p.m.

#### **February 2015**

4	Metro Vision Issues Committee	4:00 p.m.
17	Regional Transportation Committee	8:30 a.m.
18	Administrative Committee	6:00 p.m.
	Board of Directors	6:30 p.m.
20	Advisory Committee on Aging	Noon – 3:00 p.m.
23	Transportation Advisory Committee	1:30 p.m.

\*Unless otherwise noted, Administrative Committee meetings will begin at 6:00 p.m.

## Acronym List

\* Denotes DRCOG Program, Committee or Report

AAA	Area Agency on Aging	NARC	National Association of Regional Councils
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
ADA	Americans with Disability Act of 1990	NHPP	National Highway Performance Program
AMPO	Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations	NFRMPO	North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization
APA	American Planning Association	NHS	National Highway System
APCD	Air Pollution Control Division	NOx	Nitrogen oxides
AQCC	Air Quality Control Commission	NWCCOG	Northwest Colorado Council of Governments
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	O&M	Operations and Maintenance
BMPs	Best Management Practices	O <sub>3</sub>	Ozone
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments	P3	Public Private Partnership
CAC	Citizens Advisory Committee	PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Particulates or fine dust less than 2.5 microns in size
CARO	Colorado Association of Regional Organizations	PM <sub>10</sub>	Particulates or fine dust less than 10 microns in size
CBD	Central Business District	PnR	park-n-Ride
CCI	Colorado Counties, Inc.	PPACG	Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments
CDPHE	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment	RAQC	Regional Air Quality Council
CDOT	Colorado Department of Transportation	RAMP	Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance & Partnerships
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations	RFP	Request for Proposal
CM/AQ	Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality	RFQ	Request for Qualifications
CML	Colorado Municipal League	ROD	Record of Decision
CMS	Congestion Management System	ROW	Right-of-way
CO	Carbon monoxide	RPP	Regional Priorities Program
CWA	Clean Water Act	RTC	Regional Transportation Committee*
CWP	Clean Water Plan*	RTD	Regional Transportation District
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise	RTP	Regional Transportation Plan*
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement	SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
DMCC	Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce	SB	Senate Bill
DoLA	Colorado Department of Local Affairs and Development	SCI	Sustainable Communities Initiative
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation	SIP	State Implementation Plan for Air Quality
DRCOG	Denver Regional Council of Governments	SOV	Single-occupant Vehicle
DRMAC	Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council	STAC	State Transportation Advisory Committee
DUS	Denver Union Station	STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
E&D	Elderly and Disabled	STP	Surface Transportation Project (STP-Metro, STP-Enhancement)
EA	Environmental Assessment	TAC	Transportation Advisory Committee*
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	TAP	Transportation Alternatives Program
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zone
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration	TCM	Transportation Control Measures
FCC	Federal Communications Commission	TDM	Transportation Demand Management
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement	TIFIA	Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency	TIP	Transportation Improvement Program*
FWHA	Federal Highway Administration	TLRC	Transportation Legislative Review Committee
FIRE	Firefighter Intraregional Recruitment & Employment*	TMA	Transportation Management Area
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact	TMO/TMA	Transportation Management Organization/Transportation Management Agency
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration	TOD	Transit Oriented Development
FTA	Federal Transit Administration	TPR	Transportation Planning Region
FY	Fiscal Year	TSM	Transportation System Management
GIS	Geographic Information System	TSSIP	Traffic Signal System Improvement Program
HB	House Bill	UGB/A	Urban Growth Boundary/Area
HC	Hydrocarbons	UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program
HOT Lanes	High-occupancy Toll Lanes	V/C	Volume-to-capacity ratio
HOV	High-occupancy Vehicle	VMT	Vehicle Miles of Travel
HUTF	Highway Users Trust Fund	VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds
IGA	Intergovernmental Agreement	WHSRA	Western High Speed Rail Authority
ICMA	International City Management Association	WQCC	Water Quality Control Commission
IPA	Integrated Plan Assessment*	WQCD	Water Quality Control Division (CDPHE)
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act		
ITE	Institute of Traffic Engineers		
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System		
JARC	Job Access/Reverse Commute		
LRT	Light Rail Transit		
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century		
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement		
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding		
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization*		
MVIC	Metro Vision Issues Committee*		
MVITF	Metro Vision Implementation Task Force		
MVPAC	Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee		
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards		



To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director  
(303) 480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcoq.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcoq.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
December 17, 2014	Strategic Informational Briefing	8

#### SUBJECT

Staff will provide a brief update on the process to develop Metro Vision 2040 and outline the upcoming Board input and review process.

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

No action requested. This item is for information.

#### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

#### SUMMARY

The DRCOG Board last adopted a major update to Metro Vision 2035 in February 2011. The effort to update Metro Vision was shaped by 2012 and 2013 Board Workshops. In 2012 the Board directed staff to consult and engage numerous entities as part of the effort to update the process to develop Metro Vision 2040. In 2013 the Board further directed staff to consider new issues not previously included in Metro Vision, such as housing, economic development and community resiliency.

Over the past few years DRCOG staff has continuously engaged the public, stakeholders, and local government staff to lay the foundation for the Metro Vision 2040 plan. The Board also established two new committees with a specific charge to work with staff and advise the Board on the development and implementation of Metro Vision. The Metro Vision Planning Advisory Committee (MVPAC) and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) each have their final meetings in December 2014.

MVPAC, CAC, along with the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) have worked closely with DRCOG staff to develop a draft Metro Vision 2040 plan for Board consideration. MVPAC and TAC will each review a working draft of Metro Vision 2040 at their meetings in December. The Board will see a revised working draft in January 2015 based on final input from MVPAC and TAC. Please see below for an overview of key milestones related to Board input, review and action.

#### Board Review and Input on Metro Vision 2040 - Key Milestones

- Housing and Economic Vitality Ad Hoc Groups – outlines complete
- January 2015 – Working draft transmitted to Board
- February 2015 – MVIC and Board review session #1
- March 2015 – MVIC and Board review session #2
- April 2015 – MVIC and Board review “Public Hearing Draft”
- May 2015 – Public Hearing
- June 2015 – MVIC and Board action

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
------------------------------

The Board adopted a project framework for the Metro Vision 2040 update in May 2011. Further direction was provided during the 2012 and 2013 Board Workshops.

PROPOSED MOTION
-----------------

N/A

ATTACHMENT
------------

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
------------------------

Should you have any questions regarding Metro Vision 2040, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at (303) 480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcog.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcog.org), or Brad Calvert, Metro Vision Manager, at (303) 480-6839 or [bcalvert@drcog.org](mailto:bcalvert@drcog.org).



# ATTACH B

MINUTES  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2014

Members/Alternates Present

Jackie Millet, Chair	City of Lone Tree
Eva Henry	Adams County
Bill Holen	Arapahoe County
Elise Jones	Boulder County
Dennis Harward	City & County of Broomfield
Robin Kniech (Alternate)	City & County of Denver
Crissy Fanganello	City & County of Denver
Roger Partridge	Douglas County
Bob Fifer	City of Arvada
Bob Roth	City of Aurora
Sue Horn	Town of Bennett
Suzanne Jones	City of Boulder
George Teal	Castle Rock
Cathy Noon	City of Centennial
Doug Tisdale	City of Cherry Hills Village
Dan Woog	Town of Erie
Joyce Thomas	City of Federal Heights
Saoirse Charis-Graves	City of Golden
Ron Rakowsky	City of Greenwood Village
Tom Quinn	City of Lakewood
Phil Cernanec	City of Littleton
Gabe Santos	City of Longmont
Ashley Stolzmann	City of Louisville
Joyce Downing	City of Northglenn
John Diak	Town of Parker
Rita Dozal	Town of Superior
Joyce Jay	City of Wheat Ridge
Deborah Perkins-Smith	Colorado Department of Transportation
Bill Van Meter	Regional Transportation District

Others Present: Flo Raitano, Acting Senior Managing Director, Connie Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Coordinator, DRCOG; Joe Fowler, Douglas County; Scott Brink, Mark Westberg, Wheat Ridge; Danny Herrmann, CDOT; Jennifer Cassell, Ed Bowditch, George Dibble, Tomlinson & Assoc.; and DRCOG staff.

Chair Jackie Millet, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Chair Millet introduced Rita Dozal, a new member from Superior.

Move to Approve Agenda

Doug Tisdale **moved** to approve the agenda with two amendments. Agenda item #10 should be moved from the action agenda to an informational item, and

to add an action agenda item for consideration of action on the Wheat Ridge Kipling project. The motion was **seconded**. A friendly amendment was requested that agenda item #13 be moved to the informational briefings. The maker and second accepted the friendly amendment. The motion **passed** unanimously.

#### Report of the Chair

- Chair Millet announced solicitation of nominations for the John V. Christensen Memorial Award, and initiated solicitation of nominations for the Local Government Awards.
- Chair Millet reported that the Administrative Committee appointed Cathy Noon and Roger Partridge to the Nominating Committee.
- Chair Millet asked members to weigh in on changing the time for the December 17 Board meeting to 4 p.m. with an open house for Board members to be held afterwards. There was consensus of the members present to change the time of the December 17 Board meeting.
- Chair Millet reported she attended two SCI conferences on behalf of DRCOG. She noted that DRCOG is perceived as a leader among those attending. She recognized members of the Economic Vitality and Housing ad hoc groups.

#### Report of the Executive Director

- Flo Raitano, Acting Senior Managing Director, provided an update on the Executive Director. She noted that Ms. Schaufele will return to the office on November 19.
- There will not be an Administrative Committee meeting in December.
- Ms. Raitano noted several informational flyers at members' seats for informational purposes.
- Ms. Raitano reported that 2015 is DRCOG's 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. The Awards event will be held on April 22 at the Seawell Ballroom. Additional information will be distributed soon.
- Ms. Raitano noted she attended a meeting with other large MPOs in Washington DC to discuss common issues and best practices. The group is interested in working with Congress on transportation reauthorization.
- The last annual convening of the Housing & Urban Development SCI group will be held the first week of December. Ms. Raitano noted she will be attending this meeting; the purpose is to assist SCI grantees with closing out their grants.

#### Public comment

No public comment was received.

#### Move to approve consent agenda

Doug Tisdale **moved** to amend the consent agenda to remove the 2015 Budget for separate action. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously. Bill Holen **moved** to approve the consent agenda as amended. The motion was **seconded** and **passed unanimously**. Items on the consent agenda include:

- Minutes of September 17, 2014

Doug Tisdale **moved** to approve the 2015 budget with two amendments. Under revenue related to member dues, the number should be revised from \$1,350,400 to the 2014 budget level which is \$1,287,400, a \$63,000 decrease; and expenditures under personnel should be reduced from the level shown by \$63,000, and other changes as necessary related to the totals should be made throughout. The motion was **seconded**. There was discussion.

Doug Tisdale noted that the recommendation is based on discussion at the Administrative Committee. It was pointed out that the Governance committee is in the process of reviewing the dues structure. The Board approved a formula a number of years ago based on population and assessed value. From that formula is derived the dues for each city. The dues were frozen in 2009 and have since been artificially held in place as opposed to adjusting each year. It is recommended to hold the dues at the 2014 level for the time being and amend the budget at a later time to reflect any decision made by the Board related to dues.

After discussion, the motion **passed unanimously**.

Move to appoint two members to the Nominating Committee

Flo Raitano briefly outlined the process for appointing members to the Nominating Committee. Board members will be sent a Statement of Interest form to submit their names to serve as a Board Officer or as a member of the Administrative Committee for members representing municipalities with under 120,000 population. Forms were also available at the meeting. The following individuals volunteered or were nominated to be appointed to the Nominating Committee:

Bill Holen, Arapahoe County; Bob Fifer, Arvada; Suzanne Jones, Boulder; George Teal, Castle Rock; Chris Nevitt, Denver; Gabe Santos, Longmont.

Ballots were distributed, members were asked to select two names. Ballots were counted and the following members were appointed by the Board and the Chair: Suzanne Jones, Gabe Santos, Bob Fifer, and Chris Nevitt.

Move to adopt a resolution approving the DRCOG 2014 Baseline Review and Determination Report

Senior Transit Planner Matthew Helfant provided brief background information on the agenda item. The Baseline Report submitted by RTD contains two substantive changes from the assumptions in the previous DRCOG review and determination. First, completion of the southeast extension moved up to 2019; this change is reflected in the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. Second, the first phase Northwest rail line will not stop at 41<sup>st</sup> and Fox or Pecos Junction stations that are shared with the Gold Line. This operational change will be re-evaluated one year after the opening of the line. Both changes are reflected in the DRCOG model and staff has determined that no Senate Bill 208 action is required. The Transportation Advisory Committee concurred with staff's assessment.

Robin Kniech **moved** to adopt a resolution approving the DRCOG 2014 *Baseline Review and Determination Report*. The motion was **seconded** and **passed unanimously**.

Wheat Ridge Kipling Multi-use Trail project

Joyce Jay, City of Wheat Ridge, and Wheat Ridge staff, provided information to the Board regarding the Wheat Ridge Kipling trail project. The project was delayed a year, and missed the deadline for implementation. Under the Board's current project delay policy, if the implementation plan is not met by the deadline, TIP funding is pulled from the project. The policy states this action is not appealable to the Board. If the Board votes to allow the City to retain the funds it will require a revision to the policy. City staff reported that the project is now ready to go, and are asking the Board to allow them to retain the TIP funding and complete the project.

Members discussed the pros and cons of allowing the project to continue without being subject to the policy, and discussed the policy itself. Some members expressed concern that whenever the Board makes a policy the first time the policy is tested it is changed. Others felt that the Board should be sympathetic to project sponsors and allow the project to continue. A comment was made to differentiate between projects awarded funding that are not progressing and projects that are moving forward but encounter delays. The Chair requested that staff provide some policy language at the December meeting to address the concerns expressed by the Board.

Robin Kniech **moved** to direct staff to come back with policy language to address two components: first, to not require project sponsors to repay federal funds expended in good faith, and second an extension of the time limit for good cause, perhaps with milestones. The motion was **seconded**. There was discussion.

A comment was made that there should be some criteria on which the Board would base a decision as to whether a project is progressing or not.

It was suggested that staff consult with other MPOs on this topic.

A question was asked if the month delay hurt the project. City staff responded that it does not.

A suggestion was made that perhaps the Transportation Advisory Committee could address the issue.

A comment was made that perhaps if a project does have its funding pulled, the policy language could state that the sponsor either may not resubmit the project for funding, or would need to use one of their TIP submittals to resubmit the project.

Joyce Jay noted she appreciates the Board's acknowledgement of the City's efforts.

After discussion, the motion **passed unanimously**.

Amend the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation: Procedures for Preparing the 2016-2021 TIP* to include second phase project selection

Doug Rex briefed the members on prior actions related to TIP project criteria, as well as background on the purpose of second phase project selection. He noted the Metro Vision Issues Committee has been busy working on the criteria for second phase project selection. Mr. Rex outlined the proposed second phase criteria. Members discussed the criteria, specifically the criteria related to County equity. MVIC's current recommendation for showing expenditures is to show DRCOG funds only, for a period of 2008-2019. Staff's recommendation was to show expenditures from all three pots of funds (DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD). The Chair noted that there have been three different recommendations on the topic of equity from the Metro Vision Issues Committee in the past three months. Mr. Rex distributed preliminary tables showing draft equity calculations. Requests were made for staff to prepare tables showing all three pots of funding, and the over and under for each. A request was made to show funding from 2003-2019. It was noted that the Board should have a policy discussion about measuring equity. A suggestion was made to show expenditures for all three pots, for the past 3 TIP funding cycles, with no over/under numbers, just methods for calculating. Some members disagreed with showing all three pots of funding. It was noted that the process should be consistent. Staff will bring information back to the Board in December for action.

Transmittal of *Draft 2015 Policy Statement on State Legislative Issues*

Rich Mauro provided a brief overview of the draft State Legislative Policy Statement. He noted that only one comment was received by staff, regarding development of a state water plan. This item will be added to the draft. The policy statement will be on the December agenda for the Board's action. Mr. Mauro reported that the Governor has included the full \$4 million budget request for seniors in the budget. Mr. Mauro discussed an upcoming initiative to establish an aging task force, and mentioned that the annual Legislative Acquaintance Survey will be coming to members soon. The DRCOG lobbyist team was introduced.

Committee Reports

**State Transportation Advisory Committee** – Elise Jones reported the STAC adopted bylaw changes, and will reschedule their meetings to happen after the Commission Board meetings to have the opportunity to provide information to them before they take action. The group received an update on the Statewide Transportation Plan. The needs and gap analysis shows a revenue shortfall of \$20 billion. The State Legislative agenda on transportation is expected to be light. SB 228 funding estimates show a drop in revenue; a list of projects will be put together in case funding becomes available.

**Metro Mayors Caucus** – Doug Tisdale reported the MMC received a report from the Science and Cultural Facilities District, which comes up for reauthorization in 2016. A discussion occurred on Tax Increment Financing. Members of MMC and Metro Area County Commissioners will form a group to come up with language for a single bill for the upcoming legislative session. A discussion on Owner Occupied Attached Housing occurred, with legislation expected in the upcoming session. The MMC and MACC

Legislative Reception will occur on December 10. Phil Cernanec reported the MMC also received a presentation on a 25-city coordinated effort to address homelessness.

**Metro Area County Commissioners** – Roger Partridge reported in addition to the items mentioned in the MMC report, the MACC received a presentation from auditors and assessors and treasurers related to upcoming legislation.

**Advisory Committee on Aging** – Jayla Sanchez-Warren reported the AAA is beginning a new four-year plan cycle. The State Unit on Aging will impose new performance based measures on the AAAs. Discussion occurred about senior housing options.

**Regional Air Quality Council** – Jackie Millet noted the RAQC adopted their 2015 Work Plan. There will be changes in January 2015 to the car inspection/maintenance program; the details are posted on the website.

**E-470 Authority** – Ron Rakowsky reported a contract was signed for oil drilling on E470 property; the revenue will be used to pay down bond debt. Two new water tanks will be built on E470 property. Progress has been made on capturing rental car tags to bill for tolls.

**FasTracks** – Bill Van Meter reported the RTD Board approved a budget amendment to add funds for the North Metro Project, and the FasTracks Monitoring Committee approved a series of four contract amendments for public information, quality support, materials inspection and program support for contractors in support of FasTracks.

Next meeting – **December 17, 2014, at 4 p.m.** There will be an open house for Board members and alternates following the meeting.

Other matters by members

No other matters were discussed.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

---

Jackie Millet, Chair  
Board of Directors  
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

---

Flo Raitano, Acting Senior Managing Director

**ATTACH C**



To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director  
303 480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcoq.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcoq.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
December 17, 2014	Action	10

#### SUBJECT

Amendment to the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation: Procedures for preparing the 2016-2021 TIP* to reflect recommended second phase selection criteria by MVIC.

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Consider amending the 2016-2021 TIP Policy document to include second phase project selection criteria.

#### ACTION BY OTHERS

MVIC — [November 5, 2014](#)  
[October 1, 2014](#)

TAC — [October 27, 2014](#)

#### SUMMARY

##### Background

TIP projects selected as part of the 2016-2021 call for projects will be selected in two phases. In the first phase, projects are selected directly from the score-ranked lists of funding requests by project type. A maximum of 75 percent of available funds will be programmed in first phase. The remaining 25 percent of funds are programmed in second phase and will consider other criteria in addition to project score.

At its July meeting, the Board approved the Policy on Transportation Improvement Preparation (aka TIP Policy) which is being used as the basis for selecting projects for the 2016-2021 TIP. As part of its deliberations, staff informed the Board that second phase criteria was not part of their action and will be amended into the TIP Policy document later this fall per MVIC and Board actions.

##### Second Phase Criteria

Since August, MVIC has been actively engaged with developing proposed criteria that will ultimately be used to guide second phase project selection. At its November meeting, MVIC formalized its recommendation to amend the 2016-2021 TIP Policy to include the second phase criteria shown below.

