AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 2017
6:30-8:30 p.m.
1290 Broadway
First Floor Independence Pass Conference Room

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

CONSENT AGENDA

8. 7:20 *Move to Approve Consent Agenda
   • Minutes of May 17, 2017
     (Attachment A)

*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.
ACTION AGENDA

9.  7:25  *Discussion of amendments to Committee Policy, Guidelines and Descriptions  (Attachment B) Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director

10.  7:35  *Discussion of the designation of a Critical Urban Freight Corridor  (Attachment C) Matthew Helfant, Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning & Operations

11.  7:45  *Discussion of amendments to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program  (Attachment D) Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning & Operations


13.  8:05  *Discussion of adoption of the 2018-2019 Unified Planning Work Program  (Attachment F) Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director

INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS

14.  8:15  Bike to Work Day update  (Attachment G) Celeste Stragand, TDM

15.  8:25  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 – Herb Atchison
C.  Report from Metro Area County Commissioners– Roger Partridge
D.  Report from Advisory Committee on Aging – Phil Cernanec
E.  Report from Regional Air Quality Council – Shakti
F.  Report on E-470 Authority – Ron Rakowsky
G.  Report on FasTracks – Bill Van Meter

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

16.  Board Workshop Agenda  
(Attachment H)

17.  Board Collaborative Assessment Results  
(Attachment I) Jerry Stigall, Director, Organizational Development

*Motion requested

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS (cont.)
18. *2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications*  
(Attachment J) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations

19. Relevant clippings and other communications of interest  
(Attachment K)  
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.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

20. **Next Meeting – August 16, 2017**

21. **Other Matters by Members**

22. 8:30 **Adjourn**
SPECIAL DATES TO NOTE

DRCOG Board Workshop  August 25/26, 2017

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

CALENDAR OF FUTURE MEETINGS

July 2017
18  Regional Transportation Committee  8:30 a.m.
19  Finance and Budget Committee  5:30 p.m.
19  Board of Directors  6:30 p.m.
21  Advisory Committee on Aging  CANCELLED
24  Transportation Advisory Committee  1:30 p.m.

August 2017
 2  Board Work Session  4:00 p.m.
 2  Performance and Engagement Committee  5:30 p.m.*
15  Regional Transportation Committee  8:30 a.m.
16  Finance and Budget Committee  5:30 p.m.
16  Board of Directors  6:30 p.m.
18  Advisory Committee on Aging  Noon – 3 p.m.
28  Transportation Advisory Committee  1:30 p.m.

September 2017
 6  Board Work Session  4:00 p.m.
 6  Performance and Engagement Committee  5:30 p.m.*
19  Regional Transportation Committee  8:30 a.m.
20  Finance and Budget Committee  5:30 p.m.
20  Board of Directors  6:30 p.m.
22  Advisory Committee on Aging  Noon – 3 p.m.
25  Transportation Advisory Committee  1:30 p.m.

* The Performance and Engagement Committee meeting will begin immediately following the Board work session; the time listed is approximate.
MINUTES
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY, May 17, 2017

Members/Alternates Present

Bob Roth, Chair
Eva Henry
Jeff Baker
Elise Jones
David Beacom
Crissy Fanganello
Roger Partridge
Libby Szabo
Bob Fifer
Larry Vittum
Aaron Brockett
Anne Justen
Doris Truhlar
Rick Teter
Steve Conklin
Joe Jefferson
Geoff Deakin
Daniel Dick
Lynette Kelsey
Scott Norquist
Ron Rakowsky
Shakti
Brad Wiesley
Phil Cernanec
Wynne Shaw
Joan Peck
Ashley Stolzmann
Connie Sullivan
Colleen Whitlow
John Diak
Sally Daigle
Rita Dozal
Eric Montoya (Alternate)
Herb Atchison
Joyce Jay
Debra Perkins-Smith
Bill Van Meter

City of Aurora
Adams County
Arapahoe County
Boulder County
City and County of Broomfield
City and County of Denver
Douglas County
Jefferson County
City of Arvada
Town of Bennett
City of Boulder
Town of Bow Mar
City of Centennial
City of Commerce City
City of Edgewater
City of Englewood
Town of Erie
City of Federal Heights
Town of Georgetown
City of Glendale
City of Greenwood Village
City of Lakewood
City of Lafayette
City of Littleton
City of Lone Tree
City of Longmont
City of Louisville
Town of Lyons
Town of Mead
Town of Parker
City of Sheridan
Town of Superior
City of Thornton
City of Westminster
City of Wheat Ridge
Colorado Department of Transportation
Regional Transportation District

Others Present: Douglas W Rex, Acting Executive Director, Connie Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Coordinator, DRCOG; Jeanne Shreve, Adams County; Bryan Weimer, Arapahoe County; Mac Callison, Aurora; Jamie Hartig, Douglas County; Carolyn Scharf, Federal Heights; Kevin Forgett, Thornton; Danny Herrmann, CDOT; Jenn Cassel,
Chair Bob Roth called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present.

Move to Approve Agenda

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

Report of the Chair

- Chair Roth reported the Regional Transportation Committee meeting was cancelled.
- Director Fifer reported the Board Collaborative Assessment survey will be sent to Directors tomorrow, with a response date of June 1. The Performance and Engagement Committee selected a firm for the Executive Director recruitment.
- Director Diak reported the Finance and Budget Committee approved a contract extension for the Veterans Directed program, approved receipt of a $100,000 grant for part funding of a case management pilot program, received information on an application to the Colorado Department of Transportation for a transit-related grant, and received an update on the building lease negotiations.
- Chair Roth reported for the third year in a row, the City of Aurora received an award from the National Mayor’s Challenge for Water Conservation.

Report of the Executive Director

- Doug Rex noted there will be no June Board or Finance and Budget Committee meetings.
- Mr. Rex reported the DRCOG Awards Event went well, and encouraged members to provide input for future events.
- Bike to Work Day is June 28, Board Directors and alternates are encouraged to sign up for a free t-shirt.
- Registration is open for the next Small Communities/Hot Topics forum on June 29.
- There will be a Transportation Short Course on June 7 at 2 p.m.
- DRCOG is hosting a Senior Affordable Housing Developers Focus Group on May 25.
- The Board Workshop is scheduled for August 25/26, and will be held at the Colorado Springs Marriott. Additional information will be sent to Directors soon.

Public comment

No public comment was received.

Move to approve consent agenda

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

Items on the consent agenda included:
• Minutes of April 19, 2017 meeting

Discussion of appointments to the Finance and Budget and Performance and Engagement committees
Ron Rakowsky, Nominating Committee Chair, reported the Committee has unanimously recommended appointment of members to the committees as noted in the agenda memo.

Director Rakowsky moved to appoint members to the Finance and Budget and Performance and Engagement committees as proposed. The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

Presentation on Way to Go
Steve Erickson, Director of Communications & Marketing, provided an overview of the Way to Go program, a partnership of seven Transportation Demand Management agencies in the region. The goal is to reduce per capita VMT, reduce congestion and improve air quality in the region. Programs include rideshare, guaranteed ride home, vanpool, schoolpool, and Bike to Work Day activities.

Presentation on Metro Vision Scorecard
Jerry Stigall, Director of Organizational Development, briefed members on the Metro Vision Scorecard. The scorecard will be available for review by Directors in the Board Portal.

Legislative Wrap-up
Jennifer Cassell, DRCOG Lobbyist, and Rich Mauro, Senior Legislative and Policy Analyst, provided information on the recently-concluded legislative session and the final status of bills of interest to DRCOG.

Presentation on Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Accountable Health Communities grant
Jayla Sanchez-Warren, Director, Area Agency on Aging (AAA), and AJ Diamontopoulos, Business Development Coordinator, provided information on a $4.5 million grant DRCOG has received from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid to reduce costs for Medicare/Medicaid beneficiaries. DRCOG is one of two community-based programs to receive the grant. DRCOG is partnering with other agencies around the metro area to provide services under the grant.

FasTracks Annual Status Report
Bill Van Meter provided an overview of the annual FasTracks status report. He reported work on the North Metro Line schedule is delayed due to time necessary to complete review and receive approval of design drawings. A new schedule will be determined soon. Updates will be provided to DRCOG. Construction on the Gold Line is complete, and limited testing on the G line has been authorized by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The FRA waiver on the A Line is still in effect. The early start-up issues on the A Line have been largely resolved. To date $11.1 million has been spent on the Northwest rail corridor, on preliminary design and environmental work. Director Atchison asked about the status of the B Line stopping at the 41st and Fox and Pecos Junction stations. The
stations were constructed as part of the G Line operation. When the G Line operation was delayed, a request was made for the B Line (currently nonstop) to service those two stations. Staff is in discussions with the contractor on offering this service. Directors expressed disappointment with the continued delays on the North Metro line.

Committee Reports

State Transportation Advisory Committee – Director Partridge reported the STAC received a presentation from staff regarding safety and fatalities and an update on proposed changes to future year 5311 program funding.

Metro Mayors Caucus – Director Atchison reported the Metro Mayors Caucus are wrapping up their legislative work.

Metro Area County Commissioners – Director Partridge reported a presentation on affordable housing was provided.

Advisory Committee on Aging – Director Cernanec reported the ACA discussed Sunshine Home Sharing, received a Boomer Bond assessment update, a report on the County Commission on Aging Forum, and an update on the Community Transitions program. The federal budget for senior services was also discussed.

Regional Air Quality Council – Director Shakti reported the Regional Air Quality Council did not meet.

E-470 Authority – Director Rakowsky reported the recent audit of the Authority came back clean with no findings.

Report on FasTracks – No report was provided.

Next meeting – July 19, 2017

Other matters by members
Director Rakowsky noted this is National Police Week.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

_______________________________________
Bob Roth, Chair
Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

______________________________________
Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors  

From: Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations  
(303) 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 19, 2017</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT**
This item concerns approval of proposed amendments to the *Committee Policy, Guidelines and Descriptions*.

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**
Staff recommends the Board approve the proposed amendments to the Guidelines.

**ACTION BY OTHERS**
N/A

**SUMMARY**
The Fire Personnel Recruitment Advisory Committee was disbanded in conjunction with DRCOG ending the Firefighter Intraregional Recruitment and Employment program at the end of 2016. It’s appropriate to remove the committee from the guideline document.

Staff recommends the Steering Committee of the Baghdad/Denver Regional Partnership be disbanded due to inactivity. It is not staff’s intention to end the Partnership program, only the steering committee. For the past several years, the Partnership has primarily hosted activities only in conjunction with other groups such as World Denver, and provided funds to send Board members to the annual Sister Cities conference.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**
N/A

**PROPOSED MOTION**
Move to approve amendments to the *Committee Policy, Guidelines and Descriptions* as proposed.

**ATTACHMENT**
- Draft Committee Guidelines

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
Should you have any questions regarding this item, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Connie Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Coordinator, at 303-480-6701 or cgarcia@drcog.org.
COMMITTEE POLICY, GUIDELINES AND DESCRIPTIONS

JULY 2008
AMENDED FEBRUARY 18, 2009
AMENDED JULY 21, 2010
AMENDED OCTOBER 20, 2010
AMENDED JANUARY 19, 2011
AMENDED SEPTEMBER 21, 2011
AMENDED JANUARY 18, 2012
AMENDED JANUARY 16, 2013
AMENDED MARCH 19, 2014
AMENDED APRIL 20, 2016
AMENDED SEPTEMBER 21, 2016
AMENDED __________________, 2017

DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
1290 Broadway, Suite 100
Denver, Colorado 80203
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I. POLICY STATEMENT

The Denver Regional Council of Governments declares its desire to obtain the broadest possible involvement in its programs and decision-making process. The principal means of obtaining this participation is through the Board of Directors and its standing and advisory committees.

II. GUIDELINES

A. PURPOSE

The Board of Directors’ decision-making process is designed to achieve the following goals:

1. increase participation by Board members and Board alternates in the policy process;

2. integrate technical and political issues into policy discussions and actions under the umbrella of Metro Vision;

3. undertake specific tasks as requested by the Board;

4. develop proposals and recommendations, with DRCOG staff assistance, for Board consideration;

5. interact with staff and Board members so the concerns of local governments are fully understood in the formulation of region policies; and

6. actively seek the involvement of other regional agencies, and business and citizen groups so that their perspective can be incorporated in DRCOG's program activities and decisions.

B. AUTHORITY FOR FORMATION

The categories for DRCOG committees include:

- Standing committees
- Ad hoc committees

Each is formed as provided by Board action, interagency agreement, federal or state statutes, memorandum of understanding or memorandum of agreement signed by the Board Chair or Executive Director. Descriptions follow.

C. MEETINGS

Committees may meet as needed or as specified in the committee description. If a committee wishes to request a meeting that is not regularly scheduled, the committee
chair must consult with DRCOG on staffing and meeting room availability. It will be the responsibility of DRCOG staff to maintain membership lists of the committees. Meeting notices will be distributed through DRCOG.

D. COMMUNICATIONS BY COMMITTEES

It is important for committees to understand their relationship to the staff of DRCOG and to the Board.

Most committees have a direct relationship with the DRCOG Board of Directors, while some have an indirect relationship with recommendations made through a designated committee. DRCOG staff provides information and administrative support to all committees and the Board.

To provide for effective communication throughout the committee structure, the following guidelines will apply.

1. The Board may provide direction to any committee on issues for consideration.

2. Committees with a direct relationship to the Board will review communications from committees with an indirect relationship and make a policy action recommendation to the Board.

3. Recommendations from ad hoc committees to the Board may be supplemented by specific information relative to implications and options for consideration.

4. Committee officers are encouraged to make presentations of committee actions to the Board.

5. Correspondence from committees to agencies, organizations or individuals outside DRCOG are to be prepared and forwarded to the Executive Director for review. The Executive Director has the discretion to obtain approval of the full Board for correspondence before signing.

E. MEMBERSHIP

Committee membership is based on differing authorities, which authorities address the number of members, qualifications, terms of office, and other requirements concerning committee membership. Specific committee membership information is as set forth in the authorities establishing or describing committees, and summarized for each committee in the below committee descriptions.

**Standing Committees**

Authorities for these committees and their criteria for membership come from the DRCOG Articles of Association, memoranda of agreement, intergovernmental
agreements, federal or state statutes, or Board authorization. These committees include:

- Executive Committee
- Finance & Budget Committee
- Performance & Engagement Committee
- Nominating Committee
- Regional Transportation Committee
- Transportation Advisory Committee
- Advisory Committee on Aging
- Steering Committee of the Baghdad-Denver Regional Partnership
- Fire Personnel Recruitment Advisory Committee

**Ad Hoc Committees**

The Board of Directors may create ad hoc committees to review and study specific issues within a specified timeframe. Ad hoc committees will have a written charge or scope of work set by the Board. The number of ad hoc committees must be aligned and within available DRCOG budgetary and staffing resources.

Ad hoc committee membership will comprise at least a half-plus-one of interested Board members and Board alternates. Other elected officials, as well as local staff and other stakeholders may be appointed, as appropriate. The Board Chair will appoint members to those committees created by the Board and will designate the committee chair. Members of ad hoc committees may not appoint an alternate to the committee. Meetings will be conducted on an informal basis and the spirit/intent is to reach consensus decisions.

**F. ELECTION OR APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS**

Officers of a committee are designated or elected as provided in the authorities establishing or describing the committee. If not specifically stated in such authority, the chair and vice chair for a committee shall be elected from among the members annually.

**G. SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITY**

Each committee has the scope of responsibility as provided in the authorities establishing or describing the committee.

**H. QUORUM AND VOTING**

Quorum and voting requirements are as provided in the authorities establishing or describing the committee. If not specifically stated in such authority, a quorum consists of one-third of the total voting members, a quorum is required for formal
action, and a simple majority of those present, assuming a quorum, carries a motion or other action.

I. OTHER PROCEDURES

In general, committee proceedings should be conducted on an informal basis. The rules of order shall be in accordance with the latest edition of Roberts Rules of Order, Revised.

All committee meetings will have an agenda that will be posted in the designated area for posting notice of meetings at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. Agendas may also be posted to the DRCOG website. If the committee wishes to solicit input, it should schedule a specific time and notify all stakeholders of that opportunity. Seating for the public will be provided in an area of the meeting room that is distinct from that of the committee members. A meeting summary should be kept to the extent necessary to record decisions made. All motions must be recorded, including the person making the motion and the outcome of the vote. A committee may convene in executive session solely for purposes authorized by and in compliance with the procedures and requirements of the Colorado Open Meetings Law. Participation in an executive session shall be limited to members of the committee and such other persons identified by the committee as participants as part of the request or motion to convene in executive session.

Review of these guidelines and committee descriptions will occur periodically, but at least every four years.
III. COMMITTEE DESCRIPTIONS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Type: Standing Committee

Authority: Articles of Association, revised March 16, 2016

MEMBERSHIP

The incumbent Board officers shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Council.

OFFICERS

The incumbent DRCOG Chair and Vice Chair shall serve in such capacity on the Executive Committee.

RESPONSIBILITIES

• The Executive Committee shall be the primary executive leadership of the Council, providing leadership to the Board and guidance to the Executive Director.
• The Executive Committee has no policy making authority.
• The Executive Committee helps set Board meeting agendas; provides guidance on resolution of conflicts; provides process guidance, and receives updates from and assures the progress of committees of the Council.

QUORUM

A quorum for the transaction of Executive Committee business shall be four (4) of its members.

VOTING

A majority of those present and voting shall decide any question brought before the meeting.
FINANCE & BUDGET COMMITTEE

Type: Standing Committee

Authority: Articles of Association, revised March 16, 2016

MEMBERSHIP

The administrative business of the Council concerning finances, contracts and related matters shall be managed by the Finance & Budget Committee. The Committee membership shall not exceed more than one-quarter of the total membership of the Board. Members of the Finance & Budget Committee shall be appointed by the Board upon recommendation of the Nominating Committee, in accordance with procedures and requirements set forth in the Articles of Association.

Committee members are appointed to two-year terms, except that in the initial establishment of the Committee, one half of the members are appointed to an initial one-year term so as to achieve staggered terms. A Committee member is eligible to serve so long as the jurisdiction he or she represents is a member of the Council, and he or she remains that member’s official member representative on the Board. Membership on the Committee is designated to the member’s jurisdiction; therefore, if a member appointed to the Committee is no longer able to serve, membership on the Committee shall transfer to the succeeding member representative of that jurisdiction on the Board, for the remainder of the term of the Committee appointment. A Committee member may seek re-appointment at the expiration of his or her term two-year term, in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in Articles of Association, but the Board shall have no obligation to re-appoint any member.

OFFICERS

The incumbent Treasurer of the Council shall serve as chair of the Finance & Budget Committee. The vice chair of the Committee shall be elected by the Committee at its first meeting following election of Board officers and to serve until the next election of officers.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The following powers and duties are vested in the Finance & Budget Committee:

• To review contracts, grants and expenditures and authorize the expenditure of funds and the entering into contracts, within the parameters of the Council budget.
• To execute official instruments of the Council.
• To review and recommend to the Board the budget as provided in Article XV of the Articles of Association.
• To review the Council’s audited financial statements with the Council’s auditor, and to undertake, oversee and/or review other organization audits.
• To receive and review other financial reports and provide regular updates to the Board.
• To compensate member representatives for expenses incurred in attending to the proper business of the Council.
• To exercise such other powers, duties, and functions as may be authorized by the Board.

QUORUM

A quorum for the transaction of Finance & Budget Committee business shall be one-third (1/3) of its members, plus one.