MVIC also recommends grouping second phase criteria into two tiers in order to place additional emphasis during deliberations on (i) Very Small Communities and (ii) County Funding Equity Status and Ratio. The remaining five criteria would be recognized as Tier 2.

**MVIC Recommended Second Phase Criteria (Nov 5, 2014)**

<b>Tier 1</b>	
<b>Very Small Communities</b>	Projects submitted by communities with less than \$10 million in annual net sales tax value (based on the most recent data from the CO Dept. of Revenue).
<b>County Funding Equity Status and Ratio</b>	A calculation comparing the amount of dollars programmed within a county to the percent contribution from each county. A county's financial equity shall be considered "even" if its estimated percentage of programmed expenditures is within 10 percentage points of its computed percentage of contributions.
Contribution Variables:	Population, employment, vehicle miles traveled, and disbursements from the state Highway Users Trust Fund (HUTF) (all weighted equally).
Expenditure Variables:	DRCOG programmed funds (2008-2019) only.
<b>Tier 2</b>	
<b>TIP Score Points</b>	Total project points from first phase selection.
<b>Multi-Jurisdictional Projects</b>	Projects that cross the geographic boundary of two or more DRCOG jurisdictions. Note if jurisdictions were funding partners.
<b>Projects Not Eligible in First Phase</b>	Projects types (Studies and Other Enhancement) only eligible in second phase.
<b>Number of Sponsor Projects Selected in First Phase</b>	The number of sponsor projects selected in first phase will be noted. The amount of funds awarded in first phase and the total number of projects submitted by the sponsor will also be noted.
<b>First-Last Mile Connection</b>	<p>Projects that expand the quality of access to transit [rail or BRT stations, park-N-ride lots, transit terminals (all currently open on or before 2025), and existing bus stops].</p> <p>The facility/service must be safe, intuitive and universally accessible. Projects must provide a connection to a destination (residential development, school, office, shopping, dining, park, recreational facility) or fill a gap connecting to a destination within a one mile buffer from a transit property.</p> <p><u>Eligible project types include:</u></p> <p>Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects      Project physically touches a transit property or stop or eliminates a barrier that impedes patrons from accessing transit.</p> <p>Roadway Capacity, Roadway Operational Improvement, and Roadway Reconstruction projects      Project must include bike (e.g. bike path, multi-use path) and/or pedestrian facilities that physically touch transit or eliminate a barrier that impedes patrons from accessing transit.</p> <p>Transit Services Projects      Shuttle/Circulator projects that services transit</p>

Additional Information on County Funding Equity Status and Ratio

Per the Board's request at its November meeting, staff has attached for your consideration, the following four funding equity table scenarios that have been discussed by DRCOG committees over the past several months:

Scenario	TIP Expenditure Source(s)	Time Period of Analysis	Recommendation
1	DRCOG only	2008-2019	MVIC (11/5/14)
2	DRCOG, CDOT, RTD	2008-2019	RTC (11/18/14)
3	DRCOG only	2003-2019	TAC (10/27/14)
4	DRCOG, CDOT, RTD	2003-2019	DRCOG Staff (9/14/14)

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**

DRCOG Board – [November 12, 2014](#)

**PROPOSED MOTIONS**

Move to amend the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation: Procedures for preparing the 2016-2021 TIP* to include second phase project selection criteria.

**ATTACHMENT**

County Funding Equity Status and Ratio Scenarios

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or [jschuafele@drcog.org](mailto:jschuafele@drcog.org); or Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations at 303-480-6747 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org)

**Scenario #1**  
**(2008-2019 DRCOG Only)**  
**Draft Equity Calculations for Second Phase Selection of the 2016-2021 TIP**  
**Expenditures vs. County Revenue Contributions**

	(all figures in \$1,000s)								
<b>TIP Expenditures</b> (DRCOG Only)	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Denver	Douglas	Jefferson	Weld	Regional Total
<i>DRCOG Programmed Historic Funds</i>									
<b>2008-2011</b>	\$43,169	\$35,695	\$23,106	\$37,249	\$69,395	\$8,530	\$21,088	\$2,600	\$240,832
<i>DRCOG Programmed for 2012-2015</i>									
<b>for 2012-2015</b>	\$62,116	\$27,706	\$37,414	\$29,368	\$58,984	\$11,586	\$35,925	\$100	\$263,199
<i>DRCOG Selected for 2016-2019*</i> (1st Phase and other Commitments)									
	\$7,465	\$35,822	\$12,926	\$452	\$71,647	\$1,487	\$29,164	\$144	\$159,107
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$112,750</b>	<b>\$99,223</b>	<b>\$73,446</b>	<b>\$67,069</b>	<b>\$200,026</b>	<b>\$21,603</b>	<b>\$86,177</b>	<b>\$2,844</b>	<b>\$663,138</b>
<b>Expenditures as a % of the Regional Total</b>	<b>17.0%</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Contribution as a % of the Regional Total</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>19.2%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>23.4%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Expenditure % / Contribution %</b>	<b>110%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>110%</b>	<b>513%</b>	<b>129%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>22%</b>	
<b>Equity Status</b>	<b>Even</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Even</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Under</b>	

\* Subject to change. Includes First Phase projects recommended by MVIC at its 12/10/14 meeting. It also includes the following "Other Commitments" and "Set-Asides" that can be geographically attributed to counties at this point in time: \$25 million for I-70 East, \$320,000 per eligible TMA for regional partnerships, \$827,000 for Northglenn's 112th Ave Corridor Improvements (2012-079), \$1,542,000 for Commerce City's 72nd/Colorado Station Sidewalks (2012-080), and \$955,000 for Longmont's SH-119 South of Hover Underpass (2012-051))

**Scenario #2**  
**(2008-2019 DRCOG/CDOT/RTD)**

**Draft Equity Calculations for Second Phase Selection of the 2016-2021 TIP**  
**Expenditures vs. County Revenue Contributions**

	(all figures in \$1,000s)								
<b>TIP Expenditures</b> (DRCOG, CDOT, & RTD)	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Denver	Douglas	Jefferson	Weld	Regional Total
<i>All Historic TIP Funds</i> (Fed+State+RTD) <b>2008-2011</b>	\$361,028	\$214,351	\$269,052	\$88,976	\$1,430,738	\$94,068	\$832,140	\$2,600	\$3,292,953
<i>CDOT Programmed</i> <b>2012-2015</b>	\$281,738	\$139,712	\$105,428	\$77,178	\$390,656	\$61,523	\$175,173	\$28,622	\$1,260,030
<i>RTD Programmed</i> <b>2012-2015</b>	\$428,039	\$342,865	\$54,060	\$38,160	\$423,636	\$6,773	\$153,455	\$0	\$1,446,988
<i>DRCOG Programmed</i> <b>2012-2015</b>	\$62,116	\$27,706	\$37,414	\$29,368	\$58,984	\$11,586	\$35,925	\$100	\$263,199
<b>DRCOG Selected for 2016-2019*</b> (1st Phase and other Commitments)	\$7,465	\$35,822	\$12,926	\$452	\$71,647	\$1,487	\$29,164	\$144	\$159,107
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,140,386</b>	<b>\$760,456</b>	<b>\$478,880</b>	<b>\$234,134</b>	<b>\$2,375,661</b>	<b>\$175,437</b>	<b>\$1,225,857</b>	<b>\$31,466</b>	<b>\$6,422,277</b>
<b>Expenditures as a % of the Regional Total</b>	<b>17.8%</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Rev. Contribution as a % of the Regional Total</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>24.8%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Expenditure % / Contribution %</b>	<b>118%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>178%</b>	<b>149%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>106%</b>	<b>27%</b>	
<b>Equity Status</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Even</b>	<b>Under</b>	

\* Subject to change. Includes First Phase projects recommended by MVIC at its 12/10/14 meeting. It also includes the following "Other Commitments" and "Set-Asides" that can be geographically attributed to counties at this point in time: \$25 million for I-70 East, \$320,000 per eligible TMA for regional partnerships, \$827,000 for Northglenn's 112th Ave Corridor Improvements (2012-079), \$1,542,000 for Commerce City's 72nd/Colorado Station Sidewalks (2012-080), and \$955,000 for Longmont's SH-119 South of Hover Underpass (2012-051))

**Scenario #3**  
**(2003-2019 DRCOG Only)**  
**Draft Equity Calculations for Second Phase Selection of the 2016-2021 TIP**  
**Expenditures vs. County Revenue Contributions**

	(all figures in \$1,000s)								
<b>TIP Expenditures</b> (DRCOG Only)	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Denver	Douglas	Jefferson	Weld	Regional Total
<i>DRCOG Programmed Historic Funds</i>									
<b>2003-2011</b>	\$59,577	\$65,928	\$63,959	\$50,847	\$92,784	\$2,814	\$43,688	\$2,600	\$382,197
<i>DRCOG Programmed for 2012-2015</i>									
<b>for 2012-2015</b>	\$62,116	\$27,706	\$37,414	\$29,368	\$58,984	\$11,586	\$35,925	\$100	\$263,199
<i>DRCOG Selected for 2016-2019*</i> (1st Phase and other Commitments)									
	\$7,465	\$35,822	\$12,926	\$452	\$71,647	\$1,487	\$29,164	\$144	\$159,107
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$129,158</b>	<b>\$129,456</b>	<b>\$114,299</b>	<b>\$80,667</b>	<b>\$223,415</b>	<b>\$15,887</b>	<b>\$108,777</b>	<b>\$2,844</b>	<b>\$804,503</b>
<b>Expenditures as a % of the Regional Total</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>27.8%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Contribution as a % of the Regional Total</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>19.2%</b>	<b>10.1%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>23.4%</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>18.6%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Expenditure % / Contribution %</b>	<b>104%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>141%</b>	<b>509%</b>	<b>119%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>18%</b>	
<b>Equity Status</b>	<b>Even</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Under</b>	

\* Subject to change. Includes First Phase projects recommended by MVIC at its 12/10/14 meeting. It also includes the following "Other Commitments" and "Set-Asides" that can be geographically attributed to counties at this point in time: \$25 million for I-70 East, \$320,000 per eligible TMA for regional partnerships, \$827,000 for Northglenn's 112th Ave Corridor Improvements (2012-079), \$1,542,000 for Commerce City's 72nd/Colorado Station Sidewalks (2012-080), and \$955,000 for Longmont's SH-119 South of Hover Underpass (2012-051))

**Scenario #4**  
**(2003-2019 DRCOG/CDOT/RTD)**

**Draft Equity Calculations for Second Phase Selection of the 2016-2021 TIP**  
**Expenditures vs. County Revenue Contributions**

	(all figures in \$1,000s)								
<b>TIP Expenditures</b> (DRCOG, CDOT, & RTD)	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Denver	Douglas	Jefferson	Weld	Regional Total
<i>All Historic TIP Funds</i> (Fed+State+RTD) <b>2003-2011</b>	\$547,759	\$773,276	\$400,895	\$127,574	\$2,606,671	\$371,691	\$983,752	\$2,600	\$5,814,218
<i>CDOT Programmed</i> <b>2012-2015</b>	\$281,738	\$139,712	\$105,428	\$77,178	\$390,656	\$61,523	\$175,173	\$28,622	\$1,260,030
<i>RTD Programmed</i> <b>2012-2015</b>	\$428,039	\$342,865	\$54,060	\$38,160	\$423,636	\$6,773	\$153,455	\$0	\$1,446,988
<i>DRCOG Programmed</i> <b>2012-2015</b>	\$62,116	\$27,706	\$37,414	\$29,368	\$58,984	\$11,586	\$35,925	\$100	\$263,199
<b>DRCOG Selected for 2016-2019*</b> (1st Phase and other Commitments)	\$7,465	\$35,822	\$12,926	\$452	\$71,647	\$1,487	\$29,164	\$144	\$159,107
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,327,117</b>	<b>\$1,319,381</b>	<b>\$610,723</b>	<b>\$272,732</b>	<b>\$3,551,594</b>	<b>\$453,060</b>	<b>\$1,377,469</b>	<b>\$31,466</b>	<b>\$8,943,542</b>
<b>Expenditures as a % of the Regional Total</b>	<b>14.8%</b>	<b>14.8%</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>39.7%</b>	<b>5.1%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Rev. Contribution as a % of the Regional Total</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	<b>19.4%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>24.8%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Expenditure % / Contribution %</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>149%</b>	<b>160%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>20%</b>	
<b>Equity Status</b>	<b>Even</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Over</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Under</b>	<b>Under</b>	

\* Subject to change. Includes First Phase projects recommended by MVIC at its 12/10/14 meeting. It also includes the following "Other Commitments" and "Set-Asides" that can be geographically attributed to counties at this point in time: \$25 million for I-70 East, \$320,000 per eligible TMA for regional partnerships, \$827,000 for Northglenn's 112th Ave Corridor Improvements (2012-079), \$1,542,000 for Commerce City's 72nd/Colorado Station Sidewalks (2012-080), and \$955,000 for Longmont's SH-119 South of Hover Underpass (2012-051))

**ATTACH D**



To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director  
303 480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcog.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
December 17, 2014	Action	11

#### SUBJECT

This action concerns the *2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* First Phase projects.

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Approve the 2016-2021 TIP First Phase Projects and allocation of remaining First Phase funding to Second Phase as recommended by MVIC.

#### ACTION BY OTHERS

MVIC – December 10, 2014

#### SUMMARY

##### Background

Requests for federal funding in the 2016-2021 TIP were submitted to DRCOG on or before September 19, 2014. A total of \$573 million in federal funds was requested. It is estimated \$178 million will be available for funding the requests after all off-the-top commitments and set-aside programs are honored.

DRCOG staff has reviewed the entire list of projects submitted for DRCOG-selected funding (CMAQ, STP-Metro, and TAP) in the 2016-2021 TIP for eligibility, completeness, and scoring.

In accordance with TIP Policy, a peer review panel was convened to assist in review of DRCOG staff interpretation of scoring criteria and subsequent adjustments. The scoring review panel met on November 13 and raised no objections to DRCOG staff's application of adopted criteria to eligible projects. Each sponsor was notified of the scoring adjustments and given an opportunity to ask questions of DRCOG staff on the changes.

Staff then assigned projects for First Phase by project type and final adjusted scores, until the established funding targets were reached. Projects recommended by MVIC for funding in First Phase are shown in green in Table 1. As with past TIPs, staff contacted sponsors if a project next in line on the list for each project type exceeded the target available and asked if they would accept a lower federal amount. If they accepted, the difference between the amount available and their original federal request was placed back into the list for Second Phase consideration (shown in blue).

Table 1 also reveals an unallocated amount of \$7.8 million available as a result of funding targets not being met in several project types. The Board is asked to decide if this amount should be rolled over to Second Phase, which has historically been done, or redistribute within First Phase. If the decision is to rollover (recommended by MVIC), it will increase the amount available in Second Phase to \$51.5 million.

TAC also reviewed the First Phase list at its December 1 meeting and had no objections to the projects included.

#### Next Steps

DRCOG staff will work with TAC at its December 29 meeting to develop Second Phase project funding scenarios. On January 7, MVIC will consider the Second Phase scenarios and recommend projects to be funded in the TIP to the Board. Table 2 outlines the funding available for Second Phase.

The draft 2016-2021 TIP is scheduled to be released for public review following the January DRCOG Board meeting. A public hearing will be held on February 18, 2015. TIP adoption is anticipated to take place in March 2015.

#### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

#### PROPOSED MOTIONS

Move to approve the 2016-2021 TIP First Phase projects and approve the allocation of remaining First Phase funds to second phase.

#### ATTACHMENTS

Table 1 - 2016-2021 TIP: Projects Selected for First Phase; Eligible for Second Phase  
Table 2 - 2016-2021 TIP Funding Control Totals and Targets

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or [jschuafele@drcog.org](mailto:jschuafele@drcog.org); or Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations, at 303 480-6747 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org).

Table 1: Preliminary Projects Selected in Phase I, Eligible for Phase II

12/11/2014

Legend

	Selected in First Phase	Grand Total Phase I ("75%")	\$131,118
	Partially Funded in First Phase (Remaining Shown)	Total Unallocated Balance (moves to Phase II)	\$7,791
	Eligible for Second Phase	Total Funding Available in Phase II	\$51,497

Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

(First Phase Target- \$20,979)

Agency	Project Title	COG ID	Funding Request	Project Score	1st Phase Funded	Running Cost
Aurora	N - Toll Gate Creek Trail: Chambers Rd to Montview Ave	Aura-2014-001	\$5,683	89.9	\$5,683	\$5,683
Aurora	N - Metro Center Station Area Bike/Ped Connector Facility	Aura-2014-003	\$1,832	85.6	\$1,832	\$7,515
Aurora	N - Westerly Creek Trail to Toll Gate Creek Trail Connector	Aura-2014-014	\$8,507	82	\$8,507	\$16,022
Lakewood	N - Multi-Use Path on D-10: Wadsworth Blvd to Zephyr St and Kipling St to Oak St	Lakw-2014-003	\$1,920	79.3	\$1,920	\$17,942
Univ of Col - Boulder	N - East Campus Bridge and Trail Connection	UoCB-2014-004	\$386	76.7	\$386	\$18,328
Boulder	N - Boulder Slough Path: 30th St to 3100 Pearl	Bldr-2014-007	\$480	75.3	\$480	\$18,808
Aurora	N - 23rd Ave Bike/Ped Path at Fitzsimons Station	Aura-2014-004	\$1,492	74	\$1,492	\$20,300
Boulder	N - 30th St/Colorado Ave Bike/Ped Underpass	Bldr-2014-016	\$6,000	73.7		\$26,300
Superior	N - Superior Trail: McCaslin BRT Station to Coal Creek	Supr-2014-002	\$600	72.2		\$26,900
Univ of Col - Boulder	N - 19th Street Trail and Bridge	UoCB-2014-002	\$4,798	70.5		\$31,698
Boulder	U - SH-157/Foothills Pkwy Underpass at Colorado Ave	Bldr-2014-009	\$3,200	68.3		\$34,898
Denver	U - South Platte Greenway Access: Iowa Ave RR Underpass to Santa Fe Dr	Denv-2014-024	\$1,704	68		\$36,602
Denver	U - South Platte Greenway/Cherry Creek Trail: Confluence Bridge Upgrades	Denv-2014-025	\$7,980	68		\$44,582
Univ of Col - Boulder	N - 19th St and 21st St Bridges and Trails	UoCB-2014-003	\$7,305	67.6		\$51,887
Arvada	U - W 57th Ave Sidewalks: Independence St to Balsam St	Arvd-2014-034	\$628	67.2		\$52,515
Denver	N - Peoria Station Multi Use Path: 39th Ave to 44th Ave	Denv-2014-026	\$1,950	66.9		\$54,465
Wheat Ridge	N - Kipling St Multi-Use Trail: 32nd Ave to 44th Ave	WhRd-2014-006	\$2,240	66.9		\$56,705
Denver	U - 1st Ave/Steele St Multimodal Improvements: 1st Ave to Colorado Blvd	Denv-2014-035	\$5,254	66.3		\$61,959
Lakewood	N - Sheridan Blvd Bike Path: 6th Ave to 10th Ave	Lakw-2014-006	\$2,720	66.1		\$64,679
Denver	N - 38th St/Marion St/Walnut St Multimodal Improvements: Walnut St to Lawrence St/Downing St	Denv-2014-028	\$2,131	65.6		\$66,810
Boulder	N - Skunk Creek Bike/Ped Underpass at Moorehead Ave	Bldr-2014-002	\$2,640	65.4		\$69,450
Denver	N - Sheridan Station Sidewalks: 8th to 10th/Colfax to 17th	Denv-2014-027	\$1,972	64.7		\$71,422
Aurora	N - 6th Ave Bike/Ped Facility: Vaughn St to Del Mar Circle	Aura-2014-011	\$4,674	64.2		\$76,096
Boulder County	N - 71st Street Multimodal Pathway: Winchester Circle to Idylwild Trail	BICo-2014-006	\$860	64		\$76,956
Arvada	U - Independence St Sidewalks: W 50th Ave to W 57th Ave	Arvd-2014-029	\$1,665	63.1		\$78,621
Golden	N - Washington Ave Complete Streets	Gold-2014-001	\$3,045	63.1		\$81,666
Wheat Ridge	N - 32nd Ave Bike Lanes: Sheridan Blvd to Youngfield St	WhRd-2014-007	\$4,000	62.5		\$85,666
Superior	N - Superior Trail: McCaslin BRT to Davidson Mesa Underpass	Supr-2014-007	\$800	62.4		\$86,466
Westminster	N - Walnut Creek Trail: 103rd Ave to 106th Ave	West-2014-003	\$8,280	62		\$94,746
Boulder	U - SH-157/Foothills Pkwy Bike/Ped Underpass at Sioux Dr	Bldr-2014-010	\$3,440	61.2		\$98,186
Lone Tree	N - Lincoln Ave Pedestrian Bridge: West of Heritage Hill Circle	Ltre-2014-001	\$1,500	59		\$99,686
Arvada	N - Ridge/Reno Rd Mixed-use Trail: Garrison St to Allison St	Arvd-2014-018	\$1,442	58.7		\$101,128
Boulder County	N - Butte Mill Multimodal Connection: Valmont Path to Arapahoe Rd Transit	BICo-2014-007	\$312	57.9		\$101,440
Denver	N - 38th/Blake Station: 35th St Multimodal Improvements: Wazee St to S Platte Greenway Trail	Denv-2014-030	\$3,479	57.9		\$104,919
Boulder County	N - Williams Fork Trail Multi-use Path	BICo-2014-008	\$632	57.8		\$105,551
Lafayette	N - East Lafayette Multimodal Path: Commerce Ct to Lafayette PnR	Lafa-2014-005	\$999	56.3		\$106,550
Boulder	N - 28th St/US-36: Fourmile Canyon to Yarmouth Ave Multi-Use Path	Bldr-2014-005	\$4,880	55.2		\$111,430
Cherry Hills Village	N - High Line Canal Trail Underpass: Hampton and Colorado Version 1 (80/20)	CHVi-2014-001	\$4,320	55.1		\$115,750
Cherry Hills Village	N - High Line Canal Trail Underpass: Hampton and Colorado Version 2 (75/25)	CHVi-2014-002	\$4,050	55.1		\$119,800
Boulder	N - Table Mesa Dr Bike/Ped Underpass	Bldr-2014-001	\$3,840	54		\$123,640
Parker	N - Parker Rd Sidewalk Connection: Plaza Dr to Sulphur Gulch Trail	Park-2014-001	\$504	53.8		\$124,144
Jefferson County	N - US-6 Shared-use Path: Colfax Ave to Johnson Rd	JfCo-2014-001	\$589	53.6		\$124,733
Arvada	U - W 60th Ave Bike/Ped Facilities: Tennyson St to Sheridan Blvd	Arvd-2014-030	\$1,378	52.8		\$126,111
Arvada	N - W 52nd Ave Bike/Ped Facilities: Marshall St to Vance St	Arvd-2014-004	\$687	52.2		\$126,798
Arapahoe County	N - Yale Ave/Holly St/Highline Canal Trail Pedestrian and Roadway Improvements	ApCo-2014-009	\$1,470	51.5		\$128,268
Douglas County	N - C-470 Multi-use Trail Grade Separation at Yosemite St	DgCo-2014-002	\$2,000	51.4		\$130,268
Parker	N - Parker Road Sidewalk Connection: Twenty Mile Road to Indian Pipe Ln	Park-2014-003	\$541	49		\$130,809
Arvada	N - Little Dry Creek Bike/Ped Grade Separation	Arvd-2014-017	\$2,873	48.7		\$133,682
Denver	U - High Line Canal Trail Underpass: Parker Rd and Mississippi Ave	Denv-2014-033	\$3,201	48.6		\$136,883
Nederland	N - Middle Boulder Creek Bridge Project	Nedl-2014-002	\$726	48.1		\$137,609
Boulder	N - Bear Creek Canyon Bike/Ped Underpass	Bldr-2014-003	\$4,480	47.5		\$142,089
Boulder	N - Fourmile Canyon Creek: 19th St to Violet Ave Bike/Ped Facilities	Bldr-2014-006	\$5,298	46.4		\$147,387
Arvada	N - Alkire St Pedestrian Bridge	Arvd-2014-001	\$2,039	42.8		\$149,426
Erie	N - Coal Creek Extension: Reliance Park to Erie Village	Erie-2014-009	\$1,480	39.4		\$150,906
Erie	N - Coal Creek Trail Extension: Reliance Park to Kenosha Rd	Erie-2014-003	\$1,840	36.5		\$152,746
Nederland	U - Lakeview Dr/SH-72 Intersection Operational Improvements	Nedl-2014-001	\$467	35.9		\$153,213
Longmont	N - County Line Rd Bike Shoulders: 9th Ave to SH-66	Long-2014-006	\$1,360	34.5		\$154,573
Lyons	N - US36 (Broadway) and SH-7 (5th Ave) Bike/Ped Facilities	Lyon-2014-001	\$1,309	34.1		\$155,882
Westminster	U - 72nd Ave Sidewalk Reconstruct: Stuart St to Xavier St	West-2014-002	\$3,360	33.6		\$159,242
Jefferson County	N - 32nd Ave Bike/Ped Facilities: Alkire St to Eldridge St	JfCo-2014-002	\$1,113	31.1		\$160,355
Boulder County	N - Isabelle Rd Shoulders: N 95th St to N 109th St	BICo-2014-002	\$1,418	26.4		\$161,773
Erie	U - Pedestrian Underpass at Coal Creek Crossing	Erie-2014-007	\$320	25		\$162,093
Erie	N - County Line Road Bike Shoulders: Evans St to SH-52	Erie-2014-005	\$1,760	20.6		\$163,853
Jefferson County	N - McIntyre St Bike/Ped Facilities: 32nd Ave to SH-58	JfCo-2014-003	\$824	20.4		\$164,677
Lakewood*	N - Multi-Use Path on D-10: Wadsworth Blvd to Zephyr St	Lakw-2014-002	\$0	76.2		\$164,677
Lakewood*	N - Multiuse Path on D-10: Kipling St to Oak St	Lakw-2014-001	\$0	70.7		\$164,677
Wheat Ridge*	N - Wadsworth Blvd Multi-use Trail: 44th Ave to Clear Creek Trail	WhRd-2014-008	\$0	59.8		\$164,677
N- New Project		Unallocated Funds				\$679
U- Upgrade/Reconstruction Project						

\*Wheat Ridge project is removed based on assumed funding for their Roadway Capacity project  
\*Lakewood's projects are removed based on assumed funding for their Bike/Ped project

Transit Service Projects

(First Phase Target- \$7,867)

Agency	Project Title		Funding Request	Project Score	1st Phase Funded	Running Cost
R T D	E - MetroRide Service Expansion: DUS to Civic Center	RDT-2014-003	\$1,200	92.5	\$1,200	\$1,200
Boulder County	E - L Route Service Enhancement	BICo-2014-012	\$1,664	91	\$1,664	\$2,864
Boulder County	E - FLEX - Route Extension: Longmont to Boulder	BICo-2014-013	\$1,156	86	\$1,156	\$4,020
Univ of Col - Denver	N - Anschutz Medical Campus Shuttle Service	UoCD-2014-004	\$1,509	78.7	\$1,509	\$5,529
Superior	N - Superior Call-n-Ride	Supr-2014-006	\$423	77.4	\$423	\$5,952
Broomfield	N - Broomfield Call-n-Ride	BfCo-2014-002	\$369	73.6	\$369	\$6,321
Longmont	E - RTD Route #324 Frequency Improvements	Long-2014-004	\$1,176	71.4	\$1,176	\$7,497
Commerce City	E - Route 73 Extension: Smith Rd Station to 60th Ave and Dahlia St	CoCy-2014-002	\$1,355	65.6		\$8,852
N- New Service Project		Unallocated Funds				\$370
E - Expanded Service Project						

Transit Passenger Facilities Projects

(First Phase Target- \$3,934)

Agency	Project Title		Funding Request	Project Score	1st Phase Funded	Running Cost
R T D	Colfax 15L Improvements: Potomac St to I-25	RTD-2014-001	\$2,600	92	\$2,600	\$2,600
		Unallocated Funds				\$1,334



Table 1: Preliminary Projects Selected in Phase I, Eligible for Phase II

Legend	
	Selected in First Phase
	Partially Funded in First Phase (Remaining Shown)
	Eligible for Second Phase

Roadway Capacity Projects (First Phase Target- \$49,825)

Agency	Project Title		Funding Request	Project Score	1st Phase Funded	Running Cost
Wheat Ridge	Wadsworth Blvd Widening: 35th Ave to 48th Ave	WhRd-2014-001	\$25,280	83.1	\$25,280	\$25,280
Denver	SB I-25 On-Ramp and Broadway Reconstruct: Exposition Ave to Kentucky Ave	Denv-2014-007	\$17,373	82.0	\$17,373	\$42,653
Denver	Martin Luther King Jr Blvd Extension: Havana St to Peoria St	Denv-2014-001	\$8,500	71.5	\$7,172	\$49,825
Denver	Martin Luther King Jr Blvd Extension: Havana St to Peoria St (Remaining Amount)	Denv-2014-001	\$1,328	71.5		\$51,153
Douglas County	US-85: Highlands Ranch Pkwy to Blakeland Dr Capacity Improvements	DgCo-2014-003	\$15,000	65.4		\$66,153
Lone Tree	Ridgegate Pkwy Widening: Havana St to Lone Tree City Limits	Ltre-2014-002	\$6,400	61.1		\$72,553
Douglas County	US-85: Blakeland Dr to County Line Rd Capacity Improvements	DgCo-2014-004	\$15,000	60.8		\$87,553
Denver	56th Ave Widening: Chambers Rd to Pena Blvd	Denv-2014-012	\$9,800	58.3		\$97,353
Douglas County	County Line Rd: Phillips Ave to University Blvd Capacity Improvements	DgCo-2014-001	\$6,000	57.4		\$103,353
Thornton	104th Ave Widening: Grandview Ponds to S Platte River	Thor-2014-001	\$8,040	54.2		\$111,393
Commerce City	88th Ave Widening: I-76 to Hwy 2	CoCy-2014-003	\$28,809	50.0		\$140,202
Aurora	6th Ave/Pkwy Extension: Liverpool St to E-470	Aura-2014-008	\$13,918	45.3		\$154,120
Unallocated Funds						\$0

Roadway Operational Improvement Projects (First Phase Target- \$28,846)

Agency	Project Title		Funding Request	Project Score	1st Phase Funded	Running Cost
Denver	Quebec St Operational Improvements: 13th Ave to 26th Ave	Denv-2014-034	\$11,500	87.8	\$11,500	\$11,500
Arapahoe County	Iliff Ave Corridor Operational Improvements: Parker Rd to Quebec St	ApCo-2014-004	\$21,238	83.8	\$17,346	\$28,846
Arapahoe County	Iliff Ave Corridor Operational Improvements: Parker Rd to Quebec St (Remaining Amount)	ApCo-2014-004	\$3,892	83.8		\$32,738
Douglas County	US-85 Operational Improvements: Blakeland Dr to County Line Rd	DgCo-2014-005	\$15,000	76.4		\$47,738
Denver	Colfax Ave Transit Enhancements: 7th St near I-25 to Yosemite	Denv-2014-011	\$12,004	63.8		\$59,742
Arapahoe County	Gun Club Rd and Quincy Ave Operational Improvements	ApCo-2014-003	\$6,350	61.5		\$66,092
Castle Rock	Founders Pkwy and Allen Way Intersection Operational Improvements	CRck-2014-001	\$2,638	59.4		\$68,730
Aurora	Parker Rd/Quincy Ave/Smoky Hill Rd Operational Improvements	Aura-2014-005	\$4,492	56.9		\$73,222
Lakewood	Alameda Ave Operational Improvements: Vance St to Pierce St	Lakw-2014-007	\$1,150	55.0		\$74,372
Westminster	Sheridan Blvd Operational Improvements: 87th Ave to US-36	West-2014-001	\$5,600	53.3		\$79,972
Aurora	Airport Blvd-Buckley Rd/Alameda Pkwy Intersection Operational Improvements	Aura-2014-006	\$1,664	53.1		\$81,636
Louisville	Hwy 42/96th St Corridor Operational Improvements: Pine St to S Boulder Rd	Lou-2014-003	\$8,837	53.0		\$90,473
Lafayette	South Boulder Rd and 119th/120th St Operational Improvements	Lafa-2014-007	\$2,665	50.5		\$93,138
Arvada	SH-72 at W 72nd Ave Intersection Operational Improvements	Arvd-2014-002	\$5,406	49.0		\$98,544
Louisville	Highway 42/96th St Corridor Operational Improvements: Lock St to Pine St	Lou-2014-001	\$4,178	46.5		\$102,722
Louisville	Hwy 42/96th St Corridor Operational Improvements: S Boulder Rd to Paschal Dr	Lou-2014-004	\$4,840	44.6		\$107,562
Denver	Quebec St Operational Improvements: Sandown Rd/40th Ave to I-70	Denv-2014-022	\$4,290	44.4		\$111,852
Castle Rock	Plum Creek Pkwy and Wilcox St Intersection Operational Improvements	CRck-2014-003	\$1,730	43.4		\$113,582
Aurora	Peoria St Operational Improvements: Fitzsimons Pkwy to North of Sand Creek	Aura-2014-007	\$11,874	43.0		\$125,456
Castle Rock	Founders Pkwy and Crowfoot Valley Rd Intersection Operational Improvements	CRck-2014-002	\$2,042	34.4		\$127,498
Erie	County Line Road Operational Improvements: Bonnel Ave to Erie Pkwy	Erie-2014-001	\$3,240	31.0		\$130,738
Erie	County Line Road Operational Improvements: Erie Pkwy to Telleen Ave	Erie-2014-002	\$2,640	30.0		\$133,378
Lafayette	Hwy 7 and 119th St Operational Improvements	Lafa-2014-006	\$1,510	29.9		\$134,888
Erie	County Line Road Operational Improvements: Telleen Ave to Evans St	Erie-2014-004	\$2,200	24.0		\$137,088
Broomfield *	Dillon Rd Operational Improvements: 120th St to Sheridan Pkwy (ROW and CON only)	BfCo-2014-003	\$0	57.5		\$137,088
Broomfield *	Dillon Rd Operational Improvements: 120th St to Sheridan Pkwy (40% match)	BfCo-2014-004	\$0	56.9		\$137,088
Broomfield *	Dillon Rd Operational Improvements: 120th St to Sheridan Pkwy (30% match)	BfCo-2014-001	\$0	56.2		\$137,088
Denver *	Quebec St/Colfax Ave Intersection Operational Improvements	Denv-2014-003	\$0	76.6		\$137,088
Wheat Ridge *	Wadsworth Blvd Operational Improvements: 41st Ave to 46th Ave	WhRd-2014-004	\$0	86.4		\$137,088
Wheat Ridge *	Wadsworth Blvd Operational Improvements: 39th Ave to 44th Ave	WhRd-2014-003	\$0	72.6		\$137,088
Wheat Ridge *	Wadsworth Blvd Operational Improvements: 35th Ave to 41st Ave	WhRd-2014-002	\$0	72.5		\$137,088
Wheat Ridge *	Wadsworth Blvd Operational Improvements: 44th Ave to 48th Ave	WhRd-2014-005	\$0	51.3		\$137,088
Unallocated Funds						\$0

\*Wheat Ridge projects (Wadsworth) are removed based on assumed funding for their Roadway Capacity project  
\*Denver's Colfax/Quebec project is removed based on assumed funding for the Quebec: 13th to 26th project  
\*Broomfield's Dillion Rd project (all match variations) were determined to be ineligible

Roadway Reconstruction Projects (First Phase Target- \$19,668)

Agency	Project Title		Funding Request	Project Score	1st Phase Funded	Running Cost
Arvada	Ralston Rd Reconstruction: Brentwood St to Upham St	Arvd-2014-035	\$1,903	57.7	\$1,903	\$1,903
Boulder	Broadway Reconstruction: Violet Ave to US-36	Bldr-2014-004	\$6,225	56.9	\$6,225	\$8,128
Castle Rock	Meadows Pkwy Reconstruction: US-85 to Meadows Blvd	CRck-2014-004	\$1,333	46.5	\$1,333	\$9,461
R T D*	16th St Mall Reconstruction: Arapahoe St to Lawrence St	RTD-2014-004	\$4,799	17.0	\$4,799	\$14,260
Unallocated Funds						\$5,408

\*PCI can't be calculated due to unique surface materials allowed by the TIP Policy

Studies (No Funding in First Phase) (No Funding in First Phase)

Agency	Project Title		Funding Request	Project Score	1st Phase Funded	Running Cost
Bennett	Hwy 79 and Hwy 36 Grade Separation: FA and Design Study	Benn-2014-001	\$1,176	N/A	N/A	\$1,176
Boulder County	SH-7 BRT Study: Boulder to Brighton	BfCo-2014-015	\$200	N/A	N/A	\$1,376
Centennial	Arapahoe Rd: I-25 to Parker Next Steps Operations Study	Cent-2014-001	\$400	N/A	N/A	\$1,776
Commerce City	Industrial Area Transportation Study: I-25 to I-270 to 40th Ave/Smith Rd	CoCy-2014-004	\$700	N/A	N/A	\$2,476
Commerce City	Vasquez Access Study: I-270 to Hwy 2/US-85	CoCy-2014-005	\$180	N/A	N/A	\$2,656
Commerce City	88th Ave NEPA Study: I-76 to Hwy 2	CoCy-2014-006	\$150	N/A	N/A	\$2,806
Erie	Erie Pkwy Study: SH-287 to I-25	Erie-2014-006	\$160	N/A	N/A	\$2,966
Lakewood	Wadsworth: Ohio Ave to 285 PEL	Lakw-2014-004	\$1,600	N/A	N/A	\$4,566
Lakewood	JeffCo Bike Wayfinding Study	Lakw-2014-008	\$120	N/A	N/A	\$4,686
Longmont	SW Longmont Subarea Operations Study	Long-2014-001	\$300	N/A	N/A	\$4,986
Longmont	Design: Oligarchy Ditch Trail/Main St Underpass: Mountain View Ave to 21st Ave	Long-2014-007	\$160	N/A	N/A	\$5,146
Parker	Parker Road Transportation and Land Use Plan	Park-2014-005	\$125	N/A	N/A	\$5,271
R A Q C	Ozone SIP Modeling Study	RAQC-2014-002	\$480	N/A	N/A	\$5,751
R T D	Regional BRT Feasibility Study	RTD-2014-002	\$1,200	N/A	N/A	\$6,951
R T D	SH-119 BRT NEPA Analysis: Boulder to Longmont	RTD-2014-005	\$1,000	N/A	N/A	\$7,951
R T D	83L Enhancements: Downtown Civic Center to Nine Mile	RTD-2014-006	\$800	N/A	N/A	\$8,751

Other Enhancements Projects (No Funding in First Phase) (No Funding in First Phase)

Agency	Project Title		Funding Request	Project Score	1st Phase Funding	Running Cost
Lyons	US-36 (Broadway St) and SH-7 (5th Ave) Street Enhancements	Lyon-2014-002	\$1,309	N/A	N/A	\$1,309