VOTING

A majority of those present and voting shall decide any question brought before the meeting. The Budget & Finance Committee chair shall vote as a member of the Committee. A Committee member’s designated alternate on the Board may attend meetings of the Committee and participate in deliberations, at the discretion of the chair, but may only vote in the absence of the member.
PERFORMANCE & ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Type:** Standing Committee

**Authority:** Articles of Association, revised March 16, 2016

**MEMBERSHIP**

The administrative business of the Council concerning the performance and evaluation of the Executive Director, the oversight of onboarding of new Board members and related matters shall be managed by a Performance & Engagement Committee. The Committee membership shall not exceed more than one-quarter of the total membership of the Board, plus the Board Chair who shall be an ex officio, voting member of the Committee. The Board Chair’s attendance at meetings is at the Chair’s discretion. Members of the Performance & Engagement Committee shall be appointed by the Board upon recommendation of the Nominating Committee, in accordance with procedures and requirements set forth in the Articles of Association.

Committee members are appointed to two-year terms, except that in the initial establishment of the Committee, one half of the members are appointed to an initial one-year term *so as* to achieve staggered terms. A Committee member is eligible to serve so long as the jurisdiction he or she represents is a member of the Council, and he or she remains that member's official member representative on the Board. Membership on the Committee is designated to the member’s jurisdiction; therefore, if a member appointed to the Committee is no longer able to serve, membership on the Committee shall transfer to the succeeding member representative of that jurisdiction on the Board, for the remainder of the term of the Committee appointment. A Committee member may seek re-appointment at the expiration of his or her two-year term, in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in Articles of Association, but the Board shall have no obligation to re-appoint any member.

**OFFICERS**

The incumbent Secretary of the Council shall serve as chair of the Performance & Engagement Committee. The vice chair of the Committee shall be elected by the Committee at its first meeting following election of Board officers and to serve until the next election of officers.

**RESPONSIBILITIES**

The following powers and duties are vested in the Performance & Engagement Committee:

- To develop the process for recruitment of the Executive Director.
- To recommend appointment of the Executive Director to the Board.
- To execute an employment contract with the Executive Director, within the parameters of the Council budget.
• To develop the process for, and execute and document the annual performance evaluation for the Executive Director, including approval and execution of amendments to the Executive Director employment contract in connection therewith, within the parameters of the Council budget.
• To hold quarterly meetings with the Executive Director to provide performance feedback to the Executive Director.
• To recommend to the Board, as needed, policies and procedures for the effective administration of the Executive Director.
• To provide oversight of onboarding programs for new Board appointees.
• To implement and review Board structure and governance decisions.
• To plan the annual Board workshop.
• To review results of Board assessments and recommend improvements.
• To receive and review reports related to the business of the Committee and provide regular updates to the Board.
• To exercise such other powers, duties, and functions as may be authorized by the Board.

QUORUM

A quorum for the transaction of Performance & Engagement Committee business shall be one-third (1/3) of its members, plus one, not including the ex-officio Board chair.

VOTING

A majority of those present and voting shall decide any question brought before the meeting. The Performance & Engagement Committee chair shall vote as a member of the Committee. A Committee member’s designated alternate on the Board may attend meetings of the Committee and participate in deliberations, at the discretion of the chair, but may only vote in the absence of the member.
NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Type: Standing Committee

Authority: Articles of Association, revised March 16, 2016

MEMBERSHIP

The Nominating Committee will consist of six Board members who shall be appointed in November of each year. Members include the Immediate Past Chair of the Board (or Vice Chair if there is no Immediate Past Chair); one Board member representing the City and County of Denver; one member selected by the Performance & Engagement Committee; one member selected by the Finance & Budget Committee; one member selected by the Board; and one member selected by the Board Chair. Member qualifications for the Nominating Committee are as follows:

- Members of the Nominating Committee shall have served not less than one year as a member or an alternate on the Board before being eligible to serve on the Nominating Committee.
- No more than one Board officer and no more than one member from the City and County of Denver may serve on the Nominating Committee.
- A designated alternate may not serve on the Nominating Committee.

In the appointment of the Nominating Committee, consideration shall be given to providing representation of a broad cross-section of the Board, taking into account community size, geographic location, the rate of growth, county and municipality, rural and suburban, and other factors. If a vacancy arises on the Nominating Committee, the person or entity that selected the departing member shall select a replacement.

OFFICERS

At its first meeting upon annual appointment of its members, the Nominating Committee shall elect its chair and vice chair.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The following powers and duties are vested in the Nominating Committee:

- To make recommendations regarding nominations for Board officers and Board officer vacancies as provided in the Articles of Association. (A Nominating Committee member may not be a nominee for Board officer.)
- To recommend member representatives for appointment by the Board to the Finance & Budget Committee and the Performance & Engagement Committee, in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in the Articles of Association.
- To make recommendations to the Board for appointment to fill any vacancy on the Finance & Budget Committee and the Performance & Engagement Committee, which
vacancy shall be filled in accordance with the procedures and requirements set forth in the Articles of Association.

QUORUM

A quorum for the transaction of Nominating Committee business shall be all six (6) of its members.

VOTING

A majority of those present and voting shall decide any question brought before the meeting.

OTHER PROCEDURES & GUIDELINES

- The Nominating Committee will meet at a time(s) convenient for all members in November. In January the Committee will present to the Board nominations for Treasurer, Secretary and Vice Chair, and recommendations for appointment to the Finance & Budget Committee and Performance & Engagement Committee. The election of officers and appointment of Committee members will take place at the February Board meeting.

- Any candidate for Board officer or the filling of a Board officer vacancy who receives a majority or tie vote of the Nominating Committee shall be presented to the Board for consideration.

- The incumbent holding the position of Vice Chair automatically becomes the Chair. In the event the incumbent Vice Chair does not assume the position of Chair or in the event of a vacancy in the position of Chair, the procedures and requirements set forth in the Articles of Association shall be followed for any Nominating Committee presentation of nominees to the DRCOG Board.

- With the goal of encouraging broad participation from the DRCOG Board, the Nominating Committee will consider interested Board members for the positions of Treasurer and Secretary to serve one-year terms without regard to an individual’s term limit or length of term with their respective jurisdiction board. For the position of Vice Chair, the Nominating Committee will ascertain the ability of the individual nominated for Vice Chair to serve as Chair without interruption due to term limits or elections.

- The Nominating Committee will request a short written statement from all interested Board members stating why he or she wishes to serve as a DRCOG Board officer and why the Nominating Committee should favorably consider them.

- The Nominating Committee will consider the following criteria when evaluating Board members for the positions of Treasurer, Secretary, Vice Chair, and if applicable Chair:
- Commitment to DRCOG’s vision and mission,
- Substantive experience with DRCOG,
- Strong willingness to serve, and
- Capacity to be “ambassadors” for DRCOG and represent the organization as needed and desirable.

For the position of Vice Chair, the Nominating Committee will consider and present a Board member with substantive past experience as a member of the DRCOG Board that includes serving in the position of Treasurer or Secretary or membership for at least one year on Finance & Budget Committee or the Performance & Engagement Committee. Participation as a member of another standing committee or ad hoc committee also may constitute substantive past experience.
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Type: Standing Committee

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

MEMBERSHIP

Sixteen members as follows:

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

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

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

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

USE OF ALTERNATES

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

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

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

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

QUORUM

Twelve members, or designated alternates.

VOTING

Twelve votes are required to carry any action.

OTHER

DRCOG representatives will attend a briefing with the DRCOG Executive Director immediately prior to the regularly scheduled RTC meeting.
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Type: Standing Committee


MEMBERSHIP

Transportation Advisory Committee Membership shall include:

- Two members each from Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Douglas and Jefferson counties and one member from Weld County within the MPO boundary, with at least three appointed from county government and at least seven from municipalities. Of the municipal representatives, at least two, but not more than three, shall represent communities with under 35,000 population;
- Two members from the City and County of Denver and one member from the City and County of Broomfield;
- One local government member from the non-MPO area of the Transportation Planning Region;
- Local government representatives shall be city or county managers/administrators, public works directors, transportation or planning directors or their equivalents;
- The Regional Transportation Directors from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Regions 1 and 4, or their designee; the Director of CDOT’s Transportation Development Division, or their designee; and the Director of CDOT’s Division of Transit and Rail, or their designee;
- The Assistant General Manager for Planning of the Regional Transportation District, or their designee;
- The Director of Transportation Planning and Operations of DRCOG;
- The Executive Director of the Regional Air Quality Council;
- One representative of each of the following special interests:
  - environmental interests;
  - freight interests;
  - transportation demand management/non-motorized transportation interests;
  - aviation interests;
  - business/economic development interests;
  - a non-RTD representative of transit interests;
  - senior interests; and
- In an ex officio capacity, a representative of the Federal Highway Administration and of the Federal Transit Administration. Ex-officio members are non-voting.

The Chair of the DRCOG Board of Directors shall make the 15 local government appointments. The seven special interests – Environment, Freight, TDM/Non-motorized, Aviation, Economic Development, Non-RTD Transit and Senior– shall be nominated by the
DRCOG Chair and confirmed by the Regional Transportation Committee. The DRCOG Chair shall review membership annually in the second quarter of the calendar year. The DRCOG Chair can take into consideration such factors as issues to be addressed, continuity of the Committee, attendance, and turnover in reconfirming or determining new appointments and nominations.

**USE OF ALTERNATES**

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

- The member will submit the name of their designated alternate in writing to the DRCOG Board coordinator.
- The member shall be responsible for briefing their alternate in advance on the Committee’s format and issues so that the alternate is empowered to act on behalf of their agency or interest.
- The designated alternate will be allowed to vote in the member’s place.

**OFFICERS**

Committee members shall elect a chair and vice chair to serve two-year terms. Elections shall be held during the fourth quarter of odd-numbered years.

**RESPONSIBILITIES**

To assist the Board of Directors and the Regional Transportation Committee by reviewing the work of the transportation planning process, advising on methods of planning and implementation and working with staff to develop policy options and making recommendations to the Regional Transportation Committee. Specifically, the Committee shall:

- Establish a dialog on regional transportation issues among local government, regional agencies, the state and other transportation stakeholders;
- Review the transportation planning process;
- Provide advice and guidance on methods of planning and implementation;
- Assist in coordinating and facilitating implementation of Metro Vision through the transportation planning process;
- Facilitate coordination of regional plans and programs among local government, regional agencies and the state; and
- Provide advice and recommendations to the Regional Transportation Committee on transportation plans and improvement programs.

**QUORUM/VOTING**

Fifteen voting members, or designated alternates, as fifteen votes are required to carry any action.
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGING (ACA)

Type: Standing Committee

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

MEMBERSHIP

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

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

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

OFFICERS

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

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

RESPONSIBILITIES

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

QUORUM

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

MEETINGS

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

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

SUBCOMMITTEES

- The ACA, in consultation with DRCOG staff, shall determine the need for subcommittees.
- Duties of subcommittees include making recommendations to the ACA regarding matters pertaining to their specific interest.
- Any ACA member may serve on any of the subcommittees but shall include, whenever possible, at least one member from each county represented.
- Voting is limited to one vote per county.
- Each subcommittee shall appoint a chair and the meeting schedule for the subcommittee shall be determined by the chair and other members in consultation with DRCOG staff.
- All subcommittee activities shall be reported by the subcommittee chair or their designee at the next regular ACA meeting.
- It is the responsibility of the AAA Division Director or designee to develop the monthly agenda. The subcommittee chair may request the agenda be developed in consultation with the subcommittee chair.
STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE BAGHDAD-DENVER REGION PARTNERSHIP

Type: Standing Committee

Authority: Formal signed declaration between the Provincial and City Councils of Baghdad, Iraq and DRCOG, October 20, 2004

MEMBERSHIP

The full Partnership may include any organization or individual from the Denver region who is interested in working on cultural, professional and educational exchange between people and groups in the Denver Region and people and groups in the Province of Baghdad. As the Partnership is a program of the DRCOG Board, the Steering Committee will have strong Board participation. At least five DRCOG Board members or alternates will serve on the Steering Committee and will include representation from the Partnership of not more than 20.

The initial appointments to the Steering Committee shall be for two year terms, and thereafter all appointments shall be for a term of one (1) year or until a successor is identified.

OFFICERS

- The officers of the Committee shall consist of a chair and vice chair, each of whom shall be elected by the Committee. DRCOG Board members will serve as chair and vice chair.
- The chair shall preside over all meetings, appoint any ad hoc committees, and have the authority to call special meetings. The chair, with DRCOG staff, shall be responsible for establishing the meeting agenda. In the event of the absence of the chair, the vice chair shall assume the duties of the chair.
- No member of the Committee other than the chair or chair's designee shall speak or act for the Committee without prior authorization from the Steering Committee.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- To initiate, sponsor, or conduct, alone or in conjunction with other cities or agencies, public programs to further public awareness of and interest in communities throughout the Province of Baghdad emphasizing such things as regional collaboration, civic duty, municipal services, and other matters relevant to local government.
- The Steering Committee must approve all activities or events carried out by the Partnership. Overall, Partnership activities will have the support of the DRCOG Board.
- The Steering Committee will generally stimulate, facilitate, coordinate and approve fundraising activities as needed. Partnership members will assist in fundraising activities and events. Grants may be accepted through DRCOG's 501(c)(3), Regional Response.
- Annually, the DRCOG Board determines the budget for the Steering Committee. Items eligible for funding include expenses for DRCOG staff time, limited travel and travel-
related expenses by members of the Partnership; and miscellaneous costs incurred by DRCOG.

• The Steering Committee will ensure that the list of Partnership participants (and relevant contact information) is up-to-date. It will be the responsibility of DRCOG staff to maintain the list.

• Recommend a budget as necessary for Partnership projects to be considered by the DRCOG Board of Directors.

QUORUM

Meetings of the Steering Committee will occur when a majority of the DRCOG Board members or alternates serving on the Steering Committee are present.

VOTING

Any action by the Steering Committee requires the support of a majority of the DRCOG Board members in attendance at the meeting.

MEETINGS

• Meetings of the Steering Committee shall be held at the DRCOG offices located at 1290 Broadway, Denver, Colorado or such other place as designated by the chair of the Committee.

• The Committee may conduct official meetings by telephone.

• Notice of meetings will be distributed by DRCOG staff at the request of the chair.
FIRE PERSONNEL RECRUITMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Type: Standing Committee

Authority: Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) by and between DRCOG and participating Local Governments. Renewed annually to include new members, as well as other contract amendments. Reference Fire Policies (5/14/2007)

MEMBERSHIP

The Fire Personnel Recruitment Advisory Committee is composed of two representatives from each participating jurisdiction. One representative is from the fire department/fire protection district and the other is from the civil service commission/human resource department. Membership is determined on an annual basis.

RESPONSIBILITIES

• Establish general policies for the operation of the program.
• Review and recommend an annual operating budget.
• Review and recommend an assessment fee formula for funding the program.
• Provide an equitable number of volunteer personnel hours for the purpose of assisting in the administration and evaluation of the testing process.
• Assist DRCOG Staff in locating testing facilities and in coordinating advertisement and recruitment campaigns.
Type: Ad Hoc Committees

Authority: DRCOG Board

MEMBERSHIP

Ad hoc committee membership will comprise at least one-half plus one Board members and alternates. All members will be appointed by the DRCOG Board Chair, who will also designate the ad hoc committee chair. The ad hoc committee will elect the vice chair from among its members. Other elected officials as well as local staff and other stakeholders may be appointed as appropriate.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- The ad hoc committee will have a written charge and/or scope of work that will be approved by the DRCOG Board. The written charge and/or scope will include a timeframe within which to complete work.
- Members may not appoint an alternate to the committee.
- Proceedings are conducted on an informal basis. Committee members only will be seated at the table with distinct seating available for other attendees.
- Each meeting will have an agenda that will be posted on the DRCOG website in advance of the meeting.
- There will be a designated time on the agenda for public comment. If the committee wishes to solicit additional input, it will schedule a specific time and notify all stakeholders of that opportunity.
- The spirit/intent is to reach consensus decisions.
- Staff will keep a general record of meetings, capturing important points of discussion and decision outcomes.

QUORUM

A quorum is one-third the total voting members.

VOTING

A simple majority carries a motion; the chair is a voting member.
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director
303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 19, 2017</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
Designation of a Critical Urban Freight Corridor in accordance with the FAST Act.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends approval of designating a Critical Urban Freight Corridor along US-85/Vasquez Blvd. from approximately 52nd Ave. to 64th Ave.

ACTION BY OTHERS
July 18, 2017 – RTC will act on a recommendation.
June 26, 2017 – TAC recommended approval.

SUMMARY
CDOT is currently developing the statewide Multimodal Freight Plan and updating the State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan. These plans will identify a long-term freight investment strategy and project priorities for future years of funding through the National Highway Freight Program (NHFP). The NHFP is a new formula freight program created under the FAST Act, and provides approximately $15 million annually to Colorado beginning in FY 2016. CDOT selects the projects that receive NHFP funds in Colorado.

CDOT has prepared a list of freight projects adopted by the Transportation Commission (Attachment 1) for the first two years of the NHFP. The FAST Act requires NHFP-funded projects to be on a designated critical freight corridor. Within the Denver-Aurora Urbanized Area boundary, DRCOG designates Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC). Elsewhere in Colorado, CDOT makes Critical Rural Freight Corridor designations. Projects on interstates and a few other major highways are already designated.

There is one NHFP project highlighted in Attachment 1, US-85/Vasquez Blvd. from I-270 to 62nd Ave., that CDOT requests DRCOG designate as a CUFC (with slightly longer geographic limits on each end to fully encompass the project with a buffer). All other CDOT-selected projects in the DRCOG region in Attachment 1 do not need to be designated because they are either already on the network or are outside of the Denver-Aurora Urbanized Area.

The proposed US-85/Vasquez Blvd. project is reconstruction of the I-270/Vasquez Blvd. interchange and intersection at 60th Ave. to improve safety and capacity, adding grade separation (at 60th Ave.) and improving access points along US-85. The Transportation Commission approved $4 million in NHFP funding to supplement other funding sources and support pre-construction activities for possible future advancement as an urban FASTLANE grant project.

CDOT staff will provide an overview of this topic at the Board meeting.
PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
Move to designate US-85/Vasquez Blvd. from MP 291.6 (approximately 52nd Ave.) to MP 293.8 (approximately 64th Ave.) as a Critical Urban Freight Corridor.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachments
1. Transportation Commission List of FY 2016-FY 2017 National Highway Freight Program Projects
2. CDOT presentation

Link

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director, at (303) 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Jeff Sudmeier, CDOT, at (303) 757-9063 or jeffrey.sudmeier@state.co.us.
Transportation Commission Resolution
May 18, 2017

WHEREAS, in 2015, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act created the National Highway Freight Program to improve the efficient movement of freight on the National Highway Freight Network; and

WHEREAS, the National Highway Freight Program is a new formula program for freight projects with funding authorized for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2016 through FFY 2020; and

WHEREAS, the National Highway Freight Program is anticipated to provide approximately $15 million (federal) annually to Colorado through FFY 2020; and

WHEREAS, projects have been identified and evaluated for the first two years of funding (FFY 2016 and FFY 2017) based on eligibility and evaluation criteria developed in cooperation with the Freight Advisory Council (FAC) and Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC); and

WHEREAS, the eligibility and evaluation criteria were developed based on federal program requirements and goal areas identified in the 2040 Statewide Transportation Plan, State Highway Freight Plan, and Transportation Commission Policy Directive 14.0; and

WHEREAS, projects identified for consideration based on eligibility and evaluation criteria were reviewed by the FAC and STAC and significant input was provided on the priority of different project and project types, the significance of project benefits to freight, and the appropriateness for freight funding; and

WHEREAS, based on the results of evaluation and input provided, 14 projects totaling $35.75 million have been identified for National Highway Freight Program funding; and

WHEREAS, an additional five projects have been identified for program development using State Planning and Research (SPR) funds and will be considered for funding for implementation in subsequent years of the National Highway Freight Program; and

WHEREAS, the projects identified for funding represent a balanced portfolio of projects with significant benefits to freight mobility and safety, and

WHEREAS, the projects were identified with the support of the FAC and STAC; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Commission approves the 14 projects identified as FY 2016 – FY 2017 National Highway Freight Program Projects, dated May 18, 2017; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, in the case of approved projects that assume other funding sources, funding approval may be reconsidered and other projects proposed in substitute if these other sources become unavailable and project implementation is significantly delayed; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, upon completion of an approved project, any National Highway Freight Program funds that remain as a result of project savings are to be made available for the implementation of other projects identified for potential National Highway Freight Program funding; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Commission directs staff to take appropriate steps to move forward with the obligation of National Highway Freight Program funds for the approved projects, including required designations under the National Highway Freight Network, and amendments to Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) or Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
FY 2016 – FY 2017 National Highway Freight Program Projects
May 18, 2017

- **Port-of-Entry (POE) Mobile Site / Highway Pullout Improvements** – Improvements to highway pullouts used by Colorado State Patrol as POE Mobile Sites and identified as high priorities for improvements, including leveling, paving, barrier separation and other improvements.