**Table 2**  
**Draft - 2016-2021 TIP Funding Control Totals and Targets**  
(\$1,000s of federal \$)

12/11/2014

	2016	2017	2018	2019	4-Year Total
<b>Control Total Funding Levels</b>					
<b>STP-Metro Control Totals</b>	\$29,847	\$30,146	\$30,447	\$30,751	\$121,191
<i>PLUS: Carryover Funds from FY15</i>	\$10,000				\$10,000
<b>CMAQ Control Totals</b>	\$25,733	\$26,876	\$32,163	\$32,485	\$117,257
<i>PLUS: Carryover Funds from FY15</i>	\$8,161				\$8,161
<b>TAP Control Totals</b>	\$2,565	\$2,591	\$2,618	\$2,645	\$10,419
<b>Grand Total Available:</b>	<b>\$76,306</b>	<b>\$59,613</b>	<b>\$65,228</b>	<b>\$65,881</b>	<b>\$267,028</b>
<b>Off-the-Top Commitments (Metro and CMAQ Only):</b>					
I-70 East Viaduct Reconstruction		\$6,000	\$9,000	\$10,000	\$25,000
First FasTracks Commitment	\$4,000	\$4,000			\$8,000
Second FasTracks Commitment (est.)	\$6,000	\$5,591			\$11,591
Prior TIP Project Commitment (Carry Over)	\$5,504	\$1,470			\$6,974
<i>Commitments Sub-total:</i>	<i>\$15,504</i>	<i>\$17,061</i>	<i>\$9,000</i>	<i>\$10,000</i>	<i>\$51,565</i>
<b>Set-Asides / Programs (Metro and CMAQ Only):</b>					
DRCOG Way-To-Go Program	\$3,600		\$3,600		\$7,200
Regional TDM Pool - Regional Partnerships	\$1,120		\$1,120		\$2,240
Regional TDM Pool - Marketing & Infrastructure	\$2,080		\$2,080		\$4,160
Regional Transportation Operations	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$4,200	\$16,800
<i>PLUS: Carryover Funds from FY15</i>	\$639				\$639
Air Quality Pool	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$1,800	\$7,200
STAMP/Urban Center Plans	\$600	\$600	\$600	\$600	\$2,400
<i>Set-Asides Sub-total:</i>	<i>\$14,039</i>	<i>\$6,600</i>	<i>\$13,400</i>	<i>\$6,600</i>	<i>\$40,639</i>
<b>= Remaining for Call For Projects</b>	<b>\$46,763</b>	<b>\$35,952</b>	<b>\$42,828</b>	<b>\$49,281</b>	<b>\$174,824</b>
<b>First Phase (75% of Remaining):</b>	<b>\$35,072</b>	<b>\$26,964</b>	<b>\$32,121</b>	<b>\$36,961</b>	<b>\$131,118</b>
<i>First Phase Selection Targets:</i>					
Roadway Capacity - 38%	\$13,327	\$10,246	\$12,206	\$14,045	\$49,825
Roadway Operational - 22%	\$7,716	\$5,932	\$7,067	\$8,131	\$28,846
Bicycle/Pedestrian - 16%	\$5,612	\$4,314	\$5,139	\$5,914	\$20,979
Roadway Reconstruction - 15%	\$5,261	\$4,045	\$4,818	\$5,544	\$19,668
Transit Service - 6%	\$2,104	\$1,618	\$1,927	\$2,218	\$7,867
Transit Passenger Facilities - 3%	\$1,052	\$809	\$964	\$1,109	\$3,934
<b>Second Phase Selection (25% of Remaining)</b>	<b>\$11,691</b>	<b>\$8,988</b>	<b>\$10,707</b>	<b>\$12,320</b>	<b>\$43,706</b>

Grand Total Available      \$76,306      \$59,613      \$65,228      \$65,881      \$267,028

Total to Program in Call For Projects      \$46,763      \$35,952      \$42,828      \$49,281      \$174,824

12/11/2014

**ATTACHE**

To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director  
303 480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcog.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
December 17, 2014	Action	12

#### SUBJECT

This item concerns the Board's request to consider amending TIP Policy related to project delays.

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommend an amendment to the TIP Policy relating to project delays.

#### ACTION BY OTHERS

TAC – [December 1, 2014](#)

#### SUMMARY

Current TIP policy (2012-2017 and 2016-2021) establishes that a project programmed in the TIP is delayed when a phase, as identified during the project submittal and contained within the TIP project descriptions, has not been initiated in the identified funding year. If, in the following year, the sponsor fails to achieve initiation of the delayed phase, the project will be automatically deleted from the TIP and the sponsor is required to reimburse all federal funds expended on the project. Furthermore, the action cannot be appealed to the DRCOG Board.

At its November meeting, the DRCOG Board, in response to a discussion about a Wheat Ridge project that faces the removal of funds, requested staff work with TAC to prepare a recommendation for the Board's consideration to modify TIP Policy relating to project delays. Specifically, the Board was interested in revising the language to:

- 1) provide an opportunity for appeal to the Board;
- 2) allow an opportunity for a variance of TIP policy in the event a project has unforeseen issues or is close to, but could not meet the imposed deadline; and
- 3) remove the requirement that the sponsor would have to reimburse federal funds expended on the project.

The joint staff/TAC recommendation is provided as Attachment 1 for your review and consideration.

#### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

DRCOG Board – [November 12, 2014](#)

#### PROPOSED MOTION

Move to approve an amendment to the 2012-2017 TIP Policy and 2016-2021 TIP Policy related to delayed projects.

#### ATTACHMENTS

1. TAC recommended TIP Policy language for project delays
2. Current TIP Policy language for project delays

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcog.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcog.org); or Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations, at 303 480-6747 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org).

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **Staff/TAC recommended TIP Policy language for project delays**

December 1, 2014

If, in the following year, the sponsor fails to achieve initiation of the delayed phase by October 15<sup>th</sup>, OR has breached the Board conditions placed upon that delay, the project's federal funding will be automatically suspended. The sponsor may appeal at the next available Board meeting to explain the reasons why the delayed phase has not been initiated. Upon hearing the appeal, the Board has the following options:

1. Deny the request. The sponsor shall stop all future reimbursement payment requests beyond September 30<sup>th</sup>.
2. Allow a variance, if the Board believes good faith efforts and progress has been made by the sponsor to advance the delayed project phase. The sponsor would be granted (on a case-by-case basis) an extension to initiate the delayed phase. If the sponsor is unable to abide by the conditions of the Board variance, the sponsor shall stop all future reimbursement payment requests beyond September 30<sup>th</sup>. The length of the extension shall be no greater than 120 days from October 1<sup>st</sup>.

If the sponsor decides not to appeal to the Board at its next available meeting, the sponsor must return all unspent federal funds allocated to the delayed project. In subsequent contracts with any sponsor that has experienced a deletion of a project due to such delay, RTD or CDOT may include a "termination for performance" clause.



## ATTACHMENT 2

### Current TIP Policy language for project delays

#### **2012-2017 TIP Policy** (pg. 14) Adopted March 16, 2011

If, in the following year, the sponsor fails to achieve completion of the particular phase or entire project that encountered the one year delay, OR has breached the one year delay Board conditions, the project will be automatically deleted from the TIP (and the sponsor required to reimburse all federal funds expended on the project). This action cannot be appealed to the DRCOG Board. In subsequent contracts with any sponsor that has experienced a deletion of a project due to such delay, RTD or CDOT may include a “termination for performance” clause.

#### **2016-2021 TIP Policy** (pg. 12) Adopted July 16, 2014

If, in the following year, the sponsor fails to achieve initiation of the delayed phase, OR has breached the Board conditions placed upon that delay, the project will be automatically deleted from the TIP and the sponsor is required to reimburse all federal funds expended on the project. This action cannot be appealed to the DRCOG Board. In subsequent contracts with any sponsor that has experienced a deletion of a project due to such delay, RTD or CDOT may include a “termination for performance” clause.



To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director  
303-480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcog.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
November 12, 2014	Informational Item	13

#### SUBJECT

This item concerns transmittal of the *Draft 2015 Policy Statement on State Legislative Issues*.

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

The draft document is provided for review and comment.

#### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

#### SUMMARY

Each year, the Board adopts two policy statements on a range of specific state and federal legislative issues. These documents provide the DRCOG Board, staff and lobbyists with policy direction on legislative issues during the coming year.

This year, the changes in the state legislative policy statement are proposed to clarify the intent of a particular policy, use more precise language or otherwise update a statement to better reflect current practice.

The *Draft 2015 Policy Statement on State Legislative Issues* is provided now to give Board members and their staff sufficient time to review its contents before the Board considers and acts on the document in December. If you have suggested changes to the draft, you are encouraged to contact staff prior to the December 4, 2014. Action to approve the document will be requested at the December Board meeting.

#### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

The Board adopted the *2013 Policy Statement on State Legislative Issues* at its January 2013 meeting. The Board outlined the principles guiding the conduct of DRCOG's Legislative Program in a statement adopted in 1982 and readopted in 2001.

#### PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

#### ATTACHMENT

Legislative Principle Statement  
Draft 2015 Policy Statement on State Legislative Issues

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Should you have any questions regarding the draft policy statement, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcog.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcog.org), or Rich Mauro, Senior Legislative Analyst, at (303) 480-6778 or [rmauro@drcog.org](mailto:rmauro@drcog.org).

## **PRINCIPLES GUIDING DRCOG LEGISLATIVE POSITIONS**

**As adopted by the DRCOG Board of Directors December 1982  
And revised February 17, 1988, January 16, 1991 and January 17, 2001**

The Denver Regional Council of Governments' federal and state Legislative Program is defined by the character of the Denver region and the concerns of its local governments. The Denver region constitutes a unique area as distinguished from the rest of the state because its member governments comprise a large and highly urbanized population.

In the Denver region, the regional council, organized as a voluntary association of county and municipal governments, is the only regional spokesman for these entities. Due to DRCOG's regional character and local government orientation, the council is the appropriate forum for regionally focused legislative activity.

This self-imposed limitation to regional issues is reinforced by the activities of two other organizations, the Colorado Municipal League (CML) and Colorado Counties, Inc. (CCI). As statewide associations of municipal and county governments respectively, their interests are correspondingly broad. As a consequence, they address the entire range of local government issues before the state legislature, state executive and regulatory agencies, and the federal government. Both associations generally avoid issues that are unique to an individual community or region.

In addition to regional issues, DRCOG is concerned with issues that affect the organization or its programs. The organization assumes the responsibility for identifying and promoting the regional interest in its various fields of planning and management to state and federal legislative and administrative bodies.

It is not the policy of the Legislative Program to address all legislative/administrative issues of interest to local governments generally. Support of or opposition to a bill or legislative funding measure will be given, and be subject to reassessment, according to the bill's or measure's consistency with DRCOG's adopted principles, policies and plans. Where appropriate, DRCOG will strive to collaborate with other organizations representing local government(s), such as CCI and CML.

DRCOG's legislative activity generally will be focused on the following types of issues:

1. Proposals of special significance to the Denver region;
2. Proposals that would have a unique effect upon local governments in this region;
3. Proposals that affect DRCOG as an agency or which would affect one or more of its programs.

# Denver Regional Council of Governments

## Policy Statement on State Legislative Issues for 2015

### Introduction

This paper outlines the key state policy issues of the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG). It identifies policy positions intended to inform the General Assembly, state executive branch officials and others as they develop and implement state policy on these issues. This policy statement guides positions and actions taken by the DRCOG Board, its staff and members during the 2015 state legislative session.

DRCOG is a membership organization of local elected officials representing 48 municipalities and nine counties in the Denver metropolitan region. Under federal law, the DRCOG serves as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) coordinating transportation planning with air quality goals, and serves as the Area Agency on Aging in eight counties to aid the 60+ population. Under state statutes, DRCOG, as the regional planning commission, prepares and adopts a regional plan for the metro area and has a regional responsibility for oversight of transit projects and certain state-sponsored and private toll road projects.

### ***Regional Planning and Development***

**Regional Planning.** Regional growth and development is of significant concern for metro area citizens and community leaders. A sustainable region balances economic vitality, prosperity, and social wellbeing as expressed by a high standard of living for the region's residents. As a regional planning commission under Section 30-28-105, DRCOG prepares the region's long-range plan for growth and development, transportation, and environmental quality. The regional *Metro Vision* plan describes a vision for the future and policies to guide local growth decisions.

*Metro Vision* is the policy basis for all of DRCOG's programs and serves as the framework and context in which the regional council collaborates with other organizations on issues of mutual interest. **DRCOG supports those efforts that implement *Metro Vision* and encourages state and regional entities to align their policies and investment decisions with *Metro Vision* and other regional agreements to advance common objectives.**

***Metro Vision* establishes several regional goals, as summarized below, and DRCOG may support or oppose legislative proposals based on consistency with these goals.**

### **Growth and Development Goals**

- Ensure urban development occurs within an urban growth boundary/area to promote a more orderly, compact and efficient future development pattern.
- Achieve at least a ten percent increase in overall regional density between 2000 and 2035.

- Locate 50% of new housing and 75% of new employment between 2005 and 2035 in designated urban centers throughout the region. While each urban center will be unique, all urban centers will:
  - Be active, pedestrian-, bicycle- and transit-friendly places that are more dense and mixed in use than surrounding areas;
  - Allow people of all ages, incomes and abilities to access a range of housing, employment and service opportunities without sole reliance on having to drive;
  - Promote regional sustainability by reducing per capita vehicle miles traveled, air and water pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and water consumption; and respect and support existing neighborhoods.
- Promote development patterns and community design features to meet the needs of people of all ages, incomes and abilities. Pay particular attention to the needs of older adults, which represent the fastest growing segment of the population
- Maintain Boulder, Brighton, Castle Rock and Longmont as distinct and self-sufficient freestanding communities, and more clearly define and support the regional role of rural town centers.
- Minimize the extent of low density, large lot (semi-urban) development.
- Limit the total amount of semi-urban development in 2035 to a proportion that does not exceed the current proportion of all households in the region, which is estimated to be approximately 3 percent.

### **Transportation Goals**

- Provide safe, environmentally sensitive, efficient and sustainable mobility choices for people and goods, integrated with land use, while supporting the following goals:
  - Increase the rate of construction of alternative transportation facilities
  - Reduce the percent of trips to work by single occupant vehicles (SOV) to 65% by 2035
  - Reduce regional per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) 10% by 2035
  - Reduce annual per capita greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector by 60% by 2035

### **Environment Goals**

- Establish an integrated, linked, permanent parks and open space system that is accessible to all of the region's residents.
- Protect additional parks and open space as the population grows to maintain the current amount per capita with a goal to protect a minimum of 880 total square miles of parks and open space by 2035.
- Reduce regional per capita municipal and industrial water use.
- Achieve and maintain ambient air quality standards and ensure clean water to protect human health and environmental quality.
- Minimize exposure to excessive noise levels associated with land use and transportation services.

**Transit-Oriented Development.** The citizens of the Denver metropolitan region have a very large financial commitment to expand the rail transit system. To maximize the benefit of this investment, the areas surrounding existing and future transit stations

should be developed or redeveloped to include appropriate higher-density, mixed-use, pedestrian- and bicycle-oriented development that supports transit use. **DRCOG supports legislative initiatives that foster transit-oriented development, including but not limited to: a) providing RTD with the ability to manage its park and ride facilities using best practices that help the region reduce VMT; b) expanding the ability of RTD and local governments to enter into joint-development agreements; and c) protecting local authority to use tax-increment financing to leverage development in areas around transit stations.**

**Regional Planning Agreements.** Following the adoption of *Metro Vision*, the local government members of DRCOG collaboratively developed the Mile High Compact, a unique intergovernmental agreement, created as an implementation tool for *Metro Vision*. In 2015 the Mile High Compact will celebrate its 15<sup>th</sup> anniversary. While the compact is a regional planning agreement, it reinforces the role of local planning by committing local governments to use their comprehensive/master plans as the primary tool for growth and development decisions in their communities.

The signers of the compact agreed that their comprehensive/master plans will follow the specific principles and contain the specific elements outlined in the compact and will ensure consistency between local plans and between local plans and *Metro Vision*.

**DRCOG supports the following goals as a framework for future regional planning agreements and may support or oppose legislative proposals based on consistency with these goals:**

- Establishment of a process to adopt a regional planning agreement by the local governments,
- Include the public in the development of the agreement,
- Focus on regional goals and plans to accomplish those goals for transportation, land use, housing, environmental quality and utility facilities,
- Make local plans consistent with the agreement, and
- Reevaluate and amend the agreement as needed.

**Dispute Resolution.** Implementation of *Metro Vision* and the Mile High Compact relies on the collaborative efforts of the region's local governments. DRCOG recognizes neighboring communities may find themselves at odds over issues such as the intended use of adjacent lands. In addition, local governments may find themselves in conflict with state and federal agencies over the intended use of land within their jurisdiction. **DRCOG supports alternative dispute resolution techniques, such as facilitation and mediation, to resolve disputes among governments. Legal action in such disputes should be a matter of last resort rather than the initial form of remedy.**

**Local Land Use Authority and Planning.** Local comprehensive/master plans provide a framework for the exercise of local land use authority. They form the basis for local growth and development decisions. **DRCOG supports the use of comprehensive/master plans as the foundation for local land use decision-making.**

~~**Subdivision Exemptions.** State subdivision statutes [C.R.S. 30-28-101(10)] currently exempt the division of land into parcels 35 acres or larger from local subdivision regulations. County governments have been concerned about this 35-acre exemption because it limits their ability to effectively manage development. **DRCOG supports the elimination or modification of the 35-acre exemption.**~~

~~**Obsolete Subdivisions.** Historical town sites and substandard subdivisions platted prior to the establishment of local comprehensive plans and land development regulations create special problems for local governments. The parcels within these subdivisions often are much smaller than what would be allowed under current plans and regulations, and roadways and other infrastructure often are inadequate. Local governments already are empowered to address some concerns with obsolete subdivisions, such as requiring lot consolidation before issuing a septic system permit and allowing property owners to voluntarily vacate lot lines or even entire plats. However, enhanced statutory authority would be required for local governments to use other planning techniques, such as requiring the consolidation of lots in single ownership or imposing special impact fees. **DRCOG supports efforts to give local governments more authority in regulating obsolete subdivisions.**~~

**Private Property Rights.** DRCOG respects private property rights within a legal context that protects local land use authority and emphasizes that governmental actions often add value to private property. While acknowledging that there are concerns over a potential for inappropriate uses of that authority, DRCOG believes that U.S. Supreme Court decisions defining constitutional restrictions on local government regulation of private property are adequate to protect both public and private rights. When these restrictions are coupled with established precedents of the Colorado Supreme Court, protections accorded to landowners are reasonable, appropriate and balanced. Therefore, **DRCOG opposes further restrictions on the ability of governmental entities to regulate private property for the benefit of the public and opposes takings and eminent domain legislation that goes beyond the existing rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court and the Colorado Supreme Court as an attempt to unconstitutionally restrict local land use authority.**

**Planning Data and Technical Support.** DRCOG recognizes the importance of unbiased, reliable and consistent data in effective local and regional planning and decision-making. DRCOG also collaborates with the state to provide a variety of planning and technical assistance services to small communities. **DRCOG encourages the General Assembly and state agencies to support these efforts and any other efforts that would provide local governments with planning tools, technical assistance and other resources needed to enhance local and regional decision-making. DRCOG supports legislation that ensures readily available access to public data sets, including digital data, for use in planning analysis.**

**Housing.** An adequate supply and mix of housing options continues to be a concern of local governments. The affordable housing shortage is particularly acute near major employment centers and in transit station areas, causing increased transportation



impacts, as workers have limited transportation options and must commute longer distances from housing they can afford. **DRCOG supports the following principles pertaining to the quality, quantity and affordability of housing in the Denver metro area:**

- Regional approaches to addressing the affordable housing issue that incentivize local efforts, particularly as they relate to preservation of existing affordable housing stock.
- An adequate supply of permanently affordable housing located near job and transit hubs and continued public- and private sector support for such an effort.
- Increased state financial support for loan and grant programs for low- and moderate-income housing.
- Collaboration among public and private entities, including efforts to develop loan programs and address the jobs-housing connections.
- Actions to provide more accessible and obtainable housing options for seniors.

**Tax Structure.** Vibrant urban centers and transit-oriented development are key elements of the Metro Vision plan. Successful development in these areas requires collaboration along major transit corridors and throughout the region. Competition among local governments for tax revenues is detrimental to effective collaboration. **DRCOG supports changes to tax structures that minimize harmful competition and that support inter-jurisdictional collaboration.**

### ***Transportation***

**Transportation Planning.** Federal law mandates a critical role for the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in the transportation planning process. Congress has emphasized the importance of local government involvement, through the designated regional planning agency, in selecting projects and prioritizing funding for transportation. To reinforce this role at the state level, **DRCOG supports the process, established between DRCOG, the Regional Transportation District (RTD) and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) to address the following issues before final adoption of the Statewide Transportation Plan and will evaluate state legislative and administrative actions for consistency with this process:**

- The distribution of estimated future transportation revenues and the range of certainty regarding estimated funding allocations;
- Rules and criteria for determining regional transportation project selection, including system preservation projects as well as immediate and future transportation priorities based on the Regional Transportation Plan; and
- A dispute resolution process to mediate disputes related to these requirements.

The synergy between transportation and land use affects the region's growth and development, use of transportation facilities and environmental quality. A coordinated approach between the state and regional transportation systems planning efforts and local project development is crucial to ensure environmental compatibility, efficient

system performance and cost-effective solutions. Although individual local governments can take actions to address these issues in their own jurisdictions, a regional approach to addressing them also is necessary. **DRCOG supports early and frequent consultations between state, regional and local agencies to coordinate region-wide system and project planning efforts, as well as to coordinate transportation, land use and air quality planning efforts. DRCOG will evaluate state legislative and administrative actions for consistency with this policy.**

**Role of the MPO.** The interdependence of transportation systems in metropolitan areas, particularly in the context of population growth and its demands on resources, necessitates a regional approach to transportation problem solving. As the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Denver metro region, DRCOG is responsible for planning and programming funds for a multimodal transportation system. The role of the MPO and the importance of cooperation among transportation agencies are recognized in federal law and regulation. The MPO serves as the forum for collaborative decision-making on regional transportation issues. The MPO brings together decision-makers from local governments, other regional agencies and state transportation agencies to consider strategic and innovative solutions to regional transportation issues.

The critical role of the MPO needs to be recognized and supported at the state level. Consensus between state and regional transportation agencies also is critical. **DRCOG supports the following principles with regard to the role of the MPO:**

- Transportation planning that is coordinated between DRCOG, CDOT, the Regional Transportation District and affected local communities, with each participating transportation agency's plan recognizing the region's priorities in the context of statewide transportation priorities.
- A strong role for MPOs placing MPOs on equal footing with CDOT and applicable regional transit agencies in selecting projects to be funded to ensure that local, regional and state transportation needs are met in a coordinated and cooperative manner.
- Legislation that reinforces collaboration between state and regional transportation agencies and recognizes their respective roles, responsibilities and interests.
- Legislation to ensure that representation on the Transportation Commission reflects approximately equal populations based on the most recent population census.

**Transportation Financing.** Colorado and the Denver metro area face serious funding shortages for meeting their transportation needs. Regional and statewide analyses show existing revenue sources are inadequate to maintain current infrastructure, let alone address congestion in urban and recreational areas, provide multimodal options desired by the public, address needs in agricultural and energy-impacted areas, and assure safe travel throughout the state. The region's long-term economic vitality requires a built environment that supplies effective and functional transportation and infrastructure systems. Colorado and the metro area need a revenue system that is reliable and sufficient. Thus, enhancements to existing revenue sources and the enactment of new, revenue sources are necessary.

**DRCOG supports the following principles and actions to meet transportation financing needs:**

- Increase funding for transportation to preserve the system, address congestion and safety, and provide multimodal options for people of all ages, incomes and abilities.
- Eliminate “Off-the-Top” appropriations from the Highway Users Tax Fund.
- Consider alternative revenue and financing mechanisms, such as VMT-based fees, pay-as-you-drive insurance, and under certain circumstances, tolling and congestion pricing of existing roadways.
- Provide a share of increased revenues back to local governments.
- Consider the impacts of land use decisions on the needs for transportation infrastructure.
- Protect and expand the authority of regions to implement regional financing tools.
- Use tolls as a financing mechanism for public roads or highways with the conditions that (1) any road, highway, or tolled lanes in the Denver metro region or that impact the Denver metro region are reviewed and approved by the DRCOG Board for inclusion in the fiscally constrained regional transportation plan; (2) toll receipts remain in the toll highway system within the region that is tolled; and (3) toll receipts are allowed to be used for multimodal improvements and accumulated for system reconstruction.
- Allocate existing and new federal and state funds to achieve funding equity statewide based on justified needs (system preservation, congestion and multimodal options) and contribution to overall revenues. DRCOG and the Transportation Commission have worked under a Memorandum of Understanding to accomplish this goal since 2004. As that MOU has expired, DRCOG will initiate discussions with CDOT to formulate a new funding agreement. DRCOG recognizes some potential funding mechanisms under consideration by the state may be appropriate for allocation to the entire statewide system. DRCOG believes that other mechanisms, including tolls, VMT fees, and taxes on lodging, to name a few, may be more appropriately returned to the region of generation.
- Reexamine state formulas and procedures to ensure an adequate amount of federal and state funds are made available to urbanized areas to relieve congestion and achieve and maintain air quality standards.
- Consider revising the responsibilities for maintenance and supervision of the non-NHS portions of the entire current state highway system, subject to the condition that any devolution to local governments be accompanied by the funding necessary to avoid unfunded mandates and pursuant to review by, and consent of, affected local and regional agencies.

**Multimodal Transportation.** Efforts to address transportation needs in the region must draw upon an array of transportation modes to reduce single-occupant vehicle demand and to provide a variety of transportation choices. DRCOG strongly believes multimodal solutions to transportation problems are imperative to preserve and enhance our quality of life. **DRCOG supports legislation that promotes efforts to create and fund a multimodal transportation system. DRCOG also supports measures to improve**

**safety for users of alternative modes, especially pedestrians and bicyclists.**

**DRCOG supports funding for programs that provide transportation for “access to jobs” for low-income workers who cannot afford to live near where they work, and for safe routes to schools.**

**Coordination of Regional and Statewide Transportation Efforts.** The DRCOG area generates a significant number of trips throughout the state of Colorado. At the same time, Coloradans from all over the state travel to and through the metro area. Coordination of transportation planning and funding efforts between DRCOG and neighboring COG’s, TPR’s and coalitions, especially in the primary north-south (I-25) and east-west (I-70) corridors will provide mobility and economic benefits not just for the DRCOG region but for the entire state. Regional consensus through the existing planning processes is critical for defining large scale projects in the state’s major transportation corridors, establishing their priorities, and broadening the base for their funding. **DRCOG supports regional and statewide efforts at such consensus building and will work to pursue multimodal transportation solutions. DRCOG supports using the regional and statewide transportation planning processes to explore and identify transportation solutions and will evaluate state legislative and administrative actions for consistency with this policy.**

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM).** TDM programs can help reduce congestion and improve air quality by decreasing the amount of automobile traffic during high-demand periods. DRCOG sees TDM as an important element of the region’s long-range growth management and transportation planning strategy. **DRCOG supports the following principles and programs to promote TDM efforts:**

- Telecommuting, flextime and other changes to normal work patterns to avoid peak traffic conditions.
- Carpooling, vanpooling, and schoolpooling and infrastructure that facilitates these transportation options.
- Non-automobile infrastructure created by the state, counties and cities.
- Employer promotion of alternative mode use by their employees.
- Coordination of transportation alternatives wherever traffic congestion may occur, such as at schools, large retail shopping centers, and in connection with sporting or cultural events or major transportation infrastructure construction.
- Incentives to individuals who use alternative modes.
- Limiting the liability of rideshare agencies and others who promote or provide alternative transportation services.

**Effective Management of the Transportation System.** Efforts to promote the effective day-to-day, operational management of the freeway and arterial road systems and transit facilities are important to making the best use of existing transportation investments. **DRCOG supports approaches that make use of the roadways and transit facilities more efficient, including programs for incident management and Intelligent Transportation Systems. DRCOG supports efforts that improve or expand real-time traveler information.**

**Transportation and Older Adults and Persons with Disabilities.** Access to transportation is critical for older adults and persons with disabilities, particularly to obtain health care and food and to avoid isolation. DRCOG promotes the concept of regional cooperation and coordination among counties and local service providers to most effectively utilize the limited resources available for transportation for older adults and persons with disabilities. **DRCOG supports the following:**

- **A system that effectively and efficiently coordinates the resources and delivery of transportation services between providers, the federal government, counties, RTD, and the state.**
- **Increased funding for transportation services for older adults and persons with disabilities.**
- **Increased state funding for Medicaid transportation services for older adults and persons with disabilities.**

### ***Human Services***

**Older Adults and Persons with Disabilities.** As the designated Area Agency on Aging (under the federal Older Americans Act) for Adams, Arapahoe, Broomfield, Clear Creek, Denver, Douglas, Gilpin and Jefferson counties, DRCOG advocates, plans, funds and coordinates the provision of services for older adults. DRCOG also ~~recently~~ has been designated as an Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) and in that capacity is charged with providing a coordinated and streamlined access point to long term care services and supports for adults age 60 and over or age 18 and over living with a disability, and their caregivers. As an advocate for older adults, persons with disabilities, and their caregivers, DRCOG works with various groups and individuals to support state legislation, regulations and programs to meet their needs. DRCOG also provides the direct services of long-term care ombudsman and information, referral and assistance. **In performing these roles, DRCOG supports the following:**

- **Planning and Delivery of Services.** The federal Older Americans Act and the state Older Coloradans Act mandate critical roles for Area Agencies on Aging: planning and developing programs and services to meet the needs of older adults; advocating for and representing the issues and concerns of older adults; and distributing federal and state funds to service providers. As an ADRC, DRCOG is directed to provide older adults, persons with disabilities, and their caregivers with information and assistance about available resources and options counseling. DRCOG works with the state, other government agencies, consumers, service providers, `private and nonprofit organizations, and foundations to identify needs for services and then brings the parties together to determine the preferred approaches to address these needs. **DRCOG supports state legislative and regulatory provisions reinforcing collaboration between the state and Area Agencies on Aging and respecting their respective roles and interests, consistent with these state and federal laws. DRCOG supports collaboration and partnerships to effectively and**

**efficiently meet service needs consistent with DRCOG's responsibilities as an Area Agency on Aging and an ADRC.**

- **Funding.** Colorado and the Denver metro area face serious funding shortages for meeting the needs of economically and socially needy older adults, persons with disabilities, and their caregivers in the region. Regional and statewide assessments show that existing revenue sources are insufficient to meet current needs for services such as home modifications, meals, transportation to medical appointments, and health promotion. Thus, enhancements to existing sources and development of more reliable sources are necessary. **DRCOG supports:**
  - ▶ **Increased funding for programs providing services to older adults, persons with disabilities, and their caregivers, especially services that support individuals continuing to live independently in their homes and communities.**
  - ▶ **Efforts to use state funds for programs that provide prescription drugs more efficiently and effectively. This would include efforts to reduce the costs of purchasing such prescription drugs to enable those programs to better serve their growing caseloads.**
  - ▶ **Increasing the appropriations to the State Funding for Senior Services line item in the Long Bill. This includes increasing the continuing appropriation to the Older Coloradan's Fund, as well as any additional state General Fund monies that might become available. DRCOG specifically supports a stable, long-term funding source that increases to meet the growing needs for services. This also would provide a level of funding certainty that would improve yearly program planning for needed services.**
  - ▶ **Action by the General Assembly to fully fund the required share to match federal funds that are available to the state through the Older Americans Act, including the National Family Caregiver Program, so as not to require an increase in the required local share. Such state or local shares/matches should not be required to come from existing program funds.**
  - ▶ **Distributing State Funding for Senior Services monies, including the Older Coloradans Fund, using the existing structure created to administer Older Americans Act funds. DRCOG also supports the equitable distribution of the federal and state funds to the AAAs based on the needs and contribution of each region.**
  - ▶ **Reexamination of the state procedures and distribution formulas for federal and state funds to ensure adequate funds are available to urbanized areas to meet the needs of older adults.**
- **Long-Term Care.** Older adults living in long-term care communities (i.e., nursing homes and assisted living) are some of the most vulnerable members of the regional community. As the Long-Term Care Ombudsman for the region, DRCOG is an advocate for the rights of residents in long-term care communities and for improvement in the quality of care in such facilities. **DRCOG supports increases in the quality of care and consumer protections for older adults and their**



caregivers and, in particular, legislation strengthening the role of the long-term care ombudsman as a resident/consumer advocate. DRCOG urges the state, when making decisions regarding funding for long-term care communities, to structure such funding to protect the quality of care for residents.

- **Housing.** Available, affordable and accessible housing is a concern for older adults. However, an equally critical concern is the ability to live independently. As individuals age, in-home and related services enable older persons to remain in their homes. **DRCOG supports:**
  - ▶ **Increased funding and regulatory changes that improve the availability of these supportive services, while maintaining consumer protections for clients and family caregivers.**
  - ▶ **Home modification programs and funding to assist seniors, persons with disabilities and others at-risk to remain in their homes.**
  - ▶ **Property tax relief to help reduce a tax liability that especially burdens low income seniors and seniors on fixed incomes.**
- **Seniors and Driving.** As individuals age, their ability to drive safely can diminish. However, DRCOG is concerned that attempts to address this issue solely based on age imposes undue hardships on older citizens who can drive safely. When older citizens are not allowed to drive, the availability of transportation for medical appointments, grocery shopping and the like is critical for seniors to maintain independence. **DRCOG supports functional assessments of driving ability rather than age cut-off as the basis for imposing limitations on an individual's driving. DRCOG supports adequate funding for providing transportation services for the elderly and persons with disabilities.**

## ***Environment***

**Air Quality.** Air quality affects all residents of the region and continues to be a concern. The region fails to meet current federal standards for ozone and more stringent standards are expected to be established by the Environmental Protection Agency ~~in~~ **2012**. Meeting a more aggressive ozone standard will require continuous efforts from many parties. **DRCOG supports:**

- **Efforts to reduce emissions from all sources sufficient to meet federal air quality standards.**
- **Transportation and land use strategies that improve air quality in the region.**
- **Alternative fuel sources and clean-burning technology and provision of infrastructure and services for alternative fuels.**
- **Incentives for purchasing high fuel economy or alternative fuel vehicles or for accelerated retirement of inefficient or high-polluting personal, commercial, or fleet vehicles that are beyond repair.**

- Offering services, including incentives that encourage and facilitate the use of alternative modes of travel.
- Examination of the potential of select speed limit reductions.

**Water Supply.** An adequate, dependable supply of water is necessary for urban, agriculture, recreation and open space priorities both in the Denver metro area and throughout the state. Metro Vision calls for maximizing the wise use of water resources through efficient land development and other strategies. **DRCOG supports:**

- Collaborative efforts among local governments, water providers and other stakeholders to promote water conservation.
- Data collection and research to increase understanding of the link between land development and water demand, and best practices to promote the efficient use of water resources across the region.
- Water resource planning, management and development within the existing constitutional framework and pursuant to the basin roundtables process established in HB 05-1177, in which interbasin compacts are negotiated for the equitable distribution of the state's waters.
- Water reuse as one component in efforts to meet water supply needs and thus supports efforts to facilitate the reuse of water consistent with Colorado's constitutional water rights system.
- Policies and practices that, consistent with local government authority, protect Colorado's water resources.
- The development of a Colorado Water Plan that emphasizes conservation, storage, drought mitigation and streamlining of the regulatory processes, aligns the state's various water efforts, and provides a benchmark for future collaboration in addressing Colorado's water supply needs.

**Open Space.** Open space resources available to citizens in the Denver metro region are important to our quality of life. **DRCOG supports:**

- Planning, acquisition, protection and preservation of open space resources.
- Increasing funding for open space preservation.
- Great Outdoors Colorado and other efforts advancing major land acquisitions along the Front Range that link open spaces in the metro area to protect canyons and river corridors, the mountain backdrop and prominent geographic features, freestanding community buffer areas, and the east metro plains.

### ***Intergovernmental Relations***

**Intergovernmental Cooperation.** The state, local governments and regional agencies all play an important role in providing critical services and implementing programs for the benefit of Colorado residents. Legislative bodies and executive agencies at each level should respect the roles and responsibilities of the others. **DRCOG supports building consensus among state, local and regional entities in developing and**



**implementing new and existing programs and improved approaches to planning and service provision.**

**Shared Services.** Many of the services provided by local governments to their citizens are also provided by neighboring communities. To address related coordination and funding concerns, local governments have entered into agreements with each other and with DRCOG for shared service delivery. **DRCOG encourages local governments to enter into shared services agreements and supports efforts to ensure that such agreements are honored and endorsed by the state.**

**State/Regional Relations.** As the state's policy issues become more complex, it is evident that the solutions are not "one size fits all." The Denver metro region has made significant progress in developing collaborative solutions and decision-making processes for a number of the complex issues with which it has been confronted—especially in the related areas of growth and transportation. As the regional planning commission, the Metropolitan Planning Organization for transportation, , and the Area Agency on Aging, DRCOG is in a unique position to convene parties of interest on intergovernmental issues, provide the necessary forum for their resolution and facilitate a negotiated outcome. **In recognition of the importance of regionalism, it is an appropriate role for DRCOG to act as a facilitator of regional approaches. Consequently, it is appropriate for state agencies to ensure that actions they take affecting the region are consistent with regionally derived solutions and the adopted *Metro Vision* plan.**

**Regional Service Delivery.** The state plays an important role in the funding of public services and programs administered at the regional and local levels. When making such funding and programmatic decisions, it is appropriate for state agencies and the General Assembly to give consideration to which programs are implemented most appropriately at the local and regional level. State administration of federal programs can be problematic for local governments, as state agencies tend to be more removed from clients and less responsive to their needs. On the other hand, individual local governments may lack the resources to achieve the desired efficiencies and cost-effectiveness. Also, some programs, are most appropriately and effectively addressed at the regional level. The collaborative partnerships typical of regional approaches can provide the critical mass of users and clients for services or programs to be cost-effective. **DRCOG urges the state, when making funding and programmatic decisions, including creating new programs or changing existing programs, to consider the following principles:**

- **Use existing local or regional service delivery systems wherever practical.**
- **Ensure a consultative process among federal, state and local governments and regional councils before making changes to services currently being delivered at the local or regional level.**
- **Ensure existing levels of services are maintained and adequate administrative funds are provided to implementing agencies.**

- **Ensure the state treats the continuity of service delivery as a key principle guiding any actions to create new programs or revise existing programs by respecting the local and regional programs already in existence.**

# ATTACH G

To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director  
303-480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcoq.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcoq.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
December 17, 2014	Informational Item	15

#### SUBJECT

This item concerns transmittal of the *Draft 2015 Policy Statement on Federal Legislative Issues*.

#### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

No action is requested. This item is provided for information. Action to approve the policy will be requested at the January 21, 2015 meeting.

#### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

#### SUMMARY

Each year, the Board adopts two policy statements on a range of specific state and federal legislative issues. These documents provide the DRCOG Board, staff and lobbyists with policy direction on legislative issues during the coming year.

This year, the changes in the federal legislative policy statement are proposed to clarify the intent of a particular policy, use more precise language or otherwise update a statement to better reflect current practice.

The *Draft 2015 Policy Statement on Federal Legislative Issues* is provided now to give Board members and their staff sufficient time to review its contents before the Board considers and acts on the document in December. If you have suggested changes to the draft, you are encouraged to contact staff prior to the January 10.

#### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

#### PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

#### ATTACHMENT

*2015 Policy Statement on Federal Legislative Issues – changes highlighted*

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Should you have any questions regarding the draft policy statement, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or [jschaufele@drcoq.org](mailto:jschaufele@drcoq.org), or Rich Mauro, Senior Legislative Analyst at 303-480-6778 or [rmauro@drcoq.org](mailto:rmauro@drcoq.org).

## Denver Regional Council of Governments

### POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE ISSUES FOR 2015

#### INTRODUCTION

This paper outlines the key federal policy issues of the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) and its local government members. It identifies policy positions intended to inform the Colorado congressional delegation, Congress, federal and state executive branch officials and others as they develop and implement national policy on these issues. This policy statement guides DRCOG's federal legislative positions and actions during the coming year.

DRCOG is a membership organization of nearly 60 cities, towns and counties in the Denver metropolitan region. Under federal law, it serves as the Area Agency on Aging for eight counties to aid the 60+ population and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) coordinating transportation planning with air quality goals. Under state statutes, DRCOG is a regional planning commission, responsible for preparing a regional plan for the development of the metro area.

#### REGIONAL PLANNING

**Comprehensive Planning and Land Use.** Although comprehensive planning and land use are primarily matters for local determination and regional coordination, the federal government can play a supportive role in encouraging local and regional efforts through funding, technical assistance and other incentives. DRCOG's Metro Vision plan represents a shared regional vision for creating sustainable, livable communities that accommodate people of all ages, incomes and abilities. Metro Vision is the policy basis for all of DRCOG's programs and serves as the framework and context in which the regional council collaborates with other organizations on issues of mutual interest. Achieving Metro Vision goals requires coordinated investment in a wide range of planning and implementation activities that transcend traditional funding categories. **DRCOG supports those efforts that implement Metro Vision and encourages federal entities to align their policies and investment decisions with Metro Vision and other regional agreements to advance common objectives.**

**DRCOG supports the Federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities (Partnership), which is a partnership among the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Department of Transportation (DOT), and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).** The DRCOG Board has incorporated the Partnership's six Livability Principles into Metro Vision and supported legislation in 2009 and 2011 that would have provided funds to help communities develop and implement comprehensive regional plans that incorporate economic development, transportation, and housing options, while addressing environmental concerns. A sustainable region balances economic vitality, prosperity, and social wellbeing as expressed by a high standard of living for the region's residents.

**Metro Vision establishes several regional goals, as summarized here, and DRCOG may support or oppose legislative proposals based on consistency with these goals.**

### **Growth and Development Goals**

- Ensure urban development occurs within an urban growth boundary/area to promote a more orderly, compact and efficient future development pattern.
- Achieve at least a 10 percent increase in overall regional density between 2000 and 2035.
- Locate 50 percent of new housing and 75 percent of new employment between 2005 and 2035 in designated urban centers throughout the region. While each urban center will be unique, all urban centers will:
  - Be active, pedestrian-, bicycle- and transit-friendly places that are more dense and mixed in use than surrounding areas;
  - Allow people of all ages, incomes and abilities to access a range of housing, employment and service;
  - Promote regional sustainability by reducing per capita vehicle miles traveled, air and water pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and water consumption; and respect and support existing neighborhoods.
- Promote development patterns and community design features to meet the needs of people of all ages, incomes and abilities. Pay particular attention to the needs of older adults, which represent the fastest-growing segment of the population.
- Maintain Boulder, Brighton, Castle Rock and Longmont as distinct and self-sufficient freestanding communities, and more clearly define and support the regional role of rural town centers.
- Minimize the extent of low-density, large-lot (semi-urban) development.
- Limit the total amount of semi-urban development in 2035 to a proportion that does not exceed the current proportion of all households in the region, estimated to be approximately 3 percent.

### **Transportation Goals**

- Provide safe, environmentally sensitive, efficient and sustainable mobility choices for people and goods, integrated with land use, while supporting the following goals:
  - Increase the rate of construction of alternative transportation facilities;
  - Reduce the percent of trips to work by single-occupant vehicles (SOV) to 65 percent by 2035;
  - Reduce regional per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) 10 percent by 2035; and
  - Reduce annual per capita greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector by 60 percent by 2035.

### **Environmental Goals**

- Establish an integrated, linked, permanent parks and open space system that is accessible to all of the region's residents.
- Protect additional parks and open space as the population grows to maintain the current amount per capita with a goal to protect a minimum of 880 total square miles of parks and open space by 2035;
- Reduce regional per capita municipal and industrial water use;
- Achieve and maintain ambient air quality standards and ensure clean water to protect human health and environmental quality; and
- Minimize exposure to excessive noise levels associated with land use and transportation services.

**DRCOG further urges Congress to consider the following in support of local and regional planning:**

- DRCOG supports improving the coordination of housing, community development, transportation, energy, and environmental policy in the United States; coordinating federal policies and investments to promote sustainable development; and, encouraging comprehensive regional planning for livable communities and the implementation of sustainable development.
- DRCOG supports federal policies and investments that contribute to the successful development of urban centers and transit station areas throughout metropolitan areas.
- DRCOG supports federal funding, regulatory support and other incentives to bolster local and regional efforts to increase the supply of affordable housing, including housing suitable for fixed-income older adults.
- DRCOG respects private property rights within a legal context that protects local land use authority. It is also important to emphasize that governmental actions often add value to private property. While acknowledging concerns over potential inappropriate uses of that authority, DRCOG believes the U.S. Supreme Court decisions defining constitutional restrictions on local government regulation of private property and the use of eminent domain are adequate to protect both public and private rights. When these restrictions are coupled with established precedents of the Colorado Supreme Court, protections accorded to landowners are reasonable, appropriate and balanced. DRCOG opposes further restrictions on the ability of governmental entities to regulate private property for the benefit of the public and opposes takings and eminent domain legislation that goes beyond the existing rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court and the Colorado Supreme Court as an attempt to unconstitutionally restrict local land use authority.
- Federal agencies and elected officials must respect and support local and regional plans and land use authority. This includes ensuring funding decisions and the siting of federal and other facilities are consistent with those plans and respect local and

regional land use authority. Federal agencies and elected officials also must ensure maximum local and regional participation in those decisions.

- The federal government must protect open space, including natural habitats, by fully funding the land conservation, preservation and infrastructure improvement trust fund programs and providing new incentives for land conservation.
- Federal investments in local and regional data and information programs help DRCOG deliver improved information, tools and services for local and regional planning and decision-making. DRCOG supports continued funding for these programs and legislation that requires local, regional and state governments to proactively share digital data with the public.

## **OLDER ADULTS**

**Older Americans Act Reauthorization.** DRCOG has been the designated Area Agency on Aging (AAA) for the metro area under the auspices of the federal Older Americans Act since 1973. In this capacity, DRCOG is responsible for planning and advocating for the needs of the region's older residents, as well as for providing a broad array of services and programs.

Congress last reauthorized the Older Americans Act (OAA) in 2006. The next reauthorization is currently on the federal legislative agenda. The 2006 legislation included new programs requiring states and local governments to address challenges brought by the aging of the baby boom generation. Unfortunately, the reauthorization did not include any additional funding, other than a small increase for the National Family Caregiver Program. The reauthorization also included provisions encouraging better federal, state and local coordination of services provided to persons in both in-home and community-based settings, but did not specify how these provisions would be implemented.

Since the last reauthorization, the challenges to communities, states and the nation presented by the aging of the baby boomers are better understood, especially the need for more tailored in-home and community-based services, more focused prevention programs, and increased support for family caregivers. The coming reauthorization offers a prime opportunity to modernize and reshape aging services in the U.S.

**Accordingly, DRCOG adopts the following principles for reauthorization of the Older Americans Act.**

### **Elimination of Obsolete Funding Provisions in the Older Americans Act**

Recently, some members of the Senate conceded the current funding formula for the Older Americans Act (OAA) is outdated and unfair, a conclusion reached by the GAO three years ago. The OAA funding formula generally allocates federal funds to states based on the proportion of older adults in each state. However, the last reauthorization included a "hold harmless" provision that prevents states from falling below their FY06



funding levels. Moreover, the formula uses population numbers from the 2000 Census. Allocating funds based on 13-year-old data (when a Census was conducted in 2010) penalizes states like Colorado which have fast-growing senior populations. This combination of obsolete data and the hold harmless provision causes Colorado to lose more funding than any other state, during both the annual appropriations as well as in the sequestration cuts. **DRCOG opposes both the use of old data to determine the number of seniors in each state and the inclusion of the Hold Harmless Provision when allocating OAA funds.**

### **Encourage meaningful coordination with other systems and programs**

**The Administration on Aging should adopt rules and regulations incorporating the following specific concerns:**

- Require states, AAAs, Medicaid long-term care agencies, and other relevant entities to continue efforts to better coordinate regional and statewide planning of services and programs for seniors.
- Coordinate all federal programs and planning processes that serve older citizens, such as Older Americans Act, Medicaid, SAFETEA-LU and Section 202 housing programs.
- Establish new policy and program guidelines to improve coordination and optimize all public and private benefits, services, and resources aimed at promoting elder economic security.
- Remove institutional barriers to the coordination of elderly and disabled transportation services by providing the flexibility to allow trips for elderly and non-elderly disabled persons and for meal, medical and personal services to be served by the same provider using a combination of U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Transportation funding.
- Avoid shifting the cost burden from cash-strapped programs such as Medicaid to the Older Americans Act programs, simply to bail out those programs.
- Strengthen the collaboration between the AAAs and federal, state and local governments with community-based organizations and national organizations that work with diverse older adults by providing resources, including funding research, programs and training to more effectively respond to changing demographics and target services to those most in need.

### **Maximize Flexibility in Use of Older Americans Act Funds**

The majority of federal funding provided to state and local entities under the federal Older Americans Act is specifically earmarked to particular services. While all of the OAA-funded services, such as meals and transportation, are critically important, the AAAs, local governments and service providers are in the best position to assess the specific needs in the local areas. **Increased flexibility in the use of program funds would allow area agencies on aging to better meet the needs of older adults.**

- Simplify rules and regulations to allow better coordination of senior services thus enabling AAAs and service providers to more efficiently and effectively use federal funds to address local priorities. This could include the consolidation of certain funding categories to improve administration of the affected programs. For example, the Title III C-1 congregate meal and Title 3 C-2 home-delivered meal programs could be merged.
- Create flexibility in state- and federally-specified allotments of Older Americans Act funds allowing AAAs to utilize regional priorities to determine funding distributions at the local level, consistent with the goals of the Act.
- Set required local match at 10 percent and required state match at 5 percent across all programs of the Older Americans Act. Currently, required local and state funding match percentages vary widely. For example, state/local match for the National Family Caregiver Support Program is 25 percent, while the Nutrition and Supportive Services Programs require a 15 percent state/local match. In some cases, states can completely opt out of providing a state match as with the National Family Caregiver Support Program.

### **Fund Aging-Related Planning for Local Communities**

The 2006 reauthorization established new requirements for AAAs to broaden their planning efforts beyond service needs to include senior-friendly community planning to promote livable communities for all ages but did not include funds for this new mandate. **To assure these requirements are met, Congress must appropriate funds for state, regional, and local collaboration, planning, community capacity-building and technical assistance. This should include funds for conducting analyses of the strengths and needs of seniors in a given area.**

### **Increase Federal Funding for Older Americans Act Programs**

The funding provided through the Older Americans Act has proven critical in maintaining a quality standard of living for many of the nation's older adults. For years, however, OAA funding has not kept pace with inflation or the growing population of individuals eligible for services. Yet, demand by at-risk older adults in need of supportive services has risen and will continue to rise with the growth of the aging population. This long-term gap in funding translates to greater numbers of older adults and family caregivers with unmet needs and increasing pressures on state and local agencies, service providers and families. Meanwhile, waiting lists for Older Americans Act-funded services, such as Meals on Wheels, rides to medical appointments, and in-home care, have burgeoned throughout the country.

Compounding these problems, financial pressures on other programs that provide services to seniors, such as Medicare and Medicaid, have led to reductions in the services provided by those programs, and a related increase in demands on Older Americans Act programs. At the same time, there are proposals for addressing the

nation's long-term debt that actually would result in significant cuts in funding for these programs. Funding cuts, such as those in the Budget Control Act of 2011 under "sequestration," would have devastating consequences on vulnerable older adults in the metro area and across Colorado. **Congress needs to fund the Older Americans Act adequately now and into the future – in preparation for the aging of the baby boomers. DRCOG specifically supports:**

- A balanced approach to addressing the nation's budget deficits and long-term debt. Any approach must protect those older adults in greatest social and economic need by fairly balancing increased revenues and targeted spending reductions and taking no actions that increase economic vulnerability or poverty.
- Significant annual increases in the overall funding for the Older Americans Act Programs, which are necessary to catch up with the lag in historical funding. For FY ~~2014~~2015, the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging has determined an increase in funding of at least ~~5.266.38~~ percent ~~over FY 2012~~ is necessary to restore 2012 funding levels to keep pace with ~~projected~~ population growth, and price increases and funding cuts since then.
- Future authorized appropriations at levels adequate to fund identified needs but at least commensurate with the rates of growth in inflation and the economically needy older population.
- Priority for funding given to those Older Americans Act programs and services, especially nutrition services that emphasize assisting clients to live in their homes as long and as independently as possible.
- Increases in the funding for family caregiver support services (including training, respite care, counseling, and information and assistance) and the continued distribution of these monies through AAAs, which are important to address the growing needs of families who provide extensive care to their loved ones.
- Increases in funding for Long-Term Care Ombudsman programs, which are necessary to improve the ability to respond to complaints and safeguard residents' rights.
- Congress also should change budget rules to allow credit for discretionary programs that save money in mandatory programs.

## **Long-Term Care Facility Quality of Care**

Older adults living in long-term care communities (i.e., nursing homes and assisted living) are some of the most vulnerable members of society. As the Long-Term Care Ombudsman for the region, DRCOG is an advocate for the rights of residents in long-term care communities and for improvement in the quality of care in such facilities. The quality of care provided by long-term care facilities is an ongoing concern to facility residents, their families, local governments and resident advocates. **DRCOG supports increases in consumer protections for older adults and their caregivers and, in particular, strengthening the role of the Long-Term Care Ombudsman as a resident/consumer advocate and reimbursement for long-term care communities structured to enhance the quality of care for residents. DRCOG believes the following issues require particular attention by Congress and federal agencies.**

- Federal regulations designed to ensure the quality of care in long-term care facilities are not fully enforced, largely due to inadequate staffing levels in state enforcement agencies. There also are several actions that could be added to the regulations to improve enforcement. These include increased inspections and penalties on long-term care facilities failing to comply with regulations. **DRCOG supports such improved enforcement of long-term care regulations and an increase in funding for enforcement actions.**
- Most complaints investigated by DRCOG ombudsmen are traceable to staffing issues in the long-term care facilities. The inability to maintain adequate staffing is a critical concern that negatively impacts long-term care facility quality of service. **DRCOG supports federal legislation, policies and programs to improve the quality of service in long-term care facilities, including setting minimum staffing levels and providing financial and technical assistance for the recruitment, training and retention of long-term care facility employees.**
- “Nursing home transparency” legislation currently is under consideration in Congress. The nursing home transparency provisions will enhance families’ access to information about the quality of care in nursing homes and will improve the government’s ability to ensure quality care and a better-trained staff in those facilities. **DRCOG supports legislation that includes stronger disclosure of ownership and control of facilities, better oversight of quality of care indicators, improved consumer information, and an enhanced complaint and penalty process.**

### **Fund the Elder Justice Act**

This legislation provides critical protection for residents living in nursing homes and assisted living; provides needed resources and coordination to address the problem of elder abuse; and includes increased funding for the Long-Term Care Ombudsman program. The Elder Justice Act sets out a comprehensive approach to preventing and combating elder abuse, neglect, exploitation and self-neglect. **DRCOG supports funding and implementation of the Elder Justice Act, consistent with the following principles:**

- Provide a stronger and more coordinated federal response to promote elder justice.
- Increase federal support to states and communities for elder justice activities.
- Provide funding and training support to adult protection programs.
- Improve consumer protection by requiring the reporting of crimes by nursing facilities or employees and communication of consumer rights information.
- Provide new funding to improve ombudsman capacity and training, and for training of health department surveyors investigating allegations of abuse.

| **Other Health and Home-CareCommunity Services.** There are numerous other health and home care issues not covered under the Older Americans Act. In general, the following policies address concerns regarding consumer protection, access to treatment, and access to services that increase independence. **DRCOG believes it is**

appropriate for federal legislation, regulations and policies to promote access to health care coverage and the integration of long-term care into a continuum of medical and non-medical services, including health promotion and disease prevention.

- **Enhancing Health and Security of Older Adults.** The Affordable Care Act (ACA) contains several provisions regarding older adults and their ability to stay healthy and age in the community. These include provisions for Aging and Disability Resource Centers, prevention and wellness programs, care transitions and coordination, and efforts to rebalance the long-term care system relative to institutional and community care. The AAAs are positioned to play a key role in implementing these provisions. **DRCOG urges Congress and federal agencies to recognize the full potential of the Aging Network and utilize AAAs in implementing these ACA provisions.**
- **Avoid Institutional Care.** Home- and community-based services are critical components in the continuum of care for the elderly and disabled and are more cost efficient than services in institutions, particularly with regard to rural areas and for minority populations. Adequate reimbursements to providers are necessary to offset the costs of providing these important services. **DRCOG supports increased funding of home- and community-based care programs and higher Medicare and Medicaid reimbursements.**
- **Prescription Medication.** Older adults typically require more medication than younger people. Even with the adoption of a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, the high cost of prescription medication will continue to be a financial hardship for many older adults. DRCOG supports revisions to the Medicare Part D prescription drug benefit to simplify the application process and coverage offered, as well as address the gaps in coverage to provide a more comprehensive prescription medication benefit for all beneficiaries. **DRCOG also encourages the federal government to provide additional funding for AAAs to provide public education, counseling and enrollment assistance for citizens about the Medicare drug program.**
- **Patients' Rights.** Enforceable federal protections, in areas including access to care, quality assurance, patient information, grievances and appeals, doctor-patient relationship, and physician treatment decisions, are necessary to ensure that quality health care and other services are available to all. **DRCOG supports legislation to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage.**
- **Housing.** The ability to afford to live in a residence independently is a concern of older adults, especially those on fixed incomes. As the Denver metro area has grown and developed, the shortage of affordable housing has become an even more important concern. **DRCOG supports policies and programs designed to support older adults, especially those of low- and moderate-income, and persons with disabilities to live independently in the residence of their choice.**

~~This includes policies and programs to: increased federal assistance for the housing needs of low- and moderate-income adults, including home modification programs and funding of programs to assist seniors, persons with disabilities and others at-risk to remain in their homes.~~

- Encourage the delivery of home- and community-based supportive services to assist older people and persons with disabilities in maintaining independence and actively engaging in their community.
- Improve home design to promote independence and aging in place, including home modification and repair, appropriate design features in new and rehabilitated housing (through principles such as universal design, visitability, inclusive home design, and energy efficiency), and the use of innovative home products.
- Promote affordable housing options by:
  - ensuring that policies, programs and other actions that affect land-use and housing support the private and public sectors in providing a variety of housing sizes and types, while ensuring older adults and persons with disabilities have choice in the type of housing arrangement that fits their needs best. Renters and homeowners (including manufactured homeowners) should have appropriate protections. Policies should emphasize the rights of residents and minimize disparities in treatment under the law.
  - promoting policies and programs that support the creation and maintenance of an adequate supply of affordable rental and ownership options integrated with the community to meet the needs of people of all ages, incomes, and abilities. This should include strengthening housing programs to ensure that policies and funding for housing assistance and preservation programs continue to support residents who choose to remain in their homes as they age and that low- and moderate-income households have access to well-designed, safe, decent, affordable, and accessible housing integrated throughout well-designed communities.
  - reauthorizing or creating programs and policies that increase the capacity for public-private partnerships to increase the range of housing choices available to older people and persons with disabilities.
  - promoting financial security of housing assets to support the availability of affordable homeownership options, safeguard home equity, and promote the innovative use of housing assets to maintain and improve the independence and quality of life of older people.