- **US 85 Louviers to Meadows Widening** – Reconstruction of two lane roadway to four lanes with a divided median and acceleration/deceleration lanes. NHFP will complete a larger construction funding package, providing for freight-related elements including widened paved shoulders.

- **US 85/Vasquez: I-270 to 62nd Ave. Interchange** – Reconstruction of interchange at I-270 and intersection at 60th Ave. to improve safety and capacity, adding grade separation, and improving access points. NHFP will supplement other funding sources and support preconstruction activities for possible future advancement as an urban FASTLANE grant.

- **US 50 Little Blue Canyon** – Reconstruction and widening of US 50 to improved geometric design standards, and other safety, drainage, and access improvements. NHFP will complete a larger construction funding package, providing for freight-related elements including shoulders and safety improvements.

- **US 160 Wolf Creek Safety Improvements** – Safety improvements based on US 160 Wolf Creek Pass Safety Audit, including improvements to road curvature, rumble strips, shoulder widening in pull-out locations, addition of crash barrier, highway re-striping, informational signing, and Variable Message Signs (VMS) targeting freight traffic.


- **Truck Parking Information Management System (TPIMS)** – Development of TPIMs to monitor availability of truck parking at locations where deployed and provide notification to drivers via in-dash communications or roadside signs. NHFP will supplement existing project and provide for expanded deployment to additional locations.

- **I-70 Truck Parking** – Development of up to four truck parking locations along I-70 in the vicinity of Glenwood Springs.

- **I-25: Valley Highway Phase 3.0: Santa Fe to Bronco Arch** – Replacement of low-vertical clearance bridges, interchanges, and roadway widening. NHFP will supplement other sources and support Planning and Environmental Linkages study and inclusion of low-vertical clearance bridges.

- **I-25: City Center Dr. to 29th St.** – New Pueblo Freeway improvements in Pueblo to the north of City Center Dr. including complete reconstruction and widening of I-25 between 29th St. and City Center Dr., construction of a split-diamond interchange, additional exit ramps near 6th St., and construction of a one-way frontage road between ramps. NHFP
will supplement other funding sources and support preconstruction activities for possible future advancement as an urban FASTLANE grant.

- **US 287: Lamar Reliever Route** – Realignment of US 50 to the south, new US 50/US 287 interchange, and realignment of US 287 to new reliever route. NHFP will supplement other funding sources and support preconstruction activities on US 287 realignment for possible future advancement as a rural FASTLANE grant.

- **I-70 West: Vail Pass Auxiliary Lanes** – Addition of auxiliary lanes on Vail Pass to accommodate slow moving commercial vehicles and alleviate substantial speed differentials causing lane changes, back-ups, and crashes. NHFP will supplement other funding sources and support preconstruction activities for possible future advancement as a rural FASTLANE grant.

- **SH-14 Sterling “S” Curve** – Realignment of SH 14 to an “S” curve alignment in order to connect I-76 while eliminating 90 degree turns, which are difficult for trucks to navigate. NHFP funding will complete a larger construction funding package.

- **US 85 Corridor Improvements** – Safety, intersection, and interchange improvements. NHFP will supplement other construction funding sources and support freight-related elements including improvements identified in US 85 Corridor FASTLANE grant application.
National Highway Freight Program

- New formula freight program created under the FAST Act
- Approximately $15 million to Colorado annually, beginning in federal fiscal year (FFY) 16
- Freight Advisory Council (FAC), State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC), MPOs/TPR input on freight priorities, approach, and criteria.
- Projects reviewed and evaluated with recommended projects for FFY 16 and FFY 17 approved by the Transportation Commission in May 2017.
  - 14 projects totaling approximately $35 million
National Highway Freight Program

- Truck Parking
  - Truck Parking Information Management System (TPIMS)
  - I-70 Truck Parking Glenwood Springs
- Truck Safety
  - Ports of Entry / Mobile Pull-Out Sites
  - US 85: Louviers to Meadows Widening
  - US 85/Vasquez: I-270 to 62nd Ave. Interchange
  - US 50: Little Blue Canyon Reconstruction and Widening
  - US 160 Wolf Creek Pass Safety Improvements
  - Region 5 Mountain Pass Chain Up Stations
- Freight Mobility
  - I-25 Central PEL (low vertical clearance bridges)
  - I-25 City Center Dr. to 29th St. Reconstruction and Widening
  - US 287 Lamar Reliever Route
  - I-70 West Vail Pass Auxiliary Lanes
  - SH 14: Sterling S Curve
  - US 85 Corridor Improvements

National Highway Freight Network

- Projects receiving National Highway Freight Program funding must be on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN)
- The NHFN includes:
  - Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) – Identified by FHWA as most critical highway portions of U.S. freight transportation system
  - Other Interstate Portions not on the PHFS
  - Critical Rural and Urban Freight Corridors (CRFC/CUFC) – Identified by States and MPOs, according to federal criteria and within mileage limits established by FHWA
    - Mileage limits – 160 miles rural, 80 miles urban
    - Can be updated as priorities change, projects are completed, etc.
National Highway Freight Program

• If not already on the NHFN, a corridor must be designated a CRFC or CUFC prior to the obligation of NHFN funds to a project.

• Three FY 16 – FY 17 projects are within the DRCOG boundary:
  - I-25 Central (already part of the NHFN)
  - US 85: Louviers to Meadows (already designated CRFC by CDOT)
  - US 85/Vasquez: I-270 to 62nd Ave. Interchange (designation as CUFC by DRCOG requested)

• Requested Action
  - Approval of the designation of Vasquez Blvd (Route 6H) from approximately 52nd Ave. (MP 291.6) to 64th Ave. (MP 293.8) as a Critical Urban Freight Corridor.
National Highway Freight Program

• Next Steps
  • Summer/Fall 2017 - Additional analysis and program development as part of the development of the Multimodal Freight Plan
  
  • Fall/Winter 2017-2018 - Identification of projects for FY 18 – FY 20 and incorporation of projects into Multimodal Freight Plan – Freight Investment Plan
  
  • Spring 2018 – Additional corridor designations and corridor de-designations based on identified projects
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors
From: Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director
303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org
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SUBJECT
DRCOG’s transportation planning process allows for Board-approved amendments to the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), taking place on an as-needed basis. Typically, these amendments involve the addition or deletion of projects, or adjustments to existing projects and do not impact funding for other projects in the TIP.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments because they comply with the current Board-adopted TIP Amendment Procedures.

ACTION BY OTHERS
July 18, 2017 – RTC will act on a recommendation.
June 26, 2017 – TAC recommended approval.

SUMMARY
There are three types of TIP projects to be amended; they are shown below and listed in Attachment 1. The proposed policy amendments to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program have been found to conform with the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality.

General Amendments
- **2007-094** Region 4 Hazard Elimination Pool
  Add funding
- **2016-026** Broadway Reconstruction: Violet Ave to US-36
  Replace all federal STP-Metro funding with state RAMP funding as part of the CDOT de-federalization pilot program
- **2018-001** Region 1 ADA Projects
  Adjust and add funding

Second Commitment in Principle
In July 2008, the DRCOG Board approved a “second commitment in principle” (SCIP) to FasTracks corridors in which specific dollar amounts were identified for eleven corridors. To date, seven of the eleven corridors (the Southeast Corridor would be the eighth) have programmed their full SCIP funding by reaching a corridor consensus on projects and submitting requests to DRCOG to program the funds. Two corridors (Central and Southwest) have yet to request any allocation, while the Northwest Corridor received a partial SCIP distribution in 2012 and 2016.

In early June 2017, the Southeast Corridor partners submitted a request for a full distribution ($1.928 million) of SCIP funding to go to the base project scope (see Attachment 2) as part of the TIP policy amendments. (Note: Per the adopting resolution, “…jointly-endorsed consensus requests may be submitted to DRCOG at any time and the Board of Directors,
through the MPO process, will act on them as Policy Amendments to the then-adopted Transportation Improvement Program at its next scheduled opportunity.”).

- **2012-010** DRCOG Second Commitment to FasTracks Pool
  Funds will be removed from the pool to reflect the Southeast Corridor Partners’ drawdown of their allocated funds

- **2007-059** FasTracks Southeast Corridor Extension: Lincoln Ave to RidgeGate Pkwy
  The Second Commitment to FasTracks Pool funding allocated to the Southeast Corridor will be applied towards the base project scope as agreed upon by the Southeast Corridor Partners

**National Highway Freight Program Projects**

The National Highway Freight Program is a new federal formula program created under the FAST Act, with funding allocated to each state. Projects to use this new funding were discussed and selected by the Transportation Commission, in consultation with CDOT, the state Freight Advisory Council, and the MPOs. The following five amendments are associated with the addition of this funding.

- **2001-154** US-85: Cook Ranch Rd to Meadows Pkwy Widening
  Add new Freight funding and RPP funding transferred from the R1 RPP Pool (TIP ID 2016-057)

- **New Project** I-25 Central PEL
  Transfer existing project from the R1 RPP Pool (TIP ID 2016-057) and add new Freight funding to create a new individually-depicted project

- **New Project** US-85: Vasquez Blvd from I-270/E. 56th Ave to E. 62nd Ave
  **Operational Improvements**
  Transfer existing project from the Region 1 Design Program (TIP ID 2018-005) and add new Freight funding to create a new individually-depicted project

- **2018-005** Region 1 Design Program
  Remove pool project and funding for I-270/Vasquez/60th Ave and transfer to new individually-depicted project listed above. Change pool project name

- **2016-057** Region 1 RPP Pool

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**

N/A

**PROPOSED MOTION**

Move to adopt a resolution approving the attached amendments to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
ATTACHMENTS
1. Proposed TIP amendments
2. FasTracks Southeast Corridor Partners letter (May 2, 2017)
3. Draft resolution

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director, at (303) 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, at (303) 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.
ATTACHMENT 1
Policy Amendments – June 2017
2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

2007-094: Add additional state funds and local match

**Existing**

**Title:** Region 4 Hazard Elimination Pool

**Project Type:** Safety

**Sponsor:** CDOT Region 4

**TIP-ID:** 2007-094  
**STIP-ID:** SR46666  
**Open to Public:**

**Project Scope**

Pool funds hazard elimination projects in CDOT Region 4 (Boulder and SW Weld Counties).

**Affected County(ies)**

- Boulder
- Weld

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Safety)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$16,230</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$31,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised Funding Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Safety)</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$16,230</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$38,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2016-026**: Replace DRCOG-allocated federal funding with state RAMP funding as part of CDOT’s statewide defederalization pilot program

### Existing

**Title**: Broadway Reconstruction: Violet Ave to US-36  
**TIP-ID**: 2016-026  
**STIP-ID**:  
**Open to Public**: 2020  
**Sponsor**: Boulder

#### Project Scope

Project will reconstruct Broadway St, from Violet Ave to US 36. New curb and gutter, underground utility upgrades, including new or improved traffic signal interconnection and bicycle detection, and bicycle, pedestrian, and transit stop facilities and amenities will also be included as part of the project.

#### Affected Municipality(ies) | Affected County(ies)
--- | ---
Boulder | Boulder

#### Project Phases

Year | Phase
--- | ---
2018 | Initiate ROW
2019 | Initiate Construction

#### Funding Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP-M)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$3,925</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revised Funding Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (RMP)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$3,825</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018-001: Adjust funding between TIP years based on latest funding estimates, and add future funding

**Existing**

**Title:** Region 1 ADA Projects

**Project Type:** Roadway Operational Improvements

**Sponsor:** CDOT Region 1

**Project Scope**

CDOT Region 1 pool to fund ADA-type projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised Funding Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (ADA)</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$6,200</td>
<td>$33,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2012-010:** Transfer funds to TIP ID 2007-059 and update scope to reflect funding drawdown by Southeast Corridor Partners

**Existing**

**Title:** DRCOG Second Commitment to FasTracks Pool  
**Project Type:** Transit Operational Improvements

**Project Scope**
Set aside to fund second commitment in principle to FasTracks corridors not yet allocated. Individual projects will be TIP’d upon approval of Policy Amendments per the process and requirements of DRCOG Resolution 20-2008 (July, 2008).

Corridor projects previously approved using second commitment funds include:
- West Corridor (TIP ID 2007-042)- July 2010, $7,422,000  
- US-36 Corridor (TIP ID 2008-114)- Feb 2011, $2,755,000  
- Denver Union Station (TIP ID 2007-057)- July 2010, $2,519,000  
- East Corridor (TIP ID 2008-111)- Nov 2011, $13,350,000  
- Gold Corridor (TIP ID 2008-111)- May 2012, $6,461,000  
- Northwest Corridor (TIP ID 2007-050)- May 2012, $1,200,000, June 2016, $5,058,000  
- North Metro Corridor (TIP ID 2007-055)- May 2012, $7,451,000  
- I-25 Corridor (TIP ID 2007-056)- July 2012, $7,250,000

Remaining allocations include:
- Northwest Corridor $1,746,000  
- Southeast Extension $1,928,000  
- Southwest Extension $2,089,000  
- Central Corridor $771,000

**Amounts in $1,000s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$4,073</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP-M)</td>
<td>$2,461</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1,634</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,168</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Project Scope and Funding Table

Title: DRCOG Second Commitment to FasTracks Pool

Project Type: Transit Operational Improvements

Sponsor: DRCOG

TIP-ID: 2012-010

STIP-ID: Open to Public: 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Project Scope

Set aside to fund second commitment in principle to FasTracks corridors not yet allocated. Individual projects will be TIP’d upon approval of Policy Amendments per the process and requirements of DRCOG Resolution 20-2008 (July, 2008).

Corridor projects previously approved using second commitment funds include:
- West Corridor (TIP ID 2007-042)- July 2010, $7,422,000
- US-36 Corridor (TIP ID 2008-114)- Feb 2011, $2,755,000
- Denver Union Station (TIP ID 2007-057)- July 2010, $2,519,000
- East Corridor (TIP ID 2008-111)- Nov 2011, $13,350,000.
- Gold Corridor (TIP ID 2008-111)- May 2012, $6,461,000.
- Northwest Corridor (TIP ID 2007-050)- May 2012, $1,200,000, June 2016, $5,050,000.
- Southeast Corridor (TIP ID 2007-059) - July 2017, $1,928,000.

Remaining allocations include:
- Northwest Corridor $1,746,000
- Southwest Extension $2,089,000
- Central Corridor $771,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amounts in $1,000s</td>
<td>Prior Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$2,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP-M)</td>
<td>$2,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2007-059: Add Second Commitment to FasTracks funding as requested by Southeast Corridor Partners

**Existing**

**Title:** FasTracks Southeast Corridor Extension: Lincoln Ave to RidgeGate Pkwy

**STIP ID:** SST7015

**Open to Public:** 2019

**Sponsor:** RTD

**Project Scope**

Extend Southeast Corridor LRT from Lincoln Ave to RidgeGate Pkwy Station in the City of Lone Tree.

---

### Revised Funding Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal (CMAQ)</strong></td>
<td>$1,928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local (RTD)</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,959</td>
<td>$4,884</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$233,390</td>
<td>$233,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$198,619</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,959</td>
<td>$4,884</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$233,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing**

**Project Scope**

### Affected Municipality(ies)
- Castle Rock
- Littleton

### Affected County(ies)
- Douglas

### Project Details
- **Title:** US-85: Cook Ranch Rd to Meadows Pkwy Widening
- **TIP-ID:** 2001-154
- **STIP-ID:** SDR5055
- **Open to Public:** 2020
- **Sponsor:** CDOT Region 1
- **Project Type:** Roadway Capacity

### Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State (R P P)</strong></td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$121,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$71,798</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$37,300</td>
<td>$121,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2001-154:** Add new Freight funding and RPP funding transferred from the R1 RPP Pool (TIP ID 2016-057) and adjust scope.
Revised Scope and Funding Table

### Project Scope

Roadway segments, listed in order of anticipated completion, and open to public year include:
- MP 191.75 to Louviers Ave; 2025*
- Daniels Park Rd. to SH-87 (Sedalia); 2021
- Castlegate to Daniels Park Rd; 2026
- Meadows Pkwy. to Castlegate; 2024**

* Pending RTP amendment to update to 1st stage (2019)
** Pending RTP amendment to update to 2nd stage (2026)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Municipality(ies)</th>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle Rock</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts in $1,000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (FRB)</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (R P P)</td>
<td>$11,800</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,898</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$127,598</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**New Project**: Transfer existing project from the R1 RPP Pool (TIP ID 2016-057) and add new Freight funding to create a new individually-depicted project

**Title**: I-25 Central PEL

**TIP-ID**: Request

**STIP-ID**: 

**Open to Public**: 

**Sponsor**: CDOT Region 1

**Project Scope**
I-25 Central PEL from Santa Fe to 20th, including the 23rd and Speer bridges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (FR8)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (R P P)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**New Project**: Transfer existing project from the Region 1 Design Program (TIP ID 2018-005) and add new Freight funding to create a new individually-depicted project

---

**Title**: US-85: Vasquez Blvd from I-270/E. 56th Ave to E. 62nd Ave

**Operational Improvements**

**TIP-ID**: Request

**STIP-ID**: Open to Public:

**Project Type**: Roadway Operational Improvements

**Sponsor**: CDOT Region 1

**Project Scope**

Geometric and operational improvements to Vasquez, including intersection at 60th and interchange at I-270.

**Affected Municipality(ies)**

Commerce City

**Affected County(ies)**

Adams

---

**Amounts in $1,000s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (FRB)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (RDP)</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing**

**Title:** Region 1 Design Program

**Project Type:** Other

**Open to Public:**

**Sponsor:** CDOT Region 1

**Policy Amendments – June 2017**

2018-005: Remove pool project and funding for I-270/Vasquez/60th Ave and transfer to new individually-depicted project. Change pool project name

**Project Scope**

A high priority pre-construction pool that will allow the achievement of significant pre-construction milestones in order to advance future projects.

**Affected County(ies):**

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

**Existing Revised Pool Projects and Funding Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-225</td>
<td>I-25 to Yosemite</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-270/Vasquez/60th Ave Improvements and interchange reconstruction</td>
<td>US-85 Richmond Hill to Shafer's Crossing</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amounts in $1,000s</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prior Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY18</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY19</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY20</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (ROP)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised Pool Projects and Funding Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-225</td>
<td>I-25 to Yosemite</td>
<td></td>
<td>US-265</td>
<td>Richmond Hill to Shafer's Crossing</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amounts in $1,000s</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prior Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY18</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY19</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY20</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (ROP)</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing

Title: Region 1 RPP Pool

TIP-ID: 2016-057  STIP-ID:  Open to Public:  Sponsor: CDOT Region 1

Project Scope
CDOT Region 1 RPP Pool. Funds projects with RPP funds.

Affected County(ies)
Adams
Arapahoe
Broomfield
Denver
Douglas
Jefferson

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small projects/consultants/contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-70</td>
<td>PPSL</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>US 85</td>
<td>Louviers to Sedalia</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>C470</td>
<td>Stacy</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>I-25 N</td>
<td>Pwa-PEL</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>Tower to Colfax</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>I-270</td>
<td>Interchange Study (TIP ID 2016-047)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Regionwide ADA Ramps (Reconstruction)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C470 West</td>
<td>PEL</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>I-25 Central PEL</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>Brighton Blvd/42nd Cullen</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120th Ave Connection</td>
<td>Broomfield TIP ID 2007-020</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>US 85 design</td>
<td>Sedalia to Meadows</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amounts in $1,000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (RPP)</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$57,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Revised Pool Projects and Funding Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name (Cont)</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name (Cont)</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small projects/consultants/oilseeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>120th Ave Connection</td>
<td>Broomfield TIP ID 2007-029</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>I-25 N</td>
<td>Post/FEL</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>PPSL</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>Regionwide ADA Ramps</td>
<td>PPSL</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>Tower to Colfax</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>C470</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Brighton Blvd/42nd</td>
<td>Culvert</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C470 West</td>
<td>PEL</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>I-270</td>
<td>Interchange Study (TIP ID 2016-047)</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amounts in $1,000s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (TIP)</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$13,300</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$13,300</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 2, 2017

Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments
1290 Broadway, Suite 700
Denver, CO 80203-5606

Dear Board Members:

The City of Lone Tree, the Colorado Department of Transportation and the Regional Transportation District (hereafter referred to as the Project Partners) are pleased to inform you that we have reached consensus on the use of additional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) funding allocated per Denver Regional Council of Governments Resolution Number 20, of 2008 (FasTracks Second Commitment in Principle - SCIP - funding) for the Southeast Rail Extension.

The Project Partners have agreed that the SCIP funding should be allocated towards the Southeast Rail Extension base project scope elements.

If you have any questions, please contact Bill Van Meter (RTD Assistant General Manager, Planning) at (303) 299-2448.

Sincerely,

The Project Partners

Jackie Millet, Mayor
City of Lone Tree

Shailen P. Bhatt, Executive Director
Colorado Department of Transportation

David A. Genova
RTD General Manager and CEO
A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE 2018-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

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

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

WHEREAS, a Transportation Improvement Program containing highway and transit improvements expected to be carried out in the period 2018-2021 was adopted by the Board of Directors on April 19, 2017; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to amend the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Denver Regional Council of Governments hereby amends the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Denver Regional Council of Governments hereby determines that these amendments to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program conform to the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality.

RESOLVED, PASSED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of __________________, 2017 at Denver, Colorado.

__________________________________________
Bob Roth, Chair
Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director
303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org

Meeting Date | Agenda Category | Agenda Item #
-------------|-----------------|--------------
July 19, 2017 | Action          | 12

**SUBJECT**
Project selection for the Regional Transportation Operations (RTO) Improvement Program of the Regional Transportation Operations Pool (TIP ID 2016-004) identified in the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**
Staff recommends approval of the proposed project funding selections for the RTO Improvement Program.

**ACTION BY OTHERS**
July 18, 2017 – RTC will act on a recommendation.

**June 26, 2017** – TAC recommended approval.

**May 24, 2017** - The RTO Working Group, comprised of transportation operations staff from regional partners and local governments, affirmed the proposed project selections.

**January 18, 2017** – DRCOG Board approved project selection process.

**December 19, 2016** – Transportation Advisory Committee recommended selection process to DRCOG Board.

**SUMMARY**
Following Board approval of the project selection process, DRCOG issued a call for applications on March 15, 2017. DRCOG received 29 project applications from nine project sponsors by the April 28, 2017, deadline. The total of federal requests was approximately $26.3 million.

Per the project selection process, DRCOG staff evaluated the applications and prepared a draft ranking of the projects for review by the RTO Working Group. The ranking process was specifically influenced by the program objectives that the project would achieve. Listed in order, the program objectives are:

- Employ consistent incident management processes
- Expand transportation operators’ situational awareness
- Coordinate regional, multimodal traveler information
- Employ good interjurisdictional transportation operations coordination and cooperation for all modes
- Coordinate management of freeway and arterial operations
- Provide multimodal traveler support

On May 24, 2017, DRCOG presented the ranking and proposed programming to the RTO Working Group. The proposed programming allocates federal funds:

- currently identified in the TIP for fiscal years 2018 and 2019,
- recent projects savings from the Traffic Signal System Improvement Program (TSSIP) and the ITS Deployment Program, and
• projected funds for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 that assume funding levels remain unchanged.

After several requested revisions, the RTO Working Group came to consensus on the proposed programming projects as shown in Attachment 1.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
Move to adopt a resolution approving the project funding selections for the RTO Improvement Program.

ATTACHMENT
1. Table summarizing proposed project selections for the RTO Improvement Program.
2. Presentation
3. Draft Resolution

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director, at (303) 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or contact Greg MacKinnon, Regional Transportation Operations Program Manager, at (303) 480-5633 or gmackinnon@drcog.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Descriptions</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>employee consistent incident management processes</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCTV Network Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy 51 CCTV cameras at selected key intersections across the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time Monitoring System Implementation</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy a travel time monitoring system on key arterials and feed the information to the CDOT's Traffic Management System.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCTV Network Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy 23 CCTV cameras on the Wadsworth Boulevard corridor from Trailmark Parkway to Hampden Avenue and 26th Avenue to SH 128 expanding the existing cameras system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time Monitoring System Expansion</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy additional field devices and system server to expand the existing travel time monitoring system to cover multiple corridors extending from Denver’s Central Business District (a total of 75 units), and feed the information to the CDOT’s Traffic Management System.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employ good interjurisdictional transportation operations coordination</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Signal System Equipment Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Pecos and Washington Streets, deploy upgraded: traffic signal system; traffic signal controllers and cabinets; signal interconnect communications; intersection detection; and, uninterruptible power supplies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Signal Interconnect Upgrade/Expansion</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy fiber communications expanding from the existing backbone network and upgrade 17 traffic signal controllers, cabinets and uninterruptible power supplies across the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Signal System Equipment Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 26 intersections across the city, deploy upgraded: traffic signal controllers and cabinets; signal interconnect communications; and, uninterruptible power supplies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheridan Boulevard Traffic Signal Interconnect Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy upgraded fiber communications along Sheridan Boulevard from 1st Avenue to Dillon Road interconnecting 8 traffic signals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 1 Traffic Adaptive Feasibility Study and Pilot Implementation</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using CDOT’s “adaptive signal timing prioritization tool” evaluate and prioritize opportunities to deploy adaptive traffic signal control in the DRCOG area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptive Signal Control Pilot</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy the equipment necessary to implement traffic adaptive control at: 56th Avenue &amp; Quebec Street and 56th Avenue &amp; Tower Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Business District Signal System Upgrade (Phase 3)</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 56 intersection in Denver’s Central Business District (CBD), deploy upgraded: traffic signal controllers; signal interconnect communications; and, uninterruptible power supplies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multijurisdictional Monitoring and Management</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In partnership with CDOT and Lakewood, deploy TransSuite system configurations that allow shared monitoring and control between the three traffic signal system and other common operations strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITS Device Performance and Reliability Improvement</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy 12 upgraded Ethernet switches at communications hubs across the city. Deploy several upgraded fiber communications links replacing radio bridges across the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic Lane Assignment System</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy a dynamic lane assignment system at the intersection of S Platte Canyon Road and W Bowles Avenue. Deploy a wireless CCTV at the same intersection to monitor operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Signal System Upgrade (Ph 5)</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy final phase of traffic signal system upgrades on: 84th Avenue (Huron Street to Grant Street); 120th Avenue (I-25 to Quebec Street); Huron Street (84th Avenue to Fire Station #2); and, Washington Street (121st Avenue to 134th Avenue) - a total of 32 intersections. Selected intersections will also have communications and UPS upgrades.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinate management of freeway and arterial operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-25 Managed Motorway Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy 34 advance detectors at intersections near I-25 on University Boulevard Colorado Boulevard, Evans Avenue, Yale Avenue, and Hampden Avenue. The purpose is to collect signal performance measures on these arterials to better manage their operation in coordination with CDOT’s Smart 25 project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McCaslin Monitoring and Management System</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointly deploy vehicle detectors, a travel time monitoring system, and a CCTV camera system along McCaslin Boulevard between South Boulder Road and Coalton Road. The purpose of the system is to jointly monitor and manage operations on McCaslin while coordinating operations with US 36.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide multimodal traveler support</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Detection</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy bicycle detection at 33 intersections where bike lanes cross major arterials. The purpose is to provide bike phase at the intersection only when bicyclists are present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle Detection</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploy bicycle detection at 37 additional intersections to support bicycle movements crossing major arterials. The purpose is to provide bike phase at the intersection only when bicyclists are present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall program support projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$5,360,622</td>
<td>$4,353,935</td>
<td>$3,064,159</td>
<td>$998,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT TSM&amp;O</td>
<td>Travel Time Monitoring Project Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CDOT must prepare specific software configurations to accept travel time feeds from local jurisdictions deploying travel time monitoring projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X  X  X  X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRCOG</th>
<th>Signal Timing Support and System Design and Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRCOG provides interjurisdictional signal timing plan development services for the projects identified above. DRCOG consultants will also provide design support services for traffic signal system upgrade projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total Allocated**  
$5,440,622  $4,803,935  $4,614,159  $2,498,631
Background

Regional Transportation Operations (RTO) Improvement Program

- **Purpose** – fund technology infrastructure and service improvements that allow jurisdictions and agencies to better coordinate day-to-day transportation operations

Background

- DRCOG staff provides direct signal timing support services to project sponsors/practitioners (local agencies, CDOT, RTD)
- RTO Working Group (transportation system operators and other operations stakeholders) participate in planning and programming
- About 30 local jurisdictions and partner agencies have received funding and/or services through program

Program Objectives

- Projects that improve day-to-day travel time reliability:
  - Improve traffic incident management
  - Improve operator awareness
  - Improve traveler information capabilities
  - Maintain interjurisdictional coordinated signal timing and operations
  - Improve coordination between freeway and arterial operations
  - Improve multimodal travel support
Project Recommendations Summary

- 29 capital projects submitted; 22 projects recommended
- Engineer’s estimates were clarified by project sponsors
- 2 projects were withdrawn
- 2 pairs of projects were combined
- 2 projects are not recommended for funding
- 1 project recategorized as a support project
A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

WHEREAS, the Denver Regional Council of Governments conducts a regional transportation operations program to assist local governments and the state in improving the efficiency of transportation operations in the region; and

WHEREAS, the efficient operation of traffic signals and other transportation technology assists in relieving congestion, conserving energy, and reducing air pollutant emissions; and

WHEREAS, a Transportation Improvement Program containing highway and transit improvements expected to be carried out in the period 2018-2021 was adopted by the Board of Directors on April 19, 2017; and

WHEREAS, said Transportation Improvement Program includes a called Regional Transportation Operations Pool (TIP # 2016-004) to fund traffic signal system project; traffic signal timing and coordination work; traffic signal system engineering and design; and, intelligent transportation systems projects that allow jurisdictions and agencies to better coordinate day-to-day transportation operations; and

WHEREAS, the Denver Regional Council of Governments solicited applications for funding from local governments and agencies; and

WHEREAS, applications were reviewed and programmed, according to the approved project selection process, with the assistance of the Regional Transportation Operations Working Group, which is comprised of local government and state transportation operations staff and other operations stakeholders; and

WHEREAS, the program allocates federal funding identified in the TIP for fiscal years 2018 and 2019; project savings from previous program projects; and projected funds for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 that assume funding level remaining unchanged; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Transportation Committee recommended the Regional Transportation Operations Improvement Program projects.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Denver Regional Council of Governments hereby allocates the funds in the Regional Transportation Operations Pool in the amount of $5,440,622 in fiscal year 2018, $4,803,935 in fiscal year 2019, $4,614,159 in fiscal year 2020, and $2,498,631 in fiscal year 2021 to the following projects in the amounts indicated.
### Project Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee consistent incident management processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Dynamic Message Sign Implementation for Incident Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$628,843*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand transportation operators’ situational awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora CCTV Network Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$253,690*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Travel Time Monitoring System Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$112,838*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT CCTV Network Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,028*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT CCTV Network Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$184,115*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Travel Time Monitoring System Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$613,147*</td>
<td>$635,029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employ good interjurisdictional transportation operations coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams County Traffic Signal System Equipment Upgrade</td>
<td>$1,425,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvada Traffic Signal Interconnect Upgrade/Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td>$619,475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Traffic Signal System Equipment Upgrade</td>
<td>$359,144*</td>
<td>$359,144*</td>
<td>$359,144*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield Sheridan Boulevard Traffic Signal Interconnect Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$362,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT Region 1 Traffic Adaptive Feasibility Study and Pilot Implementation</td>
<td>$148,781</td>
<td>$979,801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Adaptive Signal Control Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$225,513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Central Business District Signal System Upgrade (Phase 3)</td>
<td>$1,222,378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Multijurisdictional Monitoring and Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver ITS Device Performance and Reliability Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$998,631*</td>
<td>$998,631*</td>
<td>$998,631*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton Dynamic Lane Assignment System</td>
<td>$43,523*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton Traffic Signal System Upgrade (Ph 5)</td>
<td>$544,406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinate management of freeway and arterial operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver I-25 Managed Motorway Performance Measure</td>
<td>$217,000*</td>
<td>$217,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior/Louisville McCaslin Monitoring and Management System</td>
<td>$147,600*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide multimodal traveler support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Bicycle Detection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$597,080*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Bicycle Detection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$346,257*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall program support projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT Travel Time Monitoring Project Support</td>
<td>$80,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRCOG Signal Timing Support and System Design and Coordination</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Allocated</strong></td>
<td>$5,440,622</td>
<td>$4,803,935</td>
<td>$4,614,159</td>
<td>$2,498,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This project is subject to a required non-federal match of 20%.
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RESOLVED, PASSED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of __________________, 2017 at Denver, Colorado.

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

ATTEST:

________________________________________
Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director
303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org

Meeting Date | Agenda Category | Agenda Item #
--- | --- | ---
July 19, 2017 | Action | 13

SUBJECT
The FY2018-FY2019 Unified Planning Work Program for the Denver Region is the MPO’s work program for the next two federal fiscal years.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends approval of the draft FY2018-FY2019 Unified Planning Work Program for the Denver Region.

ACTION BY OTHERS
July 18, 2017 – RTC will act on a recommendation.
June 26, 2017 – TAC recommended approval.

SUMMARY
The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is a federally-required document that outlines the planning tasks and activities to be conducted within the region with federal transportation planning funds. The document also lists other major planning activities performed by local governments and partner agencies.

The new FY2018–FY2019 UPWP (Attachment 1) outlines activities to be conducted from October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2019, and was prepared with input from CDOT, RTD, and local government staff.

Priorities over the next two years include:
- Maintain the FY2018-2019 UPWP and CPG contracts
- Conduct and educate the public and local government staff through forums, meetings, and other involvement activities
- Complete DRCOG region freight and goods movement report (DRCOG version of CDOT statewide Multimodal Freight Plan)
- Complete and adopt 2045 MVRTP
- Prepare DRCOG Active Transportation Plan
- Prepare and adopt the 2020-2023 TIP
- Work with partner agencies to set performance measures and targets, and prepare reports
- Maintain the transportation operations program
- Prepare white paper summarizing status and results of congestion mitigation TIP projects
- Maintain and update Coordinated Public Transit—Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan)
- Complete the 2016 Denver Regional Aerial Photography Project
- Maintain and enhance land use and transportation forecasting models

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A
PROPOSED MOTION
Move to adopt the FY2018-FY2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

ATTACHMENTS

Link
Track changes version

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director, at (303) 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, at (303) 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.
FY 2018 and FY 2019
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FOR THE DENVER REGION

DRAFT
June 19, 2017
ABSTRACT

TITLE: FY 2018 and FY 2019 Unified Planning Work Program for the Denver Region

AUTHOR: Denver Regional Council of Governments

SUBJECT: Joint transportation planning work program for the Denver Regional Council of Governments, Colorado Department of Transportation, and Regional Transportation District

DATE: Adopted ______

SOURCE OF COPIES: Public Information and Communications
DRCOG
1290 Broadway, Suite 100
Denver, CO 80203
(303) 455-1000
or from the DRCOG website

NUMBER OF PAGES: 45

ABSTRACT: The Unified Planning Work Program describes and facilitates coordination of all urban transportation and transportation-related planning activities anticipated within the DRCOG Region for the 2-year period October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2019 (federal fiscal years 2018 and 2019)

Preparation of this report has been financed in part through grants from the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration of the U.S. Department of Transportation.
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I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) describes the proposed multimodal transportation planning activities to be conducted in the Denver region during FY 2018 and FY 2019 (October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2019). The UPWP is administered by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement between DRCOG, the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Regional Transportation District (RTD). The Memorandum of Agreement coordinates transportation decision-making in the region. Additionally, the planning and decision making process is defined through a guiding document titled Transportation Planning in the Denver Region.

The UPWP is prepared biennially and serves as the basis by which Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) urban transportation planning funds are spent in the region. Additionally, the UPWP is the management tool for scheduling, budgeting and monitoring the planning activities of participating entities.

BACKGROUND

The Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region’s Transportation Management Area (TMA) (see Figure 1). DRCOG is the recipient of the federal urban transportation planning funds. As the designated MPO, DRCOG is responsible for facilitating the Urban Transportation Planning Process, and for coordinating the activities of the other participating agencies that carry out UPWP activities. DRCOG works with local governments, regional agencies, and the state to determine how the federal urban transportation planning funds will be spent.

DRCOG, CDOT and RTD signed a Memorandum of Agreement in July 2001 (modified in June 2008) that coordinates transportation decision-making in this region. The Regional Transportation Committee (RTC) assists the DRCOG Board of Directors in carrying out the transportation planning process. These three agencies, working through the RTC, have approved and maintained a document titled Transportation Planning in the Denver Region that defines how the planning and decision making process works.
Figure 1. Transportation Management Area
II. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

The DRCOG Metro Vision Plan and companion Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (MVRTP) define the future growth, development, and transportation investment framework for the region. CDOT, RTD, and local governments implement many important projects and services that greatly impact how many people travel, where and how development occurs, and the quality of life in the Denver region.

GUIDELINES FOR PLANNING ACTIVITIES

Federal Transportation Planning Factors

The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act was signed into law in December 2015. It carries forward the planning principles of its predecessor, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), signed into law in 2012. MPOs are required to consider ten planning factors in the transportation planning process. Substantial work is anticipated during FY 2018-19 in consideration of these planning requirements. Below is a description of each planning factor and a summary of FY 2018-19 planning activities applicable to each.

1. Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
   - Activity 1.3 – coordination of planning efforts with neighboring regions to address interregional issues and opportunities
   - Activity 3.1 – implement Metro Vision Plan, a shared vision of the metro area
   - Activity 3.3 – development of regional freight and goods movement report
   - Activity 3.3, 5.2, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7 – promote the development of a multimodal transportation system
   - Activity 4.1 – monitor the progress status and results of TIP projects
   - Activity 5.1 and 5.3 – enhance the effectiveness of the region’s existing transportation system
   - Activity 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 7.4 – maintain relevant data to better understand current and future travel patterns

2. Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users.
   - Activity 3.5 – develop strategies to improve safety of bicycle and pedestrian travelers
   - Activity 4.1 – continue to support safety as a factor in the evaluation of TIP projects
   - Activity 4.2 – monitor intermodal improvements in the DRCOG area
   - Activity 5.5 – maintain crash data; prepare safety analyses and encourage the development of appropriate mitigation strategies; participate in incident management related committees/events
3. Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users.
   • Activity 1.2 – continue coordination with regional stakeholders
   • Activity 4.2 – monitor intermodal improvements in the DRCOG area
   • Activity 5.3 – promote the use of technology to enhance the security of roadway infrastructure
   • Activity 5.4 – coordinate with homeland security and emergency management related agencies and committee
   • Activity 7.1 and 7.4 – maintain an inventory of regional base maps and datasets

4. Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and for freight.
   • Activity 3.1 – support regional and local scenario analysis to study the impacts of alternative land use and development patterns
   • Activity 3.3 – develop regional freight and goods movement report
   • Activity 3.5 – develop a regional active transportation plan
   • Activity 4.2 – monitor the performance of the transportation system
   • Activity 5.1 and 5.3 – promote operational efficiencies of the existing roadway system
   • Activity 5.2 – continue travel demand management (TDM) activities
   • Activity 6.1 – update the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Plan
   • Activity 6.2 to 6.7 – continue to assess transit needs and promote transit options

5. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
   • Activity 1.2 – coordinate with CDOT, RTD, and local governments with regard to transportation network improvements
   • Activity 2.1 – maintain contact with area citizens with a focus on receiving input to improve the transportation system and quality of life for the metro area
   • Activity 3.1 – implement Metro Vision Plan, a shared vision of the metro area; evaluate the social, environmental, land use, and economic impacts of transportation plans
   • Activity 3.3 – provide support to regional NEPA and other environmental efforts
   • Activity 3.4 – conduct air quality conformity determinations on transportation investments identified in the TIP and FC-RTP; continue to host Interagency Consultation Group (ICG) meetings
   • Activity 3.5 and 5.2 – promote non-motorized forms of transportation
   • Activity 6.2 to 6.7 – continue to assess transit needs and promote transit options
6. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, and for people and freight.
   - Activity 1.2 – coordinate with CDOT, RTD, and local governments with regard to transportation network improvements
   - Activity 3.3 – maintain 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan; develop regional freight and goods movement report
   - Activity 5.1 – continue a congestion management process that integrates transportation operations, travel demand management, and intelligent transportation systems (ITS) as mitigation tools
   - Activity 6.2 to 6.7 – continue to assess transit needs and promote transit options
   - Activity 7.1 and 7.4 – maintain an inventory of regional base maps and datasets

7. Promote efficient system management and operation.
   - Activity 1.2 – coordinate with CDOT, RTD, and local governments with regard to transportation network improvements
   - Activity 4.1 – monitor the progress and results of TIP projects
   - Activity 4.2 – monitor the performance of the transportation system
   - Activity 5.1 and 5.3 – promote operational efficiencies of the existing roadway system
   - Activity 7.1 and 7.4 – maintain an inventory of regional base maps and datasets
   - Activity 7.2 and 7.3 – analyze future travel demand

8. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.
   - Activity 4.1 – monitor the progress and results of TIP projects
   - Activity 5.1 – continue a congestion management process that integrates transportation operations, travel demand management, and intelligent transportation systems (ITS) as mitigation tools
   - Activity 5.3 – enhance the effectiveness of the region’s existing transportation system
   - Activity 7.1 and 7.4 – maintain an inventory of regional base maps and datasets that provide information about transportation facility condition.

9. Improve resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation.
   - Activity 3.3 – provide support to regional NEPA and other environmental efforts
   - Activity 5.1 – continue a congestion management process that integrates transportation operations, travel demand management, and intelligent transportation systems (ITS) as mitigation tools
   - Activity 5.3 – enhance the effectiveness of the region’s existing transportation system
   - Activity 6.2 to 6.7 – continue to assess transit needs and promote transit options
10. Enhance travel and tourism.
- Activity 1.3 – coordination of planning efforts with neighboring regions to address interregional issues and opportunities
- Activity 3.5 – monitor efforts, provide assistance, and prepare products that support pedestrian and bicycle transportation activities
- Activity 5.3 – enhance the effectiveness of the region’s existing transportation system
- Activity 6.1 – improve local and regional transit access and mobility through increased planning and coordination.

Federal Planning Emphasis Areas
Both FHWA and FTA require the metropolitan transportation planning process be responsive to federal planning emphasis areas, if any exist. Currently, there are none covering FY 2018-2019. If at any time during the fiscal years of this UPWP new planning emphasis areas are identified, they will be amended into this document.

Title VI Requirements
Transportation planning activities must be consistent with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. DRCOG prepared a 2001 Title VI Status Report, which was provided to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). In 2009, DRCOG updated the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program, originally prepared in 1999. In 2013, DRCOG completed new Title VI complaint procedures and a Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan. In 2016-2017, DRCOG prepared a draft Title VI Implementation Plan. In 2016-2017, DRCOG also completed the “Status and Impacts of DRCOG Transportation Planning and Programming with Environmental Justice” report. In addition, DRCOG continues to participate in the Colorado Unified Certification Program that was approved by USDOT in April 2004.

Federal Quadrennial Review Comments
Every four years, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) perform a review of the urban transportation process conducted by DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD. The last review was completed in 2016. Recommendations from that review are incorporated in this document, as warranted. The next review will be completed in 2020.

Integrate the Congestion Management Program Process
Traffic congestion has been recognized for its impacts on the region’s economy, environment, quality of life, and public health. It can influence decisions on where to live or work and impact the price of goods and services. DRCOG works with local, state, and national partners, creating plans and programs that seek ways to alleviate congestion and help people and businesses avoid or adapt to traffic congestion.

Relationship to Air Quality Planning
Outcomes, objectives, targets, and initiatives related to air quality are fully incorporated in the adopted Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (MVRTP). The MVRTP
explicitly calls for the transportation system to minimize transportation’s contribution to air pollution. The plan advocates the development of a rapid transit system, a supporting and supplemental bus system, and a robust system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and services.

The planning process is responsive to federal clean air legislation. Clean Air Act (CAA) amendments were passed by Congress in November 1990, and require that the TIP and the RTP show conformity with state implementation plans (SIP) for air quality.

Air quality conformity has been demonstrated for the current 2018-2021 TIP and the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan.

In 2008, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) lowered the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ground-level ozone to 0.075 parts per million (ppm) from the 1997 standard of 0.085 ppm. On April 30, 2012, the EPA designated Denver-North Front Range Area as marginal nonattainment under the 2008 ozone standard (0.075 ppm). The marginal nonattainment designation did not impose any new planning requirements on the State of Colorado at this time. The Denver-North Front Range Area failed to meet the standard before 2015 and was reclassified as moderate nonattainment. As a result, an updated Ozone SIP was completed and submitted to the state legislature in early 2017.

The Denver-North Front Range 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area for the 2008 ozone NAAQS covers the counties of: Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Broomfield, Denver, Douglas, Jefferson, and parts of Larimer and Weld Counties that have the highest concentration of emissions.

The regional transportation planning process has been organized to ensure communication and coordination between air quality and transportation agencies. The DRCOG transportation committee structure is defined in the MPO Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). The companion document, Transportation Planning in the Denver Region and an MOA between DRCOG and RAQC further define the positions on specific committees. The RAQC and APCD staffs are full participants in the air quality technical work of the planning program.

An MOA was signed by DRCOG, the North Front Range MPO (NFRMPO), RAQC, and APCD in 2015 that defines specific roles and responsibilities of DRCOG, NFRMPO, RAQC, the Air Quality Control Commission (AQCC), and APCD with respect to coordination of activities and technical responsibilities. DRCOG is responsible for preparing transportation data to be used for air quality modeling associated with conformity determinations. The APCD is responsible for conducting air quality modeling and mobile source emission calculations.

Since the 8-Hour Ozone conformity process involves three regional transportation planning agencies, a separate MOA addressing this process was signed in March 2008 by CDPHE, CDOT, RAQC, Upper Front Range TPR, NFRMPO, and DRCOG. This MOA outlines agency roles, methods for determining conformity, and procedures for compiling model results from the three planning regions.
STATUS OF DRCOG PLANNING DOCUMENTS

The following table lists the most recent status (as of July 2017) of the Metro Vision Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, and other associated planning documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Action/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro Vision Plan</td>
<td>Adopted January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (Appendices)</td>
<td>Adopted April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>Adopted April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Vision Growth and Development Supplement</td>
<td>Adopted June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional TDM Short Range Plan</td>
<td>Amended October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Regional Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Adopted April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement in Regional Transportation Planning</td>
<td>Adopted April 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY2016-2017 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Major activities completed in the 2016-2017 UPWP include:

**Transportation Improvement Program**

- 2016-2021 TIP
  - Processed over 30 sets of amendments and administrative modifications to the TIP
  - Analyzed projects for delay and reported out to committees and Board
  - Completed annual listings of projects obligated in FY 2016 and FY 2017
  - Integrated a new enhanced graphical search function for TIP projects into Transportation Regional Improvement Projects and Survey (TRIPS) webpage

- 2018-2021 TIP
  - Worked with CDOT to best align the new annual STIP updates with updates to the TIP
  - Worked with CDOT and RTD to update projects in the TIP to 2018
  - Prepared committee memos and presentations leading toward adoption in April 2017
  - Processed amendments and administrative modifications to the TIP
• 2020-2023 TIP
  o Facilitated two TIP work groups to develop a policy for project selection in 2018

**Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan**

• Adopted the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan, including components specifically addressing freight and goods movement, active transportation (walking/bicycling), and transit (public transit and human service transportation)
• Administered 2040 Fiscally Constrained RTP 2015 Cycle 2 amendments
• Administered 2040 Fiscally Constrained RTP 2016 amendments as part of 2040 MVRTP preparation and adoption

**Metro Vision**

**Planning Outreach, Education, and Training**

• Developed and maintained portion of DRCOG website to keep all stakeholders informed of interim Board discussions and decisions related to the draft Metro Vision plan
• Public hearing on Metro Vision (Nov. 2016)
• Hosted meetings and workshops on a variety of major planning products - most notably Metro Vision, age friendly communities, and Urban Growth Boundary/Area
• Numerous public and stakeholder presentations throughout the reporting period (Metro Vision, Who is TOD, Age-Friendly efforts, etc.)
• Hosted 6 Metro Vision Idea Exchanges
• Financially supported and participated in a Citizen Engagement workshop hosted by the University of Denver (Mar. 2016)
• Co-hosted a two-day convening with AARP-Colorado. The conference focused ways that AARP (national and state offices) can partner with MPOs and other regional planning agencies to advance age-friendly efforts, including transportation and mobility issues

**Metro Vision Plan**

• Adoption of Metro Vision (Jan. 2017)
• Directly supported the efforts of communities from around the region that are assessing their communities ability to support our region’s aging population – including land use and mobility programs, policies and investments
• Worked with consultant to develop survey instruments (Who is TOD) – DRCOG staff took lead on working with member governments and other partners, including RTD, to ensure results were of maximum value
• Worked with consultant to develop initial report summarizing survey responses (Who is TOD): residents (2,547 responses), businesses (1,254 responses), and employees (677 responses)
• Developed a candidate list of performance measures to support urban center planning and analysis
• Explored several visualization tools that can potentially support small area scenario planning efforts, including informal testing at TOD site
• Offered opportunity for member governments to participate in pilot exploration of small area scenario planning tools – 5 communities were selected to participate
• Developed eligibility and evaluation criteria for Urban Center/Station Area Master Planning funding (FY16-17)
• Worked closely with the Urban Land Institute (ULI) to develop the program for the 2016 TOD Marketplace
• Financially supported 2 ULI Technical Assistance Panels (TAPs) to explore transit-oriented development issues in two communities – Englewood and Superior

Air Quality
• Monitored and provided comment on the development of the Moderate Ozone State Implementation Plan
• Coordinated an Electric Vehicle Workshop in Aug 2016
• Coordinated with air quality partners on detailed conformity procedures and facilitated Interagency Consultation Group meetings
• Completed two conformity determinations (modeling and report) for Cycle 2 2015 and the new 2040 MVRTP and 2018-2021 TIP
• Competed update to Regionally Significant Projects definition

Bicycle & Pedestrian and TDM Planning
• Oversaw/coordinated the update of GIS inventory and mapping of bicycle facilities. Will be working on ways to enhance the mapping features, product(s) and process in FY 2017 (and 2018) as part of the Active Transportation Plan
• Active Transportation Plan
  o Held bicycle summit and stakeholder meetings to solicit input on AT topics to potentially include in the RFP and Plan
  o Developed and released RFP soliciting firms to partner with to develop the AT Plan
  o Assembled a consultant review panel to assist in the selection of a consultant
  o Selected consultant
  o Plan underway (beginning July 2017 and will be underway for 12 months)
• Regional Bicycle Use Count Program
  o Began development of a regional AT count program
  o Conducted research on what other MPO’s have implemented in terms of count programs
  o Working with CDOT to determine ways to collaborate based on their recently released state AT count plan study
  o Reviewing FHWA’s recently released Bicycle-Pedestrian Count Pilot Program study to garner ideas on best practices and lessons learned.
  o Developing recommendation for regional program
• Regional Transportation Plan
  o Developed the Active Transportation and TDM sections of the plan
• TDM Set-Aside
  o Board approval of the projects recommended for the 2016-2017 TDM set-aside (October 2016)
Coordinating efforts to get FY 2016-2017 infrastructure projects under contract with RTD and CDOT
- Monitored evaluations and results of past projects
- Developing recommendations for 2018-2019 Call for Projects

Transit
- Completed the Coordinated Transit Plan (the federally required Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan)
- Completed the Status and Impacts of DRCOG Transportation Planning and Programming with Environmental Justice report
- Completed draft Title VI Implementation Plan for DRCOG

Congestion Management
- Completed 2015 Report on Traffic Congestion
- Completed Report on VMT in the Denver Region
- Completed 2016 Report on Traffic Congestion
- Updated traffic count inventory
- Completed new INRIX-based congestion performance measures

Traffic Ops
- Completed Regional Transportation Operations Improvement Program document, project selection, and associated ITS Turbo Architecture database
- Conducted extensive dialogue and coordination with local, regional, state, and federal partners regarding operations, security, and new technologies

Modeling
- Developed UrbanSim socioeconomic forecasts for three RTP amendment conformity modeling cycles
- Conducted major outreach effort with local governments to improve socioeconomic forecasts
- Conducted travel model runs to create inputs for three air quality determination cycles
- Completed Focus 2.0 travel model recalibration and validation effort which significantly reduced the model run time and improved the model results
- Provided the travel model, specific output results, and assistance to partner agencies and consultants for use on over a dozen major corridor studies
- Completed the Commercial Vehicle Survey as the final element of the Front Range Travel Counts project

Information Systems
- Launched the Signal Timing Briefs webmap (see http://gis.drcog.org/signaltimingbriefs)
- Created and took measurements from 2016/2017 regional datasets for Metro Vision Performance Measure Analysis
• Updated base year data for UrbanSim to 2015
• Restructured the Information Systems Wiki (online documentation)
• Completed the 2014 Planimetric Project (occurred in 2016; vintage of the data is 2014)
• Completed the Denver Regional Aerial Photography Project (DRAPP) 2016
• Hosted Denver Regional Visual Resources (DRVR) workshops for local government planners, GIS professionals, librarians, and the media
• Launched a new visualization on the DRVR site - (see https://drcog.org/services-and-resources/denver-regional-visual-resources/relating-jobs-and-housing-to-transit)
• Optimized the Development Type Model
• Applied new DRCOG branding to static and webmaps
• GIS team published in ArcUser magazine for innovative and collaborative quality control approach
• Published new and updated data to the Regional Data Catalog
• Hosted Denver Regional Data Consortium (DRDC) meetings
III. THE PLANNING PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

The UPWP lists proposed transportation and transportation-related planning objectives and activities in the Denver region from October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2019.

The activities (ongoing tasks and specific deliverables) are organized to reflect the following key objectives associated with the implementation of the region’s transportation planning process:

- **Objective 1.0 Program Administration and Coordination** – Coordinate activities between Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) participating agencies to address transportation and development issues of the region.
- **Objective 2.0 Planning Outreach, Education, and Training** – Increase participation and support of the public in the planning process to achieve projects that are consistent with Metro Vision goals and policies.
- **Objective 3.0 Long Range Planning** – Implement and refine Metro Vision to enhance and improve the quality of life in the DRCOG region.
- **Objective 4.0 Short Range Planning** – Identify and implement priorities within the metropolitan area. The transportation improvement program is the primary tool used to advance the goals of the regional transportation plan.
- **Objective 5.0 Transportation Operations** – Emphasize mitigation strategies that improve the safety and effectiveness of the existing transportation system.
- **Objective 6.0 Public Transportation Planning** – Plan and operate rapid transit corridors, the regional bus network, and transit facilities.
- **Objective 7.0 Support Systems for Planning** – Acquire and maintain critical data and tools for planning activities.

Other major planning activities are presented in Chapter V and organized in three groups:

- **Planning for projects identified in the Transportation Improvement Program** – The implementation of major projects requires planning studies, environmental assessments, and design activities. One or more of the implementation steps for the projects listed in this section have been funded with federal and state funds and are derived from the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
- **Activities identified in the CDOT State Planning and Research Program** – The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) prepares a document similar to the UPWP for its planning activities. A number of these activities affect this region and are so listed.
- **Non-federally funded and local government planning activities** – The Regional Transportation District (RTD) and local governments conduct various plans and prepare project environmental documents. Significant transportation planning and project development activities are listed in this section.
PROGRAM FINANCING & DELIVERABLES

Revenues available to carry out the region’s transportation planning activities contained within this UPWP are shown in Appendix A.

- Table 1 displays total funding by specific revenue source.
- Table 2 shows total anticipated expenditures distributed to each major objective and the activities within each objective.
- Table 3 shows federal Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) expenditures and associated match amounts by activity.
- Table 4 in Appendix B shows key deliverables and expected completion dates for each activity.
IV. FEDERAL URBAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROGRAM
ACTIVITY DESCRIPTIONS

DRCOG may acquire consultant services in completing planning activities in this UPWP.

OBJECTIVE 1.0 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

Activity 1.1  Direct Program Management

**Purpose:** To provide for the effective administration of the DRCOG transportation planning process including management of DRCOG planning staff and grants.

**Tasks:**
- Supervise DRCOG personnel assigned MPO planning work. Monitor staff work on the UPWP and evaluate progress
- Implement new internal strategic management and performance measurement system
- Prepare and maintain adequate records of correspondence, purchasing, and contracts
- Routine personnel, office, and administrative activities

**Participants:** DRCOG

Activity 1.2  Maintaining the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process

**Purpose:** To ensure the transportation planning process is conducted in compliance with applicable federal and state laws.