## TRANSPORTATION

~~**Implementation of MAP-21.** The reauthorization of the federal transportation program, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), was signed into law July 6, 2012, and expires September 30, 2014. In the coming year, US DOT will be promulgating numerous rulemakings linked to the recently enacted MAP-21. Also,~~

~~congressional action on sequestration and subsequently on the full-year appropriations will be key short-term activities. DRCOG supports MAP-21's emphasis on rebuilding the aging highway and transit infrastructure of the nation, while committing to asset management practices that maintain the integrity of this infrastructure into the future. As USDOT promulgates rules for maintaining and operating our nation's transportation infrastructure, the following components should be included:~~

- ~~• Top priority to maintaining, repairing, and reconstructing the existing infrastructure~~
- ~~• Flexibility that allows each state and region to decide how to best set performance targets and make investments to show progress toward these targets~~
- ~~• Performance objectives for system operations and reliability~~

**Reauthorization of MAP-21.** In 2009, when Congress began work on reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU, the DRCOG Board adopted a policy statement recommending Congress create a new policy framework in the reauthorization. However, MAP-21 only meaningfully addressed the first element of that framework: invest in rebuilding the nation's transportation infrastructure. The Board stated transportation is an essential component of multidimensional efforts to advance economic development, industry growth and competitiveness; reduce the nation's carbon footprint; increase job access and mobility; and create communities having a high quality of life for people of all ages, incomes and abilities. This remains DRCOG's vision for federal-metro partnerships for prosperity. Since MAP-21 ~~is~~ was only a two-year bill, it is critical that Congress act on its reauthorization to maintain funding stability and delivery of long-term capital projects. **DRCOG supports an energy-efficient, environmentally sustainable, multimodal transportation system that ensures America's economic competitiveness and provides livable communities for its residents. DRCOG supports providing additional transportation revenues to accomplish this vision. DRCOG urges Congress to adopt the remaining elements of the Board's previously adopted policy framework as outlined below.**

- **Additional Investment in the Nation's Infrastructure.** Beyond the rulemaking for the initial investments MAP-21 made in rebuilding the nation's infrastructure, **Congress, in reauthorization, should consider:**
  - Including incentives to use state-of-the-practice green materials and green maintenance and construction techniques,
  - Continuing MAP-21's increased emphasis on reducing the severity of accidents rather than just the total number of incidents, include performance objectives for safety in all modes, and
  - Updating the system to serve our nation's aging population.
- **Support Multimodal Solutions.** Addressing the nation's transportation challenges requires investment in a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach. The nation will need to provide multimodal alternatives to achieve congestion relief, better air quality, reduced household transportation costs, and increased independence for people unable to drive because of age, income or ability. In the DRCOG region, the

Metro Vision plan includes goals for increasing the rate of construction of alternative modes, reducing VMT, and reducing SOV mode share. **DRCOG supports adding multimodal transportation capacity appropriate to meet national and regional objectives.**

- Programs that allow states and planning regions to develop, fund and implement integrated investment solutions should be maintained and financially enhanced. In addition, transportation funding must allow flexibility to address the multimodal, energy and environmental needs of individual urban areas.
  - Beyond MAP-21's identification of "traffic congestion," national performance objectives and measures for increasing access and mobility for people of all ages, incomes and abilities are needed, as well as flexibility to allow each state and region to decide how to best make investments to show progress toward national mobility and accessibility goals.
  - Equalize federal funding match requirements across all modes of transportation.
  - Create a national strategy for interregional person mobility.
  - Expand MAP-21's National Freight Strategic Plan to include all major modes of freight transport including rail, water, and air, to better enable informed decision-making about efficient, long-distance freight movement.
- **Support Metropolitan America.** Metropolitan areas account for 84 percent of the U.S. population and more than 85 percent of employment, income and production of goods and services. (Source: U.S. Conference of Mayors, July 2012) Growing congestion, poor system reliability, along with deteriorating infrastructure, threaten the ability of these regions, and the nation, to compete globally. Metropolitan regions must play a stronger role in the nation's transportation programs, both in the authority to direct investment and demonstrate accountability for the system's performance. **One proposal to achieve this supported by DRCOG is the creation of a new Metropolitan Mobility and Accessibility Program.** This program would be highly flexible and would be aimed at improving metropolitan travel times and freight mobility, reducing carbon emissions and achieving national and regional energy conservation goals. MPOs would have project selection authority for this program.

**A new Metropolitan Mobility and Accessibility Program would be:**

- Focused on the largest metropolitan regions, and would be in addition to traditional federal aid highway and transit allocations.
- Allocated by formula to all large metropolitan regions, but receipt subject to state and local designation as a Metropolitan Mobility Authority (MMA). Unused allocations would be reallocated to areas that meet the designation requirements.
- Performance based, require performance standards, measurements, and reporting to reduce travel time, improve freight mobility, improve safety, reduce carbon emissions, and conserve energy.



- Funded from new federal revenues (preferably, the Surface Transportation Trust Fund discussed below), and add incentives for increased local funds to include eliminating toll restrictions in metropolitan areas.

**DRCOG supports transportation legislation that addresses metropolitan mobility and accessibility issues, specifically with consideration for the following:**

- Enable major metropolitan areas to establish and implement overarching plans for intraregional mobility and accessibility with focus on:
  - Easy access, choices and seamless transfers
  - Elimination of traffic chokepoints and reduction of severe traffic congestion
  - Strategies that manage transportation demand and provide transit service and implement non-motorized methods of travel
  - Strategies for accommodating interregional movement of people and goods within and through the metropolitan area
  - Fostering livable communities for people of all ages, incomes and abilities
  - Promoting the urban infrastructure necessary to support high-density development around transit
  - Performance metrics that extend beyond MAP-21's traffic congestion and motor vehicle emissions measures and consider Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction, economic development, environmental sustainability, global competitiveness, accessibility, etc.
- Fold "Complete Streets" policies into the metropolitan planning process so that transportation agencies routinely consider designing and operating the entire right of way to enable safe access for drivers, transit users and vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists, as well as for older people, children, and people with disabilities.
- **Improve Energy Efficiency and Environmental Sustainability.** Transportation plays a key role in achieving energy independence and addressing some of the nation's environmental concerns. More than 60 percent of every barrel of oil used in the United States today is used by the transportation sector, and transportation sources accounted for 27 percent of total U.S. greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in 20 (Source: U.S. EPA website). The competitiveness of our economy, the health of our citizens and the strength of our national security depend on reducing our reliance on and consumption of fossil fuels. **DRCOG supports strategies to reduce fossil fuel use and greenhouse gas emissions by the transportation sector.**
  - Expand investment in research and development for alternative fuels, new clean fuel technologies, more efficient vehicles, and new ideas and technologies for transporting people and goods.
  - Incentivize rapid conversion to more fuel efficient and lower-emission vehicles or retrofits.
  - Increase incentives for environmentally-friendly replacement transportation fuels.

- Incentivize regions to more closely link land use and transportation infrastructure to reduce transportation energy consumption, increase non-vehicle transportation options, and reduce VMT, through techniques including scenario planning and investments in projects that improve accessibility.
  - Add public transit projects that enhance capacity, convenience and/or reliability to the exempt project list for Clean Air Act purposes; these types of improvements increase in importance in situations where conformity cannot be attained.
- **Provide Responsible and Efficient Investment.** The SAFETEA-LU-authorized National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, which released a congressionally mandated report in January of 2008, called for interim investments of at least \$225 billion annually over the next 50 years at all levels of government. The February 2009 report of the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission set up under SAFETEA-LU estimated we need to invest at least \$200 billion per year at all levels of government to maintain and improve our highways and transit systems. MAP-21 did not meaningfully increase transportation revenues nor provide anywhere near these levels of investment. **DRCOG continues to support the funding principles adopted by the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission, which includes developing a funding and financing framework that:**
    - Supports a goal of enhancing mobility and accessibility for users of the transportation system,
    - Generates sufficient resources to meet national investment needs on a sustainable basis with the aim of closing the funding gap,
    - Causes users and all \*(Note: This is a change from the Commission’s original language, which refers to “direct beneficiaries.”) beneficiaries to bear the full cost of using the transportation system to the greatest extent possible,
    - Encourages efficient investment in the transportation system,
    - Incorporates equity considerations, including but not limited to geography, equity across income groups, population growth, and revenue generation, and
    - Synchronizes with other broad public policy objectives (and may include energy independence, environmental protection, and workforce housing).
  - **DRCOG supports both short- and long-term federal funding policies:**
    - Short-term
      - Boost the federal gas tax (at minimum, to restore the purchasing power of the Highway Trust Fund) and other existing Highway Trust Fund revenue,
      - Index the federal gas tax to inflation,
      - Create a National Strategic Freight Trust Fund (supported by a dedicated funding mechanism from all users of the freight system that is predictable, dedicated and sustainable),
      - Reduce federal obstacles to options available to states and localities such as tolling, congestion pricing and public/private partnerships, and

- Further expand current federal credit programs.
- Long-term
  - Carbon tax or trading programs (if Congress implements such a program) should ensure transportation activities that reduce greenhouse gas emissions receive a proportionate share of any new revenue generated by such programs.
  - Transition to a new, more direct user charge system such as the Vehicle Miles Traveled fee (also referred to as the mileage-based user fee). This includes:
    - An aggressive research, development and demonstration program to address issues such as privacy rights, program administration, costs, revenues, partnerships with states and localities, and interplay with national policy objectives such as reducing VMT and congestion,
    - A national public education program, and
    - A national pilot program.
- **DRCOG supports funding, project delivery and planning policies that promote efficiency, stability and reliability:**
  - Maintain transportation program's use of contract authority, allowing states to advance money for multiyear construction projects.
  - While supporting a shift to national performance standards and goals, consideration must be given to equity issues (geographical/return on dollar).
  - Reform any earmarking processes and discretionary programs remaining or reappearing to reduce the number of earmarks and ensure transparency, simplicity and accountability; any funds so awarded should honor the full request (no "partial grants") and earmarks should not reduce transportation program formula funds.
  - Provide full-year appropriations at the start of the federal fiscal year to the level of the authorization. Limit the use of short-term continuing resolutions and rescissions. These tactics reduce the flow of or cut into formula funds and negatively impact fiscal constraint, responsible planning, implementation of federal requirements, and project continuity.
  - While MAP-21 made progress in this regard, continue to streamline project delivery and National Environmental Policy Act processes without compromising environmental or public participation values.
  - Enhance and strengthen the cooperative, collaborative partnerships required under current legislation with all the transportation planning partners.
  - Support publication and dissemination of performance measurement results and analyses and widespread distribution of, and education about, the conditions of the transportation system.

**Other Transportation Issues. There are numerous other transportation issues not specifically covered under DRCOG's Map-21 reauthorization policies. Beyond the key**

**elements of DRCOG's framework for MAP-21 reauthorization outlined above, DRCOG expresses the following policies on other federal transportation issues:**

- **Clarify and Enhance the Role of the Metropolitan Planning Organization.** The metropolitan planning process establishes a cooperative, continuous, and comprehensive framework for making transportation investment decisions in metropolitan areas. In many cases, MPOs provide the only regional, multimodal transportation plans that link transportation to land use, growth and air quality. Through the MPO process, local governments, in cooperation and collaboration with the state and local transit operators, determine the best mix of transportation investments needed to meet long-term transportation needs of a metropolitan area. This important role must be strengthened to make metropolitan transportation planning successful.
- MAP-21 requires adequate financial forecasts through the cooperation and collaboration of the state, MPO and public transit agency to develop transportation plans. However, “collaboration, cooperation, and consultation” are poorly defined in the context of developing such financial forecasts, giving states wide discretion in how and when those estimates of revenues are to be provided and allowing for various interpretations of the regulations. **DRCOG supports:**
  - Expanding regulations to require all three entities to agree upon procedures governing the projection of future revenue estimates.
  - Requiring all three agencies (DRCOG, RTD, and CDOT) to agree upon distribution of estimated revenues.
  - Establishing an external appeals process to USDOT if there is disagreement among the parties regarding estimate procedures and revenues.
- MAP-21 similarly requires cooperative project selection and prioritization for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). **DRCOG supports:**
  - Expanding current regulations to require all three entities to agree upon procedures governing project selection and prioritization for transportation planning and there should be consequences for not following these procedures.
  - As part of the normal Memorandum of Agreement between an MPO, state DOT and local transit agency, requiring the three entities to cooperatively establish a process for addressing project cost overruns.
  - Requiring suballocation to Transportation Management Areas (MPOs representing populations greater than 200,000) to be based on the total population within the MPO boundary. Currently, the suballocation formula for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds is based solely on the U.S. Census definition of “urbanized area” population discounting any population falling outside the urbanized area but still within the MPO-adopted boundary.
  - Establishing a population-based/air quality severity formula for suballocating CMAQ funds within a state and requiring suballocation of CMAQ to non-

attainment MPOs representing populations greater than 200,000 on the basis of the total populations within the MPO boundary.

- **Transit.** Transit is an essential part of the metropolitan transportation system. Implementation of the Denver region's transit system is a high priority for DRCOG, although cost increases and revenue decreases have forced RTD and DRCOG to remove some corridors from the fiscally constrained 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. DRCOG also recognizes the importance of making transit-supportive improvements to these corridors along with the transit improvements. With the metro area having made a significant commitment of local resources for the regional transit system, **DRCOG urges Congress and the administration to take the following actions in support of transit in the Denver region:**
  - Continue the federal investment for transit and multimodal projects in the Denver region.
  - Provide dedicated sources of revenue and increased funding for bus rapid transit and rail new starts programs.
  - Provide federal funding for the FasTracks corridors (over time this could include corridors that have had to be removed from the fiscally constrained RTP).
  - Clarify with regard to transit-oriented developments (TOD) that up to a half-mile from an existing or proposed transit station, parking and transportation infrastructure, TOD planning, land acquisition, and a project or program that supports compact, mixed-use, mixed-income, bicycle/pedestrian friendly development are eligible for federal transportation funding and require that this clarification be incorporated in funding program decisions, and work to identify additional sources of funding.
  - Incorporate the Partnership for Sustainable Communities' Livability Principles into federal policy and investment decisions.
  - Improve transportation services for older adults and individuals with disabilities by giving states added flexibility in utilizing their federal funds; enhancing the planning and coordination process; providing technical assistance; and promoting innovative community programs.
  - Designate the "Rocky Mountain Corridor" (from Cheyenne, Wyoming, through Colorado to Albuquerque, New Mexico, and the I-70 corridor from DIA to the Utah border) and the Western ~~High-Speed Rail~~Regional Alliance high-speed rail network (to provide high-speed rail connections between Denver, Salt Lake City, Reno, Las Vegas, and Phoenix) as High-Speed Rail Corridors. This action would identify them as having potential for high-speed rail activity and enable these corridors to receive federal funds that might become available for corridor studies of high-speed rail options, development of plans for high-speed rail infrastructure, construction of high-speed rail facilities and highway/rail grade crossing safety improvements.
- **Air Quality Conformity.** The air quality conformity process is a success in the Denver region. It has increased support for multimodal planning and for integrated land use and transportation planning. It has also increased interagency coordination

between the air quality and transportation planning agencies. **DRCOG supports maximum flexibility so that comparatively minor changes to the planned or programmed highway and transit network do not require a full conformity analysis at taxpayer expense. DRCOG supports continued funding for transportation projects that improve air quality.**

- **Transportation Demand Management (TDM).** DRCOG views TDM principles and practices as increasingly important elements of the region's long-range transportation planning strategy. **DRCOG supports actions that minimize the barriers to the use of alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle and encourage changes to normal work patterns to avoid peak traffic conditions. DRCOG also supports efforts to provide incentives to employers, schools, rideshare agencies, and individuals to encourage alternative transportation use.**

## **ENVIRONMENT**

**Water Conservation.** Water is a particularly scarce resource in the Denver region and western United States, and a key consideration in planning for future growth and development. Recognizing this fact, the DRCOG Board of Directors added a new water conservation element to Metro Vision, the Denver region's long-range plan for growth. The element calls on the region to maximize the wise use of limited water resources through efficient land development and other strategies, and establishes a goal of reducing regional per capita water consumption. **DRCOG therefore supports federal policies and investments that contribute to local and regional water conservation efforts.**

**Water Quality.** Local governments in the Denver region face increasingly complex water quality challenges in an environment unique to the arid West but without the resources to respond to them appropriately. Reauthorization of the Clean Water Act could provide local governments and regional water quality planning agencies the additional planning, financing and regulatory tools needed to address our growing water quality challenges. **As the legislative process proceeds in these areas, there are a number of issues of concern to DRCOG that Congress can address.**

- **Integrated Planning.** DRCOG supports an integrated approach to water quality, tying together the management of point sources, nonpoint sources and stormwater through the involvement of the various stakeholders.
- **Regional Planning.** The Clean Water Act recognizes the importance of planning to address the challenges associated with both point and nonpoint source pollution. The regional planning provided for in the act is even more critical, given the growing emphasis on watershed approaches. **Congress should maintain and strengthen the regional planning process as the key component of the watershed approach. The planning funds provided under section 604(b) need be increased to assist responsible parties in meeting the expanding**

responsibilities that accompany implementation of a watershed planning and management approach.