**Tasks:**
- Manage and administer the transportation planning process, including the FY2018-2019 Unified Planning Work Program
- Support and participate in DRCOG’s transportation policy, planning, and programming committees with agendas, meeting logistics, maintenance of membership, and miscellaneous communications
- Facilitate the planning and implementation of transportation projects and services, while strengthening the working relationships among the MPO partner agencies
- Host the Agency Coordination Team (ACT) and Interagency Consultation Group (ICG), and participate in CDOT and RTD quarterly meetings in order to facilitate communication among planning partners
- Incorporate guidance of state and federal agencies on the regional transportation planning process
- Participate on procedural efforts such as the definition of the functional highway classification system, national highway system, and planning boundaries
• Address items that were contained within the 2016 joint FHWA and FTA Quadrennial Review of the MPO Planning Process

**Deliverables:**

2018
• Complete FAST Act compliant Metropolitan Planning Agreement between DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD
• Prepare FY2017 UPWP end-of-year report
• Prepare FY2018 UPWP mid-year report

2019
• Prepare FY2018 UPWP end-of-year report
• Prepare FY2019 UPWP mid-year report
• Develop the FY2020-FY2021 UPWP

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD, APCD, RAQC

**Activity 1.3 Interregional Planning Coordination**

**Purpose:** To maintain the working relationship and coordination of planning efforts between DRCOG and its neighbors that address interregional transportation issues and opportunities.

**Tasks:**
• Maintain communication and exchange information with other regional stakeholders, including neighboring counties and the state on transportation, land use, and economic development issues
• Coordinate with neighboring counties, MPOs, and TPRs on planning for transportation facilities and services adjacent to mutual border; attend Statewide MPO Committee meetings
• Monitor, participate, and assist with statewide or interregional transportation planning activities, corridor studies, NEPA studies, PELs, and funding opportunities
• Participate in and/or monitor the state transportation-related enterprises and committees including: High-Performance Transportation Enterprise, Statewide Bridge Enterprise, CDOT Transit and Rail Advisory Committee, CDOT Efficiency and Accountability Committee, the State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC), and others as appropriate

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD
Activity 1.4  DRCOG Staff Training and Development

**Purpose:** To provide DRCOG staff with the necessary training and development to perform their jobs efficiently and effectively.

**Tasks:**
- Provide training in-house and offsite for DRCOG staff
- Attend webinars
- Attend in-state and out-of-state conferences

**Participants:** DRCOG

OBJECTIVE 2.0 PLANNING OUTREACH, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING

Activity 2.1  Public Engagement and Outreach

**Purpose:** To inform stakeholders and the general public about DRCOG’s plan and program development and implementation processes, and to provide an opportunity for them to participate in planning and policy decisions by conveying their opinions to DRCOG staff and Board members.

**Tasks:**
- Conduct public forums, community meetings, and workshops regarding major planning products identified in the UPWP
- Hold public hearings and facilitate public comment periods associated with MVRTP and Metro Vision Plan amendments, FasTracks reviews, new TIPs, and other topics; monitor and compile comments and input received
- Inform the public of adopted documents, program amendments, and opportunities to offer comments via DRCOG’s website
- Give presentations to community, advocacy, and other interest groups, as requested
- Create and maintain various DRCOG web pages
- Continue to research and integrate and/or implement interactive internet-based technologies and other methods to support the public participation process, as necessary and appropriate
- As requested, conduct DRCOG-led short courses on Metro Vision and the transportation planning process

**Deliverables:**
2018 and 2019
- Summaries of public meetings, hearings, and workshops

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD, and local governments
Activity 2.2 Local Government and Stakeholder Education, Outreach, and Support

Purpose: To provide local governments and other stakeholders education, outreach, and support.

Tasks:
• Educate local governments and other interested parties about the DRCOG transportation planning process, federal regulations, and associated documents
• Meet with local governments about their transportation planning issues and needs
• Provide support for communities as they prepare transportation and other plans and studies, including reviewing consultant scopes of service, ensuring final plan consistency with Metro Vision and the MVRTP
• Develop and distribute factsheets, reports, white papers, brochures, and other collateral materials needed to communicate critical regional issues to the Board, regional stakeholders, and the public
• Work collaboratively across jurisdictions, agencies, and organizations to conduct stakeholder outreach and engagement processes to better inform and involve communities in planning and decisions that impact them
• Facilitate/host transportation-related webinars and other educational events
• Hold workshops and outreach opportunities for the DRVR site
• Maintain and update DRCOG’s plans and documents addressing public involvement, environmental justice, and Title VI/Limited English proficiency

Participants: DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD, and local governments

OBJECTIVE 3.0 LONG RANGE PLANNING

Activity 3.1 Metro Vision Plan – Collaboration and Implementation Assistance

Purpose: To work with local and regional partners to continuously evaluate and implement Metro Vision.

Tasks:
• Develop and provide decision-support tools to local jurisdictions, regional partners, and the public
• Provide individualized technical assistance to communities for the purposes of implementing Metro Vision
• Use new tools and technology to support regional and local scenario analysis, including impacts of alternative land use and development patterns
• Establish and convene topical working groups and forums, as needed (e.g., urban centers, first- and final-mile, small or rural communities, etc.)
• Participate on steering committees, advisory groups, leadership teams, etc. for aligned organizations and initiatives
• Sponsor events, organize workshops, and collaborate with organizations that are working to support Metro Vision outcomes
• Develop and apply Metro Vision plan consistency framework for communities that voluntarily refer local plans and regulations for regional review
• Coordinate with local governments on member-sponsored plan amendments (e.g., new urban centers, other policy amendments)
• Collaborate with communities using DRCOG’s Boomer Bond assessment tool to help address impacts of region’s rapidly increasing aging population.
• Work with local governments to develop programs or update current initiatives that improve the coordinated efforts to identify and designate areas for new urban development.

**Deliverables:**
**2018:**
- Urban center boundary review with member governments
- Amendments (if any) to Metro Vision
- Evaluation of coordinated growth management initiative(s)

**2019:**
- Amendments (if any) to Metro Vision
- Preliminary scope for Metro Vision 2020 assessment (to be completed in 2020)

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), local governments, CDOT, RTD

**Activity 3.2 Metro Vision Plan – Research and Performance Management**

**Purpose:** To research and share data and information that may illustrate progress toward plan outcomes.

**Tasks:**
- Routinely analyze progress on Metro Vision outcomes, including documentation of successes and ongoing challenges
- Provide data, tools, case studies, and information that support and document local and region initiatives that contribute to Metro Vision outcomes and objectives (e.g. connecting people to open space, preparing for and minimizing the impact of natural disasters, increasing access to opportunity, and diversifying the region’s housing stock, etc.)
- Survey local governments, the public, and other stakeholders to understand local and regional planning challenges, opportunities, and needs
- Develop and provide information on key economic trends influencing the region’s forecasted growth
• Develop and provide data-driven stories and infographics that illustrate the state of the region in terms of economics, transportation and demographics.
• Design, build, maintain and enhance applications (i.e. Regional Equity Atlas) that enable internal and external users to explore and consume regional data related to Metro Vision outcomes, objectives and initiatives.

**Deliverables:**

2018
• Metro Vision performance measurement report
• Data-driven visualizations for Metro Vision performance measures

2019
• Metro Vision performance measurement report
• Data-driven visualizations for Metro Vision performance measures
• Regional Equity Atlas – extensive update (smaller updates occur annually)

**Activity 3.3  Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan**

**Purpose:** To maintain the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2040 MVRTP), and prepare the 2045 MVRTP.

**Tasks:**
• Solicit and process (if needed) amendments to the 2040 MVRTP annually or as needed; assist local governments and other project sponsors with plan amendment questions and procedures
• Coordinate with CDOT to prepare a freight and goods movement report for the DRCOG region derived from CDOT’s Statewide Multimodal Freight Plan
• Incorporate the DRCOG region freight report and Active Transportation Plan into the 2040 MVRTP through amendment and/or into the 2045 MVRTP
• Participate and provide technical support in regional NEPA/environmental and Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL) efforts and/or similar regional planning efforts, as necessary; implement or incorporate into planning documents as appropriate
• Work with local governments, CDOT, RTD, and other stakeholders to update the Metro Vision transportation system, including the Regional Roadway System and unfunded/vision projects
• Collaborate with CDOT, RTD, and other stakeholders to develop a common set of revenue assumptions, project costs, and other information needed to prepare the 2045 MVRTP financial plan
• Monitor federal, state and other efforts to increase transportation funding, and incorporate into scenario analysis for the 2045 MVRTP financial plan
• Solicit, evaluate, score, rank, and prioritize regionally significant projects desiring federal or state funding
• Prepare the 2045 MVRTP financial plan
• Conduct transportation and air quality modeling for the draft fiscally constrained RTP
• Prepare and adopt the 2045 MVRTP
**Deliverables:**

2018

- Amendments (if any) to the 2040 MVRTP
- Complete the DRCOG region freight and goods movement report

2019

- Complete and adopt the 2045 MVRTP

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD and local governments

### Activity 3.4 Air Quality Conformity

**Purpose:** To complete air quality conformity determinations associated with transportation facilities identified in the TIP and the 2040 FC-RTP (a finding of conformity is a federal requirement and a prerequisite to the adoption or amendment of the TIP or RTP).

**Tasks:**

- Monitor federal and state legislation regarding new standards, requirements, or procedures impacting transportation. Assist air quality agencies (i.e., APCD, RAQC), as needed
- Monitor the readings and trends of criteria pollutants in relation to established attainment standards
- Host the Interagency Consultation Group (ICG) in order to facilitate better communication among planning partners and make air quality process decisions
- Collect annual Regulation 16 Street Sanding and Sweeping reports and prepare a summary (RAQC)
- Prepare highway and transit networks (DRCOG), update planning assumptions, perform air quality conformity model runs (DRCOG and APCD), and review highway networks (CDOT) and transit networks (RTD) associated with amendments of the 2040 MVRTP
- Prepare air quality conformity findings (DRCOG) and assess findings (APCD and AQCC) associated with amendments to the MVRTP
- Participate in the development of the new ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP)
- Continue with activities associated with the Regional Haze SIP

**Deliverables:**

2018 and 2019

- Annual Conformity Determination Reports

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), APCD, RAQC, AQCC, RTD, CDOT

### Activity 3.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning

**Purpose:** To monitor efforts, provide assistance, and prepare products that support pedestrian and bicycle transportation activities.
Tasks:

- Monitor progress on TIP-funded and other bicycle and pedestrian projects
- Maintain facility inventory and mapping products for bicycle facilities in the Denver region. Monitor new sources, methodologies, and applications for providing information (Note: Enhancing the mapping product and identifying process efficiencies will be a focus in the AT Plan)
- Continue regional active transportation meetings/summits to facilitate communication and provide educational opportunities
- Assemble Active Transportation Plan Work Group and coordinate monthly meetings
- Respond to requests for assistance regarding local pedestrian and bicycle planning topics and projects
- Monitor, evaluate procedures, and compile bicycle use counts conducted by CDOT and local governments across the region
- Participate in CDOT’s annual Safe Routes to School program development and project selection process, as requested
- Maintain a performance tracking report on TIP-funded bicycle and pedestrian projects
- Participate in the development of TIP Policy related to AT projects in the region, including attending or contributing to TIP Policy Work Group meetings

Deliverables:

2018

- Develop the DRCOG Active Transportation Plan (will be completed approximately Spring 2018)
- Implementation of a regional bicycle use count program (pending feasibility study recommendations)

Participants: DRCOG (lead), RTD, CDOT, local governments

OBJECTIVE 4.0 SHORT RANGE PLANNING

Activity 4.1 Transportation Improvement Program

Purpose: To maintain and monitor the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) by identifying projects to be funded with federal resources and other regionally significant projects.

Tasks:

- Prepare amendments and monthly administrative modifications to the 2018-2021 TIP and the subsequent 2020-2023 TIP, and maintain an amended version of the TIP document on DRCOG’s website and in the Transportation Regional Improvement Projects and Survey (TRIPS) database, as necessary
- Facilitate the 2020-2023 TIP Policy Work Group and advise DRCOG committees and the Board, leading to a 2020-2023 TIP Policy document
• Lead and coordinate the Regional Share project selection process Call for Projects for the 2020-2023 TIP
• Monitor and assist in the Subregional Share Forums and subsequent Call for Projects and project selection process for the 2020-2023 TIP
• Prepare a 2020-2023 TIP document for committee review and Board adoption by March 2019
• Conduct appropriate project programming activities when additional revenues are made available or decreased
• Provide financial and project coordination assistance to implementing agencies and project sponsors
• Conduct activities with CDOT and local governments to continuously refine the IGA and contracting processes
• Monitor the progress status and results of TIP projects
• Update TRIPS project database when applicable

**Deliverables:**

**2018**
- Prepare FY 2017 Projects Delayed Report
- Prepare FY 2017 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects
- Adopt 2020-2023 TIP Policy document

**2019**
- Prepare FY 2018 Projects Delayed Report
- Prepare FY 2018 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects
- Adopt 2020-2023 TIP

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), RTD, CDOT, local governments

**Activity 4.2  Performance Measure Reporting**

**Purpose:** To update, compile, and report on regional performance measures from Metro Vision and the regional transportation planning processes.

**Tasks:**
- Compile data associated with various regional performance measures
- Work with CDOT, RTD, FHWA, and FTA to set targets and develop baselines for each FAST Act-required performance-based planning measure
- Prepare performance measure reports, and/or assisting CDOT with preparing performance measure reports, for FAST Act performance measures
- Maintain performance tracking reports on TIP-funded projects
- Prepare CMAQ performance plan of TIP-funded projects
- Develop and distribute information products that support the monitoring and evaluation of Metro Vision performance measures

**Deliverables:**

**2018**
- Metro Vision performance measurement report
2019

- Metro Vision performance measurement report
- Fast Act performance measures report

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD

**OBJECTIVE 5.0 TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS**

**Activity 5.1   DRCOG Congestion Management Process**

**Purpose:** To administer the region’s multimodal and multi-approach congestion management process through the DRCOG Congestion Mitigation Program that includes transportation operations, travel demand management (TDM), and intelligent transportation systems (ITS).

**Tasks:**
- Update the Congestion Mitigation Program (CMP) databases annually
- Update formulas and factors for delay calculations, as needed. Evaluate new data sources and methodologies (e.g., INRIX, HERE)
- Prepare public information and outreach documents and presentations, including summaries of CMP data
- Maintain and update CMP pages on the DRCOG website
- Monitor federal (FAST Act) and statewide congestion measure rules, measures, targets, and procedures. Compile required calculations as needed,
- Maintain performance tracking report on TIP-funded roadway projects
- Review CMP per recommendation of 2016 Federal Planning Certification Review

** Deliverables:**

**2018**
- Prepare white paper (CMP Status Report) summarizing status and results of congestion mitigation projects funded in the TIP from FY 2012 through FY 2017 (recommendation of 2016 Federal Planning Certification Review)
- Prepare Annual Report of Traffic Congestion in the Denver Region

**2019**
- Prepare Annual Report of Traffic Congestion in the Denver Region

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD, TMOs, public highway authorities

**Activity 5.2   Regional Travel Demand Management (TDM) Planning**

**Purpose:** To facilitate and monitor the provision of travel demand management services and projects consistent with the MVRTP.
Tasks:
- Monitor progress and results of projects funded through the TIP Regional TDM Pool, including activities of the Regional TDM Program
- Monitor new types of TDM activities and techniques
- Monitor and assist with “last-mile” studies and analyses associated with various transit stations

**Deliverables:**
2018
- Complete FY 2018-2019 project selection process for the TDM Pool

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD, TMO’s, local governments

**Activity 5.3  Regional Transportation Operations**

**Purpose:** To provide a Regional Transportation Operations technical perspective to the Metro Vision planning process, assure project conformance with the Regional ITS Architecture and the Regional Concept of Transportation Operations, and continue to facilitate cooperative work on ITS deployment and day-to-day transportation operations.

**Tasks:**
- Conduct periodic stakeholder meetings to maintain dialogue necessary to implement the Regional Concept of Transportation Operations and assist with project implementation
- Monitor ITS deployment to ensure compliance with 23 CFR Part 940 and maintain systems engineering analysis project documentation submitted by stakeholders
- Maintain the DRCOG Regional ITS Architecture
- Coordinate with CDOT and FHWA to perform functions assigned to MPOs for operations project clearance and the systems engineering analysis process
- Coordinate with relevant CDOT TSM&O Division incident management efforts
- Incorporate ITS and operations strategies into the Congestion Management Process analyses, measures, and public information products
- Maintain and update Regional Transportation Operations and other applicable DRCOG web site pages
- Assist in the establishment of inter-jurisdictional and interagency data sharing and performance measure procedures and agreements

**Deliverables:**
2018
- Prepare 2017 Annual Report on Regional Transportation Operations Performance Measures
- Prepare feasibility study for pilot implementation of regional traffic operations monitoring support

2019
• Prepare 2018 Annual Report on Regional Transportation Operations Performance Measures
• Develop and approve Regional Transportation Operations Program, programming funds identified in the RTO set-aside of the DRCOG TIP

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), FHWA, CDOT, RTD, public highway authorities, public safety agencies, local governments (traffic, public safety, and information technology elements)

**Activity 5.4 Transportation Security Planning**

**Purpose:** To participate in security-related activities and develop planning products/methods that will be used to consider security in the process to identify, evaluate, and fund transportation projects.

**Tasks:**
- Participate on federal and state agency committees dealing with security and transportation, as requested
- Monitor and respond to federal rulemaking and guidance documents
- Liaise with the boards of Colorado’s North Central All-Hazards Region and the Denver Urban Area Security Initiative
- Refine roles, establish and maintain relationships to existing documents and protocols (e.g., incident management plans, evacuation plans, training/exercise planning, and Regional ITS Architecture), and determine further activities with local stakeholders

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD, local governments, Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (North Central Region and Northeast Region), and others

**Activity 5.5 Transportation Safety Planning**

**Purpose:** To further incorporate safety data and analyses into transportation planning and public awareness activities.

**Tasks:**
- Geocode crashes in the Denver region that are off the state highway system, as data is made available
- House the annual crash database of all crashes in the region and disseminate data
- Prepare crash and safety analyses, as needed
- Respond to requests for information
- Lead or participate on a Regional “Vision Zero” or “Towards Zero Deaths” regional strategy

**Deliverables:**

2018
- Board established HSIP 2014-2018 safety targets (Five federal measures)
- Documentation of Federal safety baseline performance measures for DRCOG region
• Incorporate crash data into Active Transportation Plan

2019
• Documentation of federal safety performance measures and progress for DRCOG region

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, Colorado Department of Revenue

**OBJECTIVE 6.0 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

**Activity 6.1 Regional Transit/Human Service Transportation Planning and Coordination**

**Purpose:** To improve local and regional transit access and mobility through increased planning and coordination.

**Tasks:**
- Participate with the Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council (DRMAC) and other groups on efforts to improve coordination of human service transportation, including serving on DRMAC’s Board in an ex-officio capacity
- Coordinate with DRMAC, DRCOG’s Area Agency on Aging (AAA), Local Coordinating Councils (LCCs), and other stakeholders to plan for, develop, and implement regional human service transportation coordination strategies
- Work with stakeholders to better leverage and integrate various human service transportation funding sources and activities to increase service and people served.
- Compile ongoing service data from RTD to use for the travel model, plans, reports, and other activities as needed
- Coordinate with RTD, CDOT, and LCCs on the selection, implementation, and performance of FTA grant-funded transit projects within the DRCOG region
- Maintain a performance tracking report on TIP funded transit projects

**Deliverables:**
2018
- Complete and achieve objectives of Veterans Transportation and Community Living Initiative Grant
- Maintain and update Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan)

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), RTD, CDOT, DRMAC and others

**Activity 6.2 FasTracks Review and Assessment**

**Purpose:** To review and assess the status of FasTracks with respect to State Senate Bill 90-208 (SB-208) as directed by the DRCOG Board (such as through Resolution #14, 2013).
**Tasks:**

- Complete the review and assessment of RTD FasTracks Change Report(s) when submitted by RTD. (If consultant assistance is required for DRCOG financial plan review of an RTD Change Report, RTD would provide funding for the financial consulting effort.)
- Based on DRCOG review and assessment of RTD Change Report(s), take further action pursuant to SB-208, and/or amend the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan, if needed
- Provide to the DRCOG Board RTD’s annual FasTracks Status Report (due to DRCOG by May 1st)

**Deliverables:**

**2018**

- DRCOG review and assessment of RTD Change Report(s), when submitted by RTD. If needed, subsequent SB-208 action and/or 2040 MVRTP amendment
- RTD 2018 FasTracks Annual Status Report

**2019**

- DRCOG review and assessment of RTD Change Report(s), when submitted by RTD. If needed, subsequent SB-208 action and/or 2040 MVRTP amendment
- RTD 2019 FasTracks Annual Status Report

**Participants:** DRCOG, RTD

**Activity 6.3 RTD and CDOT Local Government Planning Process**

**Purpose:** To provide a mechanism that incorporates the input of local and governmental jurisdictions into the RTD Strategic Budget Plan/FTA Program of Projects and CDOT planning process.