- **Infrastructure Funding.** Colorado and the nation are at a critical juncture regarding water and wastewater infrastructure. There are significant needs for new treatment plants and upgrades to existing plants. Local governments already shoulder a significant portion of water and wastewater capital investment. **Increased funding for infrastructure investment as well as the provision of greater flexibility of these funds will allow states and local governments to determine the best use, according to local prioritization of needs.**
- **Good Samaritan Protection.** Abandoned and inactive mines present a serious risk to the quality of nearby water supplies. Lack of adequate funding for reclamation and the potential liability for “Good Samaritans” are serious obstacles that have prevented cleanup of many of these sites. **DRCOG supports federal funding for reclamation activities. DRCOG also supports legislation encouraging federal, state, tribal and local governments, as well as mining companies and nonprofit groups that have no prior ownership or responsibility for an abandoned mine, to clean up an abandoned or inactive mining site by granting them liability protections under several environmental statutes, including the Clean Water Act.**

**Superfund.** DRCOG is concerned that a number of Superfund issues have become serious problems in recent years while the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) has been awaiting reauthorization. **DRCOG urges Congress to address the following issues individually or as part of a comprehensive reauthorization.**

- **Liability Protection.** Under current law and regulation, parties interested in cleaning up a Superfund site may decide not to pursue remediation efforts for fear of being held liable for preexisting problems. Lengthy clean up delays have occurred in our region and elsewhere while parties litigate over responsibility. DRCOG supports federal funding for cleanup activities. **DRCOG supports legislation and regulations encouraging parties that have had no prior ownership or responsibility for a site to clean up the site by granting them liability protections under several environmental statutes, including the Superfund law. DRCOG also supports limiting liability when a party has complied with applicable environmental laws at the time of disposal to further the goal of timely and cost-effective clean-up of Superfund sites.**
- **Community Participation.** Local governments often face significant community and neighbor-hood concerns regarding contaminated sites. Public involvement in the assessment, planning and clean-up for such sites is an important aspect of efforts to bring these sites to a safe condition. **Provisions that assist local governments in establishing and funding formal mechanisms for citizens to participate in the**

**clean-up and land-use decision-making process are appropriate and necessary.**

- **Funding for Clean-up.** DRCOG is concerned that the federal government not reduce its commitment to assist with clean-up and redevelopment of these sites. **DRCOG supports the creation of new mechanisms to fund clean up to the extent they are sufficient to make significant progress toward the Act's goals. Allocation of clean-up costs among responsible parties should be according to the proportion of contamination caused by each.**
- **Health Risk Criteria.** The safety and health of populations exposed to pollution associated with Superfund sites is a primary concern related to potential redevelopment. Health risk-based criteria are necessary to guide these efforts. **These criteria must reflect the intended reuse of a site and the risks to special populations, including children, the elderly and those already disproportionately exposed to pollution. Risk-based standards specific to Superfund clean-up are needed to promote redevelopment of contaminated sites while protecting human health and the environment.**

**Brownfields.** Redevelopment of brownfields is important for economic development and environmental and public health and safety in many areas within the Denver region. This is a specific issue related to CERCLA that is of particular significance and should be pursued separately, if inaction on the Superfund reauthorization continues. There are approximately 250 brownfields, former industrial and commercial sites, in both urban and rural areas throughout the Denver region. The redevelopment of brownfields is consistent with DRCOG's Metro Vision, which supports infill and redevelopment within the region. **DRCOG supports federal actions, including increased funding, to encourage the redevelopment of brownfields. DRCOG urges Congress to prioritize funding for projects that go beyond remediation and redevelopment of individual sites to focus on broader planning and economic development efforts, such as projects that incorporate brownfield remediation and redevelopment into larger infill development efforts.**

## **INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS**

**Intergovernmental Cooperation.** All levels of government – federal, state, local and regional – play an important role in providing critical services and implementing programs for the benefit of their residents. Legislative bodies and executive agencies at the federal and state levels should respect the roles and responsibilities of local governments and regional entities. **DRCOG supports cooperation among federal, state, local and regional entities in developing and implementing new programs and improved approaches to service provision.**

**Federal/Regional Relations.** The region is the nexus of local, state and federal issues and economic activities. DRCOG convenes parties of interest on intergovernmental issues, providing the necessary forum for their resolution, and facilitating a negotiated



outcome. **DRCOG urges Congress, when new legislation is proposed and existing legislation is reauthorized, to identify and use regional agencies as critical partners in the implementation of such legislation, including the planning for and delivery of services.**

**Regional Service Delivery.** The federal government plays an important role in setting standards and priorities for the funding of public services and programs administered at the state, regional and local levels. **When making such funding and programmatic decisions, it is essential to consider the most appropriate level of government for delivery of such public services.**

State administration of federal programs can be problematic for local governments, as state agencies tend to be more removed from clients and less responsive to their needs. On the other hand, individual local governments may lack the resources to achieve the desired efficiencies and cost-effectiveness. Further, some programs, such as transportation, air quality and water quality, that address issues crossing local political boundaries, are most appropriately and effectively addressed at the regional level. Regional programs also often benefit from economies of scale. The collaborative partnerships of regional approaches can provide more cost-effective services and programs for users and clients. **DRCOG urges Congress to use existing regional service delivery systems.**

**Principles for Implementation.** New programs or changes to existing programs must at least maintain the existing level of services and provide adequate administrative funds for implementation. Otherwise, there is a shift in responsibility without adequate funds for the services to be provided or programs administered. As such, it is important to treat the continuity of service delivery as a key principle guiding any actions to create new programs or revise existing programs. **A consultative process among the federal, state, local, and regional agencies must be in place before any changes are made to services currently being delivered at local or regional levels.**

**ATTACH H**

# Boulder County Nonprofit Offering Incentives for U.S. 36 Transit Users

November 7, 2014

By: Joe Rubino

*Boulder Daily News*

If you drive U.S. 36, a commuter advocacy group wants you to "curb your frustration" by ditching your car in favor of ride-sharing or mass transit as the highway's multi-modal widening project trudges into its third year.

Louisville-based 36 Commuting Solutions, in cooperation with the *Denver Regional Council of Governments*, the Colorado Department of Transportation and numerous other partners, is reaching out to commuters up and down the U.S. 36 corridor for its "Curb Your Frustration" campaign, officially launched Sept. 8.

Using free 10-ticket RTD booklets and financial incentives for carpooling or joining a vanpool, the organization had signed up 163 people for the campaign as of Thursday.

"I think we're off to a great start," said Audrey DeBarros, executive director of 36 Commuting Solutions. "We're definitely elevating community awareness of the travel options available."

U.S. 36 had a reputation for traffic jams even before CDOT broke ground on the highway's mass transit-focused Express Lanes project in July 2012. The average daily traffic count for U.S. 36, as measured at a station near McCaslin Boulevard, was 78,809 in September 2010, according to CDOT. That number increased to 79,867 in September of this year.

Now the ongoing project on the beleaguered highway has resulted in numerous lane realignments and overnight lane closures that haven't done drivers any favors.

"We know that traveling U.S. 36 can be frustrating, especially coming into Boulder in the morning and leaving in the evening," DeBarros said. "With changes to the alignment, the predictability of the traveler experience is unreliable."

The construction-related headaches are expected to continue, starting Saturday night.

The westbound off-ramp to McCaslin Boulevard will be completely closed beginning at 9 p.m. Saturday and will not reopen until 5:30 a.m. Monday, according to CDOT. The closure will delay RTD regional buses that typically stop at the off-ramp, which is being repaved.

Rolling closures, expected to cause 15-minute delays, are expected in both directions of U.S. 36 between Federal and McCaslin boulevards between midnight and 4 a.m. Sunday through Thursday nights as overhead signs are installed, CDOT said.

## **Bus, vanpool 'more convenient'**

The goal of "Curb Your Frustration" over the next year and a half or so that CDOT is expected to be working on the \$487 million project is to reduce vehicle miles traveled on the highway by 5,000 miles per day, DeBarros said.

The larger goal is to get a head start on changing commuter behaviors as CDOT and RTD prepare to unveil a highway that will have an associated bike lane alongside it and lanes dedicated to carpools and a bus-rapid transit system, she added.

Louisville resident Joanie Kindblade, who works for a public relations firm in downtown Denver, said she picked up riding the RTD bus back and forth to work because it took her half the time of driving herself. When she saw a sign for the "Curb Your Frustration" campaign, she signed up and quickly used all 10 of the free bus tickets, valued at about \$47 in total, in the first week.

"I was really happy to join the program to learn about other options to see if my plan of action was the best one for my commute," Kindblade said. "The bus is more convenient because it gets to use the HOV lane. It's faster, and I can use my free time on the bus more efficiently. I do a lot of reading."

Brian Kedash, of Boulder, was among the people who signed up for a vanpool. He works in Northglenn and estimated that between car payments, insurance and gas he was spending roughly \$600 a month commuting, not to mention typically sitting in heavy traffic on 120th Avenue after exiting U.S. 36 in Broomfield.

Armed with a \$75 subsidy from 36 Commuting Solutions, Kedash said his first month of riding in a vanpool with six other Boulder-area people cost him just \$12. It will be \$87 a month from now on, but Kedash said he doesn't mind. He already got rid of his car.

"For me, I really enjoy it because it allows me to read or fire off some emails," he said. "I get to work for an extra hour during the commute when I'm not driving. I mean, I walk about two blocks to where they pick me up, and I don't have any issues."

### **EcoPass subsidies start in Jan.**

Another major component of the "Curb Your Frustration" that will start in January is a pilot EcoPass program for businesses located close by the RTD Park-n-Ride stops in Westminster, Broomfield and at McCaslin.

DeBarros said so far companies representing more than 800 employees have signed up for the program, which subsidizes passes for the entire business in 2015 and gives that business 70 percent off EcoPasses for all employees in 2016. She said the cost of an EcoPass, which provides unlimited access to RTD services, has an estimated value of \$2,100 per person.

Return Path Inc., an email intelligence firm in Broomfield, is among the companies signed up for 2015 and will provide all 205 employees in its local office with passes.

"Return Path saw the master EcoPass pilot program as an opportunity to help reduce our environmental impact and to deliver a great benefit to our Broomfield employees," office manager Angela Fitzgerald said. "We have a lot of employees that are now using the bus, and they are very excited to learn that we are going to provide them with an EcoPass."

# I-70 Mountain Corridor Gets More Attention This Ski Season

November 14, 2014

By: Monte Whaley

*The Denver Post*

If your tires fail the "George Washington test," the Colorado State Patrol, state highway officials, resorts and businesses along the Interstate 70 mountain corridor want you to stay home this winter.

The test is easy and was displayed Thursday as part of the state's expanded efforts to ease I-70 congestion from Eagle to Denver during high-volume weekend hours.

Place a quarter upside down into the tire tread, with Washington's head going in first. If the top of George's head is covered by the tread at various points around the tire, your radials are road-ready for a trip to Vail.

"But if the top of his head is visible at any point around the tire, you need new tires and you probably shouldn't head on up," said Amy Ford, spokeswoman for the Colorado Department of Transportation.

Encouraging people to do the tire check is one small but vital cog in CDOT's plan for the corridor, which includes \$8 million in new operational funds, an educational campaign and beefed-up enforcement of chain laws.

CDOT is bringing in more snowplows and personnel to help with traffic management, including a new coordinator of I-70 mountain traffic, Patrick Chavez. The snowplows, along with state troopers, will be used as escorts to move backed-up traffic through the Eisenhower/Johnson Memorial tunnels, a strategy that worked well last season, CDOT said. The CSP will be emphasizing chain law enforcement for truckers, as well as passenger vehicles, said Maj. Steve Garcia.

Motorists will be blanketed with information about the chain law and the "Move It" law, which requires drivers to move their vehicles out of traffic after an accident to a safe location when the vehicle is drivable, no drugs or alcohol are involved and there are no injuries.

"Traffic accidents — not volume — account for as much as 60 percent of all traffic delays," Garcia said. "It's called the accordion effect. A minor accident that takes just 10 minutes to clear can delay traffic up to one hour."

CDOT and its volunteers will be conducting the George Washington quarter test at resort parking lots and leaving a note telling skiers and snowboarders if their tires are not in good condition, and tire companies will offer discounts for new ones.

Also, CDOT is partnering with the **Denver Regional Council of Governments** to provide a van pool for one mountain trip each weekend.

The I-70 Coalition — a consortium of mountain towns and resorts — will again offer discounts, deals and incentives for travelers interested in avoiding traffic by staying in the mountains for an extra hour or two.

Those "Peak Time Deals" are updated regularly.

More travelers are taking advantage of off-hour deals but it will take time for people to make wholesale changes in their travel habits, said Margaret Bowes, program manager for the I-70 Coalition.

"There is no magic bullet for solving the traffic problem on I-70," Bowes said. "But if we keep up with these programs and keep at it time and time again, things will turn around."

# Landowner Group Wants Aurora to Annex 3,000 Acres East of City Planning Boundary

November 18, 2014

By: Rachel Sapin

*Aurora Sentinel*

Aurora could annex as much as 3,000 acres east of city boundaries to accommodate residential and commercial development associated with Denver International Airport.

At a study session Monday, Aurora City Council voted 9-1 to explore the costs of extending city boundaries at South Schumaker Road and East Sixth Avenue south to East Alameda Avenue, west to Quail Run Road and as far south as County Line Road from Quail Run. Councilwoman Molly Markert voted against the measure.

A group of landowners who want Aurora to annex a portion of land that's five square miles just east of city limits for residential development spurred the discussion. The properties would be northeast of Hayesmount Road and East Yale Avenue, about due east of Buckley Air Force Base.

"If we're going to do this, we might as well look at this bigger area," said Councilwoman Marsha Berzins. "The city is going east, no doubt about it."

A map provided by the City of Aurora shows the city's current boundary, a projected annexation boundary, and in orange, land outside the planning range that developers want to annex to Aurora for residential and business development.

Bob Watkins, director of planning and development services for the city, said the proposed residences fall outside of the city's 2009 Comprehensive Plan, a document Aurora uses to guide residential and commercial development as well as policymaking. He said the Comprehensive Plan would have to be amended to include the proposed properties, and the city would have to commission various studies at a cost of \$450,000 to look at infrastructure impacts such creating a network of roads for the rural area.

"A large portion of annexations occurred in the 1980s," Watkins said. He said the city's comprehensive plan was changed four times throughout that decade as the city moved southeast. "We've had small or intermittent annexations in recent years that are within an annexation boundary, and within transportation and water planning. The fiscal analysis has been simple and routine," he said.

Developing farther east versus focusing on urban infill also goes against agreements Aurora has with the **Denver Regional Council of Governments**. According to city documents, Aurora has 21,000 acres of vacant land zoned for residential use, which translates into 111,000 dwelling units for the city.

Aurora Water Director Marshall Brown said the proposed development would use 4,600 acre feet of the city's water supply, which would require the city to acquire additional water sources. "Water supply and acquisitions themselves are the biggest challenge related to water and new demands," he said. "Water acquisitions are becoming exorbitantly more expensive year to year." Councilman Bob LeGare said he supported the proposed area of annexation but needed more information.

"Certain types of development are good," he said. "Residential housing by itself ...that's a net loss for the city. We have to pay for that. For every thousand residents that move out (east), we have to pay a quarter of a million dollars for two cops ... That's what I'm looking for in these studies, what's the financial impact in case we annex another 20 sections out there."

According to city documents, the landowners said they would pay for a fiscal impact analysis for their properties, but no other studies recommended by city staff. Property owners Steven Cohen, Marc Cooper, James Spehalski and Andy Chaikovsky said the project could take anywhere from 10 to 30 years and would include some retail development. Landowners are represented by Michael Sheldon and Diana Rael.



# Silver Tsunami Faces Housing Crisis

November 21, 2014

By: Jennifer Smith

*Centennial Citizen*

Five years ago, Linda was a stable homeowner with two of her grandchildren living with her — or so she thought.

“What happened to me could happen to anyone,” she told those who attended a City of Centennial panel on affordable senior housing on Nov. 18. “Five years ago, I was ordering off the left side of the menu. I wasn’t planning on being a stroke victim.”

Linda, who asked that her last name not be used, lost her home to foreclosure during the recession and after her stroke.

“Being poor is very, very expensive,” she said.

According to **Denver Regional Council of Governments** data, there are 35,000 households in the metro area headed by people 65 and older making less than \$20,000 a year who pay more than 50 percent of that for housing.

“It’s not going to go away, it’s going to increase,” said Pat Coyle of the Colorado Department of Local Affairs, adding that Colorado is aging at double the rate of the national average.

That equals a crisis of significant proportions, said the panelists, one that local housing authorities simply can’t cope with on their own. Chris Shaffner, director of South Metro Housing Options, said 74 percent of his 600-plus units are occupied by seniors, with an additional 500 or so on his waiting list, which is closed.

“Frankly, we were offering help that just doesn’t exist for the next two years,” he said. “The folks that strike me the most are the ones who just don’t see it coming.”

Many seniors feel secure in their homes but don’t consider what would happen if their spouse died, or if they found themselves unable to care for the house or even themselves at some point. The market has anticipated the need for senior housing, and private buildings are cropping up all over the place. But those can run upward of \$3,500 a month.

“Not a single person I work with can afford these places,” said Missy Griggs, case manager supervisor at DRCOG. Many people only get enough Social Security to cover their rent, she said, and many end up living with family, in shelters or even on the streets.

“We’re going to have to start getting really creative to get people out of their cars, off people’s couches and into stable housing,” said Griggs.

If they're lucky enough to get on a waiting list for affordable housing, some get on Medicare and enter assisted living, even if they don't need it, until their number comes up.

"This is not a solution," said Griggs.

In fact, it's bad for the economy of the entire state, impacting health-care costs, food banks, crime rates, transportation, the tax base, education and on and on.

"People are not equipped to live as long as people are living today," said Jeff Martinez of Brothers Redevelopment, a nonprofit that helps meet housing needs for low-income, senior and disabled residents.

All panelists agreed that no one agency can solve the problem on its own, and that partnerships and creativity are the way to go. Housing authorities might put more of a focus on serving people in their own homes, for example, or matching people for roommate or communal living situations.

Local governments, often wary of high density and afraid to be seen as anti-developer, can lay the groundwork for some solutions through zoning and incentives, Shaffner said.

"It's a great conversation to have with city council," he said.

And people like Linda hope city councils will listen. She ended up getting help from Griggs, but she knows she's one of the lucky ones.

"I was very, very afraid I wouldn't be accepted anywhere else," she said. "But now I'm not alone, I'm not living in a Dumpster or eating out of one. I'm not embarrassed. Today, I'm recovering from a stroke. And with Missy's help, I'm getting the Medicaid I need and the transportation I need. ... I've come a long way since my foreclosure."

**From:** Mark Deven [<mailto:mdeven@arvada.org>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 25, 2014 6:35 AM  
**To:** Brad Calvert  
**Cc:** Flo Raitano; Bob Fifer  
**Subject:** Presentation

Brad

I know I said this last night; however, I wanted to express it again in writing. Excellent presentation last night. Arvada is on board for working within the framework developed by DRCOG to assess the needs of our seniors. This work is entirely consistent with Council direction expressed through our Strategic Plan. I am genuinely excited by the outcome of this work!

Please also express my appreciation to Jayla. It was great to see two people so engaged in the work they are doing!

--

Mark G. Deven  
City Manager  
City of Arvada  
8101 Ralston Road  
Arvada, CO 80001  
720-898-7510  
[mdeven@arvada.org](mailto:mdeven@arvada.org)

**From:** Santoro, Andrea L. - CPD Planning Services [<mailto:Andrea.Santoro@denvergov.org>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 13, 2014 2:34 PM  
**To:** Roxie Ronsen  
**Cc:** Ashley Summers; Gordon, Steve D. - Community Planning and Development  
**Subject:** A note of appreciation

Hello Roxie,

I am emailing to express my appreciation and excitement for DRCOG's new data portal, which your GIS team has designed. I attended the training last week and am very impressed with the data portal site, not to mention the potential benefits of the portal as a whole.

First and foremost, the data portal creates a more efficient process of collecting data and reducing the number of data requests, while storing information that has been provided. DRCOG's integration of existing open data portals and harvesting data available through Open Colorado further reduces duplicate efforts, while promoting the transition to an open data policy. In the case of Denver, the portal also provides transparency within our own organization, so we don't have multiple departments responding to the same request (if any data is needed beyond what is already online).

Another significant benefit of the new data portal is that it will allow our region's municipalities to share with each other through the portal, rather than posting data for the general public (and the whole world). This introduces an intermediate level of data sharing that may promote the creation of regional datasets and gently push people in the direction of more open data policies. I am hopeful that the portal will be another step towards these greater goals of more complete, more available, and more reliable data.

Thank you again to the DRCOG GIS team!!



**Andrea Santoro, GISP | Senior GIS Analyst**  
Community Planning and Development | City and County of Denver  
720.865.2946 Phone | [andrea.santoro@denvergov.org](mailto:andrea.santoro@denvergov.org)  
[DenverGov.org/CPD](http://DenverGov.org/CPD) | [@DenverCPD](https://twitter.com/DenverCPD) | Take our Survey  
Maps [\[Link\]](#) | Data [\[Link\]](#)



**OFFICE ON AGING**

DENVER HUMAN RIGHTS &  
COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

201 W. Colfax Dept. 1102, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

Denver, CO 80202

p: 720.913.8465

f: 720.913.8471

[www.denvergov.org/aging](http://www.denvergov.org/aging)

November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2014

Denver Regional Council of Governments  
1290 Broadway, Ste 700  
Denver, CO 80203

Dear Jayla Sanchez-Warren,

On behalf of Human Rights and Community Partnerships and the Denver Office on Aging, we would like to thank you for the support your staff member, Kelly Roberts, provided to the City Café held on Thursday, November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2014. This particular meeting is a vital part of the steps for the City and County of Denver to develop a plan for older adults moving forward.

Kelly Roberts provided support in various planning sessions, as well as the entire meeting to help participants through a very important process to create recommended actions steps and strategies. Her expertise in facilitation allowed for a very productive and engaging meeting, which will add to the upcoming Update of the Age Matters Report for the City and County of Denver in 2015.

It was a pleasure working with Kelly and we look forward to further partnerships with the Denver Regional Council of Governments in the future.

In respect and appreciation,

Derek Okubo  
Executive Director  
Denver Human Rights and Community Partnerships

Amanda Gregg  
Director  
Denver Office on Aging