**Tasks:**

- Gather input from local government representatives for RTD’s Strategic Budget Plan capital projects and annual service plan changes
- Conduct coordinated public involvement efforts associated with CDOT and RTD products such as the STIP, environmental studies, and other planning activities

**Participants:** RTD (co-lead), CDOT(co-lead), local governments, DRCOG

**Activity 6.4 RTD Strategic Budget Plan**

**Purpose:** To prepare the RTD Strategic Budget Plan/FTA Program of Projects for both the 2016-2021 and the 2017-2022 time frames.

**Deliverables:**

**2018**
• Prepare the 2018-2023 Strategic Budget Plan for input into the Transportation Improvement Program

2019
• Prepare the 2019-2024 Strategic Budget Plan for input into the Transportation Improvement Program

Participants: RTD

Activity 6.5  RTD System Planning Process

Purpose: To continue to provide system-level planning for the rapid transit corridors, the regional bus network, and transit facilities.

Tasks:
• Continue oversight of system planning process

Participants: RTD

Activity 6.6  Park-n-Ride® Planning and Transit Oriented Development (TOD)

Purpose: To research and report on Park-n-Ride use and plan for and implement transit oriented development in conjunction with the planning and development of FasTracks and at existing transit stations and Park-n-Rides. This is done in partnership with local government jurisdictions, the development community, and other key stakeholders.

Tasks:
• Prepare quarterly Park-n-Ride use reports
• Prepare biannual Park-n-Ride user distribution geocoding and mapping
• Participate in local jurisdiction land-use planning processes for station areas
• Pursue joint development at RTD transit stations where practical and consistent with local government land use plans and state law governing eminent domain and RTD operations
• Benchmark TOD activity in annual status report and FasTracks Quality of Life study
• Provide ongoing TOD education and outreach
• Complete Annual TOD Status Report

Participants: RTD (lead), DRCOG, local governments

Activity 6.7  FasTracks Program Management and Planning Assistance

Purpose: To oversee and manage engineering, planning, environmental, project controls, and construction management activities for FasTracks (consultant assistance may be required).
**Tasks:**
- Annual Program Evaluation of the FasTracks program, including revised capital costs, schedule, and preparation of program management plans for FasTracks corridors
- Preparation of FasTracks Change Report(s) for DRCOG
- Other assorted engineering, planning, and environmental activities for FasTracks

**Participants:** RTD

**OBJECTIVE 7.0 SUPPORT SYSTEMS FOR PLANNING**

**Activity 7.1  Develop and Maintain Information Systems**

**Purpose:** To be a regional resource for the research, development, and deployment of tools and technologies, and provide data and information that support UPWP activities.

**Tasks:**
- Develop, maintain, and update tools, applications, and visualizations that allow internal and external users to explore and consume information (e.g. Regional Equity Atlas, TRIPS, including the TIP webmap, Denver Regional Visual Resources (DRVR), traffic signal webmap)
- Develop and maintain tools and applications that enable data exchange among local jurisdictions, regional partners, and DRCOG (e.g. Data Portal, Regional Data Catalog)
- Develop and distribute informational products at the local and regional level (e.g. Community Profiles, Legislative Profiles)
- Facilitate forums for data professionals in the region to collaborate on GIS data and information (e.g., Denver Regional Data Consortium)
- Collect, compile, and purchase data in support of transportation and land use modeling, travel modeling, performance measurement, and Metro Vision implementation
- Create and maintain a Data Plan that integrates the data management efforts of the planning, socioeconomic, travel modeling, and GIS teams
- Maintain an internal and external data repository
- Coordinate the acquisition of regional datasets through the Denver Regional Data Consortium and Denver Regional Aerial Photography Projects
- Perform GIS analysis for decision-support and performance measurement
- Maintain internal processes and infrastructure in support of application and tool development
- Complete the local data collection and regional dataset creation efforts
- Run the Development Type Model
- Partner with the US Census to prepare our local governments for Census 2020

**Deliverables:**

**2018**
- Initiate the 2018 Denver Regional Aerial Photography Project (DRAPP)
- Create a new baseline dataset for UrbanSim
2019
- Complete the 2018 DRAPP
- Complete the Denver Regional Planimetric Project
- Submit PSAP data to US Census on behalf of our member governments.: https://www.census.gov/geo/partnerships/psap_overview.html

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), local governments

### Activity 7.2  Land Use Modeling and Forecasting

**Purpose:** To maintain, operate, expand, and refine the land use modeling and forecasting tools.

**Tasks:**
- Maintain and refine UrbanSim model, as needed
- Implement visualization and planning tools into the land use forecasting process and in support of the implementation of Metro Vision 2040 plan
- Develop and maintain economic forecasting tools in support of UrbanSim
- Develop and distribute informational products at the local and regional level (e.g. Regional Economic Reports)
- Support work groups associated with forecasting, modeling, and planning efforts detailed in the UPWP

**Deliverables:**
2018
- Calibrate and validate the UrbanSim land use model with updated base year data

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), local governments

### Activity 7.3  Transportation Modeling and Forecasting

**Purpose:** To maintain, operate, expand, and refine the transportation modeling and forecasting tools.

**Tasks:**
- Provide travel model data results in support of 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (MVRTP) amendments, air quality conformity, the new 2045 MVRTP, and other requests
- Continue efforts to optimize and streamline Focus, DRCOG’s regional travel demand forecasting model, for faster and more accurate results available to a wider range of users. Evaluate modifications to facility types, areas types, values of time (VOT), TAZs, and other model attributes
- Incorporate outcomes of the Commercial Vehicle Survey (CVS) into the components of the Commercial Vehicle Travel Model. examine package delivery travel patterns
• Work with partner agencies (CDOT, RTD, other Colorado MPOs) to evaluate options and prepare for an updated and statewide household travel survey
• Collaborate with CDOT in developing the statewide activity-based (ABM) model
• Work with RTD to incorporate results of their 2015 system-wide on-board survey and new fare structure into the Focus model
• Work with RTD to evaluate methods for improving Focus model ridership forecasts regarding Park-n-Ride and Transit-Oriented Development outcomes
• Investigate developing a spatial visualization tool for CVS data
• Explore/Evaluate uses and benefits of 2D and 3D ABM visualization tools such as CityPhi (INRO product)
• Explore how additional socioeconomic traits or network attributes (e.g. sidewalks) may enhance Focus modeling of bicycle and pedestrian trips
• Work with RPD Division on a new methodology for forecasting future school locations
• Evaluate and if cost effective, implement the Highway/Transit Master Network for maintaining different projects
• 2010 Front Range Travel Counts/Household Travel Survey:
  o Further incorporate into Focus model components
  o Collaborate with CDOT to re-estimate the model coefficients
• Provide model components and outputs to planning partners, local governments, or consultants conducting NEPA or other studies
• Maintain a cohesive storage area to keep all travel model related files including documentation, scenario analysis, calibrations, and inputs and outputs for RTP Cycle runs

**Deliverables:**

2018

• Create 2015 base year model including new calibration and traffic/ridership validation
• Complete updated Focus model runs and output data files used for air quality conformity determinations

2019

• Design and implement a new tool to automate the calibration process of the Focus model components
• Complete Focus model runs and output data files used for air quality conformity determinations

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD
Activity 7.4 Maintain Transportation and Related Data

**Purpose:** To obtain, maintain, and distribute transportation and related data to be used in the regional transportation planning process.

**Tasks:**
- Collect and process local government receipts and expenditure data, state, and local roadway inventory data, and bridge data from CDOT, incorporating it into DRCOG databases
- Collect and process traffic counts from CDOT and all member governments/consultants, perform quality control, and add to the traffic count database
- Continuously update the DRCOG website traffic count map to show count data for the last three years
- Improve methods for calculations of greenhouse gas and air quality measures
- Collect transit ridership, Park-n-Ride lot user data, and other transit-related data from RTD
- Obtain bridge and pavement condition data from CDOT and local governments, as needed
- Transfer state highway crash data into the DRCOG linear reference system and geocode crashes on non-state roadways
- Edit the transportation information database per plan amendment and update various travel model networks staging respectively

**Deliverables:**
2019
- Conduct the Transportation Improvement Survey

**Participants:** DRCOG (lead), CDOT, RTD, local governments
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V. OTHER MAJOR PLANNING ACTIVITIES

The following sections describe other major planning activities that will be ongoing during FY2018-2019.

**Identified in a previous/current Transportation Improvement Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridor/Interchange/Operational Studies/EA/EIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Hwy 79 and Hwy 36 Grade Separation EA and Design Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>SH-7 BRT Study: Boulder to Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td>Arapahoe Rd: I-25 to Parker Rd Next Steps Operations Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT Region 1</td>
<td>West Connects PEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-25 S PEL/NEPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-25 Operational Bus on Shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central I-25 PEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wadsworth (Wheat Ridge) EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vasquez PEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT Region 4</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement of North I-25 (DUS to Ft. Collins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce City</td>
<td>North Metro Industrial Area Transportation Study: I-25 to I-270 to 40th Ave/Smith Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88th Ave NEPA Study: I-76 to Hwy 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRCOG</td>
<td>SHRP2 Planning Process Bundle Implementation Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmont</td>
<td>Southwest Longmont Subarea Operations Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>SH 119 BRT NEPA Analysis: Boulder to Longmont Regional BRT Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rapid Transit Station Area, Urban Center Master Plans, or other Planning-Related Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36 Commuting Solutions</th>
<th>Northwest Corridor Bike/Pedestrian Final Wayfinding Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arvada</td>
<td>Gold Line Kipling Ridge Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Aurora City Center Train/Traffic and Transportation Network Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>SH-7 Arterial BRT Station Design, Connectivity, and ROW Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSOR</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Denver              | Federal Blvd Corridor Plan  
                        | National Western Center Parking and Transportation Management Study  
                        | North Capitol Hill/Colfax Urban Center Study                               |
| Littleton           | Mineral Light Rail Station Area Study                                    |
| Longmont            | Main Street Corridor Plan                                                |
| RTD                 | Colfax Corridor Connections (3C) TOD Implementation Plan                 |
| Transportation Solutions | Multi-Station Plan and Mobility Study                              |

**Colorado Department of Transportation, Division of Transportation Development – State Planning and Research Program (Summary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CDOT      | 10-Year Development Plan  
                        | 2045 Statewide Transportation Plan  
                        | Bike/Ped Facilities Inventory  
                        | High Priority Bicycle Corridors  
                        | Mobility Choice  
                        | Multimodal Freight Plan  
                        | Risk-Based Asset management Plan Update  
                        | Statewide TDM Plan  
                        | Statewide Travel Model               |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td>Complete Streets Study and Cross-sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams County Denver</td>
<td>Federal PEL: 46&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to 84&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Transportation Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1601: I-70 and Monaghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1601: 1-70 and Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County</td>
<td>East County Line Road Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UP/RTD Trail Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH119 Quiet Zone Feasibility/Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County City of Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Washington Street Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>US 85/C-470 Interchange Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-25/Happy Canyon Rd Interchange Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2040 Transportation Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Village</td>
<td>Transportation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EA: Belleview/I-25 Interchange Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>SH 119 BRT NEPA/Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First and Final Mile Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional BRT Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Life Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTD Boundary Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Status Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX A

PROGRAM FINANCING TABLES
Table 1. FY2018 and 2019 UPWP Revenue Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
<th>DRCOG Cash Match</th>
<th>RTD In-Kind Match</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 18 CPG</td>
<td>DRCOG</td>
<td>4,742,730</td>
<td>492,949</td>
<td>492,949</td>
<td>$ 5,728,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 19 CPG</td>
<td>DRCOG</td>
<td>4,853,108</td>
<td>504,421</td>
<td>504,421</td>
<td>$ 5,861,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16/FY17 CPG Carryover</td>
<td>DRCOG</td>
<td>6,573,526</td>
<td>683,237</td>
<td>683,237</td>
<td>$ 7,940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Available Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 16,169,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,680,607</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,680,607</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 19,530,577</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. FY206 and 2017 Anticipated Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2018 Total</td>
<td>FY2019 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1</strong> Program Administration and Coordination</td>
<td>$767,256</td>
<td>$805,619</td>
<td>$1,572,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1 Direct Program Management</td>
<td>$409,174</td>
<td>$429,633</td>
<td>$838,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2 Maintaining the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>$241,547</td>
<td>$253,624</td>
<td>$495,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3 Intergovernmental Planning Coordination</td>
<td>$21,951</td>
<td>$23,049</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.4 DRCOG Staff Training and Development</td>
<td>$94,584</td>
<td>$99,313</td>
<td>$193,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2</strong> Planning Outreach, Education, and Training</td>
<td>$298,318</td>
<td>$302,734</td>
<td>$591,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.1 Public Engagement and Outreach</td>
<td>$151,492</td>
<td>$159,067</td>
<td>$310,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.2 Local Gov and Stakeholder Education, Outreach, and Support</td>
<td>$136,826</td>
<td>$143,667</td>
<td>$280,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3</strong> Long Range Planning</td>
<td>$1,444,761</td>
<td>$1,341,999</td>
<td>$2,786,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1 Metro Vision Plan - Collaboration and Implementation Assistance</td>
<td>$402,545</td>
<td>$429,633</td>
<td>$838,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.2 Metro Vision Plan - Research and Performance Management</td>
<td>$324,123</td>
<td>$340,329</td>
<td>$664,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.3 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>$294,395</td>
<td>$309,115</td>
<td>$603,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.4 Air Quality Conformity</td>
<td>$122,381</td>
<td>$128,500</td>
<td>$250,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning</td>
<td>$301,317</td>
<td>$141,383</td>
<td>$442,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 4</strong> Short Range Planning</td>
<td>$464,124</td>
<td>$487,330</td>
<td>$951,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4.1 Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>$387,969</td>
<td>$407,367</td>
<td>$795,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4.2 Performance Measure Reporting</td>
<td>$76,155</td>
<td>$79,963</td>
<td>$156,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 5</strong> Transportation Operations</td>
<td>$437,437</td>
<td>$459,309</td>
<td>$896,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.1 DRCOG Congestion Management Process</td>
<td>$125,374</td>
<td>$131,643</td>
<td>$257,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.2 Regional Travel Demand Management (TDM) Planning</td>
<td>$42,548</td>
<td>$44,675</td>
<td>$87,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.3 Regional Transportation Operations</td>
<td>$142,232</td>
<td>$149,344</td>
<td>$291,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.4 Transportation Safety Planning</td>
<td>$26,747</td>
<td>$28,084</td>
<td>$54,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.5 Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning</td>
<td>$100,536</td>
<td>$105,563</td>
<td>$206,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 6</strong> Public Transportation Planning</td>
<td>$431,104</td>
<td>$452,659</td>
<td>$883,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.1 Regional Transit/Human Service...Planning and Coordination</td>
<td>$149,924</td>
<td>$157,420</td>
<td>$307,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.2 FasTracks Review and Assessment</td>
<td>$56,615</td>
<td>$59,420</td>
<td>$116,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.3 RTD and CDOT Local Government Planning Process</td>
<td>$51,825</td>
<td>$54,416</td>
<td>$106,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.4 RTD Strategic Budget Plan</td>
<td>$41,457</td>
<td>$43,530</td>
<td>$84,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.5 RTD System Planning Process</td>
<td>$41,457</td>
<td>$43,530</td>
<td>$84,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.6 PnR Planning and Transit Oriented Development (TOD)</td>
<td>$48,369</td>
<td>$50,787</td>
<td>$99,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.7 FasTracks Program Management and Planning Assistance</td>
<td>$41,457</td>
<td>$43,530</td>
<td>$84,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 7</strong> Support Systems for Planning</td>
<td>$2,479,287</td>
<td>$2,603,251</td>
<td>$5,082,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.1 Develop and Maintain Information Systems</td>
<td>$778,937</td>
<td>$817,884</td>
<td>$1,596,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.2 Land Use Modeling and Forecasting</td>
<td>$514,344</td>
<td>$540,061</td>
<td>$1,054,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.3 Transportation Modeling and Forecasting</td>
<td>$963,310</td>
<td>$1,011,476</td>
<td>$1,974,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.4 Maintain Transportation and Related Data</td>
<td>$222,696</td>
<td>$233,831</td>
<td>$456,527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY2018/FY2019 Anticipated Expenditures**

|                          | $6,312,287 | $6,452,901 | $12,765,188 |

Anticipated Unused FY18/19 Contract Funds (Carryover to FY20/21) $6,765,389

**TOTAL Funding Available** $19,530,577

*Total expenditures include CPG, cash match, and RTD in-kind.

Note: In-kind match provided by RTD for transit-related activities is proportionally distributed among all UPWP activities.
Table 3. CPG (Federal) Expenditures and Associated Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2018/2019 UPWP Objectives and Activities</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 18 CPG (federal)</td>
<td>DRCOG Cash Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>Program Administration and Coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1</td>
<td>Direct Program Management</td>
<td>$338,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2</td>
<td>Maintaining the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process</td>
<td>$199,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3</td>
<td>Interglobal Planning Coordination</td>
<td>$18,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.3</td>
<td>DRCOG Staff Training and Development</td>
<td>$78,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>Planning Outreach, Education, and Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.1</td>
<td>Public Engagement and Outreach</td>
<td>$125,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.2</td>
<td>Local Gov and Stakeholder Education, Outreach, and Support</td>
<td>$113,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>Long Range Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1</td>
<td>Metro Vision Plan - Collaboration and Implementation Assistance</td>
<td>$333,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.3</td>
<td>Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>$243,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.4</td>
<td>Air Quality Conformity</td>
<td>$101,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.5</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning</td>
<td>$249,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>Short Range Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4.1</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>$321,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4.2</td>
<td>Performance Measure Reporting</td>
<td>$63,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>Transportation Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.1</td>
<td>DRCOG Congestion Management Process</td>
<td>$103,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.2</td>
<td>Regional Travel Demand Management (TDM) Planning</td>
<td>$35,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.3</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Operations</td>
<td>$117,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.4</td>
<td>Transportation Security Planning</td>
<td>$22,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.5</td>
<td>Transportation Safety Planning</td>
<td>$83,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6</td>
<td>Public Transportation Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.1</td>
<td>Regional Transit/Human Service...Planning and Coordination</td>
<td>$89,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.2</td>
<td>RTD and CDOT Local Government Planning Process</td>
<td>$12,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.3</td>
<td>RTD Strategic Budget Plan</td>
<td>No federal funding will be expended on this activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.4</td>
<td>RTD System Planning Process</td>
<td>No federal funding will be expended on this activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.5</td>
<td>PnR Planning and Transit Oriented Development (TOD)</td>
<td>$5,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 6.6</td>
<td>RTD Program Management and Planning Assistance</td>
<td>No federal funding will be expended on this activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7</td>
<td>Support Systems for Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.1</td>
<td>Develop and Maintain Information Systems</td>
<td>$644,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.2</td>
<td>Land Use Modeling and Forecasting</td>
<td>$425,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.3</td>
<td>Transportation Modeling and Forecasting</td>
<td>$797,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 7.4</td>
<td>Maintain Transportation and Related Data</td>
<td>$184,370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In-kind match provided by RTD for transit-related activities is proportionally distributed among all UPWP activities.
APPENDIX B

TABLE OF DRCOG DELIVERABLES WITH EXPECTED COMPLETION DATES
# Table 4

**Key DRCOG Deliverables with Expected Completion Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>2-Year Program Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2018 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-Dec Jan-Mar Apr-Jun Jul-Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>FY20-21 UPWP</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Metro Vision Performance Measurement Report</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>DRCOG Freight and Goods Movement Report</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Conformity Determination Reports</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>TIP Projects Delayed Report</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Metro Vision Performance Measurement Report</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Report of Traffic Congestion in the Denver Region</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>FY18-19 project selection process for TDM pool</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Annual Report on Regional Transportation Operations Performance Measures</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2014-2018 Safety Targets</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan update</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>RTD Change Report review</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Denver Regional Aerial Photography Project (DRAPP)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>UrbanSim calibration and validation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2015 Base Year Calibration</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUBJECT
This item is an update on Bike to Work Day 2017

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
No action recommended, this item is for information only

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
Celeste Stragand, Regional TDM Program and Marketing Manager, will discuss the 2017 event, including a brief overview of its purpose, highlights of the June 28 effort, and results.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
Attachment: Staff presentation

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, acting Executive Director at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Steve Erickson, Director, Communications & Marketing, at 303-480-6716 or serickson@drcog.org.
Bike to Work Day 2017
Bike today for a better tomorrow

Presented by:
Celeste Stragand
Regional TDM Program & Marketing Manager

July 19, 2017

Agenda

- Overview
- 2017 Bike to Work Day
  - By the numbers
  - Event highlights
- Long-term benefit to region
- Where do we go from here?
Way to Go partnership: Nearly 30 year history
- CMAQ funding and sponsorships
- Fourth Wednesday of June (Colorado statute)
- Supportive, fun and safe environment encouraging people to try bike commuting
- New bike commuters realize it’s easy and the benefits are significant
- Catalyst for changing behavior
- We’re No. 2!

2016 Bike to Work Day by the numbers
- 34,000 riders
- 37 percent were first-timers – more than 12,000!
- 8.9 miles average one-way commute
- 610,000 miles traveled
- 307 breakfast and bike home stations
- 718 businesses and organizations participated in the Business Challenge
BIKE TO WORK DAY RIDERS

There are 20,728 riders that shared data about their commute during 2017 DRCOG Bike to Work Day!

2017 highlights
2017 highlights

- Sponsorships and prizes
- Regional partnerships
- Biker and Wheelie
- Active Bike Corridors

Beyond Bike to Work Day

- Long-term change
- Metro Vision goals
- DRCOG leads the way
- Signature event: Part of healthy ecosystem in our region
- One of many commuting choices
How are we doing?

• Between 2000 and 2014, bike commuters **doubled** (fastest-growing mode) U.S. CENSUS

• Colorado is the **No. 3** state in bike commuting in the nation! AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY 2011-2013

• By 2040, all trips are projected to increase by **35 percent**. Biking expected to increase by **56 percent**. DRCOG MODEL

Bike today for a better tomorrow

• **2,300 miles** of bicycle facilities in the region

• TIP cycle – **21.4 percent** bike and pedestrian projects

• Your communities

• Active transportation plan

• Regional momentum
Back in “the Day”

QUESTIONS?

Thank you!
The DRCOG Board Workshop presents opportunities for Board Directors and Alternates to:

- Discuss and plan how our region addresses important issues
- Engage with colleagues across the region to share insights into successes and challenges
- Learn about existing and new products and services underway at DRCOG
- Have informal, social time to get to know each other outside of work

**Friday afternoon training sessions** (Participants can attend at least two sessions)

3 – 4 p.m.  **Session 1**
4:15 – 5:15 p.m.  **Session 2**

*For newer members or those who just want a quick refresher, in-service training includes abbreviated versions of the following:*
- Area Agency on Aging mini course
- Metro Vision mini course
- Transportation Improvement Program mini course

**Friday evening**

5:30 p.m.  **Chair’s remarks**
5:45 – 7 p.m.  **Social time, networking with Directors and key staff**
7 – 9 p.m.  **Dinner**

**Saturday morning**

7 a.m.  **Breakfast**
8 – 9 a.m.  **Review and discussion of the 2018 strategic initiatives**

*The Board will adopt the 2018 budget no later than November 2017. The purpose of this review and discussion is to suggest any changes, additions, etc. to the draft strategic initiatives to be included in the planned budget.*
Plenary sessions:

9:15 – 10:30 a.m.  **Transportation for Older Adults**

Getting older adults and other vulnerable populations (low-income, veterans, individuals with disabilities) where they need to go is a regionally critical issue for DRCOG. Within the DRCOG region, the senior population is growing much faster than the general population. By 2040, the number of area residents 60 and older is expected to almost double and those 75 and older are forecast to increase by 200 percent (from 2015). Changing demographics, as well as many older adults choosing to age in place, will create the need for the region’s communities to improve accessibility and expand transportation services for the aging population. DRCOG funds and coordinates transportation services for older adults and helps communities plan for an aging population. Board Directors will be asked to share their experiences, best practices and suggestions for dealing with this regional challenge.

10:45 a.m. – noon  **Focus Areas for the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

The TIP Review Work Group encouraged the Board to develop specific goals or focus areas for what it hopes to accomplish in the next TIP call for projects. In this session, the Board will finalize its TIP focus areas so overarching project/program scoring criteria can be developed ahead of the call for projects in early 2018.

12:15 – 1:30 p.m.  **Lunch (Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority)**

Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments Acting Executive Director Rick Sonnenburg will give a presentation on the Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority, an effort among Colorado Springs, Manitou Springs, El Paso County, Green Mountain Falls and Ramah to maintain roads and support public transit. His presentation will cover the authority’s history and structure, as well as how it is collaboratively addressing challenges and embracing opportunities.

1:45 – 3 p.m.  **Technology and Planning: DRCOG’s Cool Tools in Action**

At the 2015 Board Workshop, DRCOG staff shared a variety of tools and technologies being developed or rolled out. Since that time, DRCOG has invested time and resources to continue the development, deployment, and evaluation of innovative and state-of-the-art tools and technologies to support our regional planning functions. In this session, Board Directors will learn more about our regional planning tools that are rooted in data and technology, including why they are critical to our work. Directors will be asked to offer guidance to staff on how these data and tools might provide additional value beyond supporting regional planning efforts and Board decision-making, but also as potential resources for other regional and local planning initiatives.

Wrap-up at approximately 3 p.m.
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director  
303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org
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-------------|----------------|----------------
July 17, 2016 | Informational Item | 17

SUBJECT
DRCOG Board Director Collaboration Assessment Results - 2017

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
None

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

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

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
Attachments:  
DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment Results – 2017  
Dr. Carl Larson analysis of results  
Summary of results by Board Director tenure

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you have questions about the results, please contact Bob Fifer, Chair of the Performance and Engagement Committee. If you have questions about the assessment process, please contact Jerry Stigall at jstigall@drcog.org or 303-480-6780.
DRCOG BOARD
COLLABORATION ASSESSMENT RESULTS
2017
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DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment

Overview

Board Collaboration Assessment is a continuous improvement tool to help the DRCOG Board refine their governance process using input exclusively from its own Board Directors. The assessment will be administered yearly to provide Board Directors feedback and recommended actions for improving collaboration. Individual responses are completely anonymous and only group results will be shared with all Board Directors.

The Performance and Engagement Committee, established in part from the results of the 2015 DRCOG Board collaboration assessment, as a key function of their role did an initial review of the Executive Summary and assessment results to ensure that a timely and informative report will be provided to the full Board.

Report Format

The Executive Summary is the first section of the report. This section provides Dr. Larson’s analysis and recommendations based on the assessment results. It’s helpful to review this section before reviewing numeric scores and comments.

The second part of the report contains 12 main sections; Structural Integrity, Authenticity, Strong Leadership, Members, Structure, General Success, Community Involvement & Collaboration, Outcomes, Quality of Services, Fragmentation of Services, Duplication of Services, and Costs. The Membership Value is the last item and was added for the 2016 assessment but was not included for 2015. It is currently a measure in the Executive Office scorecard. Each main section will include numeric scores for items in that section. Board Directors’ comments for each section follow the numeric scores.

Reviewing numeric scores

All items in the assessment are scored on a 4-point scale, True (4), More True than False (3), More False than True (2), False (1). The numbers in parenthesis next to each answer option listed above is the value assigned to that answer and is used to calculate the average score. The Authenticity section is reverse scored relative to all other sections of the assessment. True for the items in the Authenticity section is scored as a 1 and False is scored as a 4 to calculate the average.

Don’t Know/Not Applicable is a 5th answer option but is not factored into the average. Scores above 2.5 (mid-point of scale) are moving in a positive direction and scores below 2.5 are moving in a negative direction.

Bar charts in the report include three scores; 2017 results are next to or inside the bar, 2016 and 2015 results are in a text box to the right of the 2017 result. The Section Average text box at the top of each section reports the overall average scores for that section based on the three assessments to date. Color coding (green or red) is used to indicate how scores to items compare to the previous results. Green indicates a higher score than the previous assessment and red indicates a lower score than the previous assessment. Some differences in scores from year to year were insignificant but are still color coded to reflect any change.

For questions about this assessment, contact Jerry Stigall at jstigall@drcog.org.
I have been a DRCOG Board Director for:

Answered: 34  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 years</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Structural Integrity refers to how Board Directors perceive the fairness of the collaborative process. A process that has high structural integrity applies criteria for making decisions and allocating resources in a fair and consistent manner, treats all members equitably, and allows sufficient opportunity for members to challenge and revise decisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The people involved in the process usually are focused on</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broader goals (outcomes) of the region, rather than</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual agendas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is free of favoritism.</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, everyone has an equal opportunity to influence</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process responds fairly to the needs of its members.</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made in the process are based on fair criteria.</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of resources is decided fairly.</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The criteria for allocations are fairly applied.</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, there is sufficient opportunity to challenge</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decisions made in the process are consistent.</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>55.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions are based on accurate information.</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide comments for the Structural Integrity section in the space below.

I have been with DRCOG such a short time I am not sure of a lot of these processes.

Larger stakeholders or Cities do seem to have the advantage for decisions, allocations and resources.

There are always the coalitions built which often push out the suburban cities and smaller communities. I believe the metro vision has helped this, and I am hopeful that we can improve with this new tool.

We still have times when false information is introduced by stakeholders and former Board members with intent to influence a decision. The criteria for decisions is still often not really fair in that it does not take into account all perspectives and community values. I still have concerns that resources are not actually allocated properly. We put a lot of focus on scoring for growth not where growth is actually occurring, but where it is planned. And the focus on scoring for growth is still often not fair in that areas with planned density often score higher than areas experiencing growth that still have valid plans for more growth.

Fairness is the question and I believe the process is as fair as it can be.

Troubled a bit by the term "fair" without having a clear and agreed upon definition and is likely a word that we all interpret differently. While I do think staff does a lot of work to try to be fair with all members, I'm not sure we as a board have clarity around how we define "regional" and bias continues to be revealed in comments and conversations that may or may not affect "fairness" of the overall process and decision making.

This seems to be a continually improving area.

We have bettered ourselves since my arrival on the board but I think a discussion of "what is regional?" - defining what this is and how should it be implemented (resources allocated, etc.) would be a good discussion topic. We have reshaped the organization through the Structure/Governance reboot but Board Members still come from the local perspective. Metro Vision is a vast document that identifies what is regionally important but unless we go through and prioritize outcomes, define regional values and ideals, or create a framework that creates a consensus view of what is fair - the local bias will always be there. Some municipalities have more resources/people/experience in the DRCOG environment - I would like to see a continued attempt to assist smaller communities - funding initial master plans and providing educational opportunities to learn from staff and larger communities in order to provide a path to growth where DRCOG can provide a forward-looking vision on what challenges they will encumber and some resources to overcome those challenges.

While I picked 'more true than false' on many of these I feel that they are very close to true and rather far from false. The Board is trying to be fair and consistent in the process and in the decisions.

There are so many moving parts in the process that until someone has at least a year of seasoning, it is difficult to contribute much. Not a criticism of the process because that would be pretty much impossible to change given the complexities of all that we do. Just a general comment. Then I think sometimes some of the smaller jurisdictions don't feel like they have enough at stake to find their voice. Possibly just an education piece for them.

jurisdictions don't feel like they have enough at stake to find their voice. Possibly just an education piece for them.

It seems obvious that in the past it was not fair, just and equitable. More recently, it is obviously as fair, just and equitable as possible.

I believe that the bike/ped coalition is more dominant than it should be from a regional perspective.
It seems that people are often coached by their individual bodies and staff to advocate for parochial outcomes rather than the best benefit for the region. I feel that it would be useful to have a road show to each member government every third year (staggering) that highlighted how investing our limited regional resources carefully could have more positive outcomes for the region as a whole. I think it would help the bodies that send representatives understand why we need to invest the resources where they could be chosen to be invested & be conformable and rise to the task of using local resources to fix local problems.

Participation and opportunity for collaborative discussions have improved.
II. Authenticity refers to the extent Board Directors perceive the collaborative process is free from undue outside influence. An authentic process is one where members are confident the group has the power to make independent judgments and evaluations of the issues, and can make decisions on how to respond to those issues that will be respected by all members as well as those in positions of authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process gives some people more than they deserve, while shortchanging others.</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, some people’s opinions are accepted while other people are asked to justify themselves.</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, strings are being pulled from outside Board discussions which influence important decisions.</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In discussions about decisions or procedures, some people are discounted because of the organizations/jurisdictions that they represent.</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide comments for the Authenticity section in the space below.

We still have times when false information is introduced by stakeholders and former Board members with intent to influence a decision. I feel certain members are allowed to make comments and then when challenged, the challenger is made to feel like a protocol has been breached. Whereas others views are always challenged and compelled to justify even the most simple statements of fact or even viewpoint. Many times some of us feel like our opinions are discounted due to the jurisdiction we belong to.

I think it's important that the BOD receives outside help. We are all so busy that we cannot possibly know all the answers and must rely on knowledgeable folks that don't sit on the Board.

I have seen a great deal of respect for all board members.

Outside input is critical and should be welcomed in a proper forum. My concern is placement and degree of the outside input. The last TIP cycle one of the three TIP funding scenarios was named for a outside agency (Bicycle America, I believe) that was ultimately selected. I recall getting email from other outside agencies outlining their position and advocating for a specific vote on certain matters. Technology also can aide and assist outside input - having interested members in the audience providing real time information to board members to advocate and further their position within the board discussion.

The process, while not perfect is more fair than unfair in working with the members and in evaluating facts and information. This is regardless of the organization the Board member represents. Occasionally the Board member must convey the opinion of the organization they represent. We are trying to do what is good for the region represented by DRCOG.

Although there are certainly those that feel these statements are true, I would counter that they haven't tested the theory by stepping up with their ideas.

My experience is that everyone was considered respectfully.

Not all jurisdictions are equal notwithstanding they each have a vote.

There is so much political influence over the TAC and other technical panels that it is hard to take their recommendations as technical advice.

Some voices still seem to carry more weight, but decisions are being made based on a broader discussion of members.
III. Strong Leadership reflects the perception the Board has an effective organizing/coordinating body and, is led by committed and effective leaders. The role of the organizing/coordinating body is to provide a convening location, collaborative environment and relevant information for Board Director deliberation and decision-making. Note: The first item below regarding Organizer/coordinator refers to DRCOG's role as the convener/convening location. The second item refers to Board Director leadership. Our collaborative...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...has an effective organizer/coordinator.</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...is led by individuals who are strongly dedicated to the Mission and Vision of DRCOG.</td>
<td>67.65%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide comments for the Strong Leadership section in the space below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am honored to be a part of the BOD, due in part to the fact that most of the members are regional in thinking, albeit they still have their local prejudices. That is only natural.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure we as a board have clarity around how we define &quot;regional&quot; and how that plays into the mission and vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident in staff in the role of convener.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DRCOG Board is generally supportive of regional collaboration but individual members sometimes succumb to parochialism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to have strong leadership but it also must be responsible and reasonable leadership. I believe we have that. The dictator/rubber stamp of some groups does not exist with DRCOG.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are led by wise and people committed to integrity!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290 Broadway works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong and effective leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Members refers to how Board Directors perceive other Director’s capacity to collaborate: Are they willing to devote their efforts to furthering the goals of the collaborative rather than simply garner additional resources for their individual programs? Will they support the ideas that have the most merit even at the expense of their own interests? And, do they think there is sufficient trust among members to honestly share information and feedback?

Members...
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...are effective liaisons between their home organizations and our group. 38.24% 55.88% 5.88% 0.00% 0.00% 3.32
...trust each other sufficiently to honestly and accurately share information, perceptions, and feedback. 29.41% 55.88% 8.82% 0.00% 5.88% 3.22
...are willing to let go of an idea for one that appears to have more merit. 23.53% 55.88% 8.82% 5.88% 5.88% 3.03
...are willing to devote the effort necessary to achieve Metro Vision Outcomes. 32.35% 52.94% 5.88% 5.88% 2.94% 3.15
Please provide comments for the Members section in the space below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some partisanship was present in Metro Vision Plan process but it didn't obstruct coming to agreement of the plan components.</th>
<th>I have not been involved in TIP allocation process, so can't comment on that yet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned that we do have members who don't think they are actually liaisons with their home organizations. We have had too many votes where people abstained because they didn't know how their home organization would vote on the same subject.</td>
<td>DRCOG can be a time bandit. If the members didn't believe in the regionalism of DRCOG's vision, they wouldn't make it such a priority to be there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe there is good cooperation among directors and have personally received valuable shared information. Of course, each Director has a measure of leaning to his or her own area of representation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It took a while to understand how to communicate DRCOG information to the home municipality - maybe add a topic in the orientation to assist the new members. We are better at sharing thoughts to the group and believe the board as a whole is willing to incorporate other thoughts and ideas to achieve a better solution. Everyone is doing their part to work toward Metro Vision outcomes. The concern is understanding how local municipalities - who are at different cycles of development and view different Metro Vision outcomes as important - can come to a consensus on how to fund improvements that will further their view of the region. Once we can understand if we are a top down (emphasis should be on funding regional projects with little/limited consideration on sub regional projects) or bottom up (emphasis sub regional projects and allow other agencies - CDOT, RTD - to take care of regional projects) agency we can advance the discussion. This is where board members personal or philosophical bias can affect the process.</td>
<td>While it was wonderful that we unanimously adopted Metro Vision 2040, it is discouraging when individual board members say things like &quot;multi-modal transportation is a cult.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the area where the rubber hits the road. My observation has been the overall good of the region is a controlling goal, with regionalism and cooperation of directors becoming stronger.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that by far the majority of the members do understand the need to take off their jurisdiction hat and put on their regional hat while sitting at the DRCOG table. There are still, however, some that feel they will not support any mission or effort that does not directly benefit their municipality. Some have even made similar statements as that at the DRCOG table. Although we continue to represent our individual jurisdictions even at DRCOG, we are supposed to be REGIONAL thinkers and policy makers in this role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very collaborative.</td>
<td>As to the effort to achieve: It has to be false more than true just given the attendance at Metro Vision meetings in the past. As to effective liaisons: Knowing some of the councils and mayors’ perceptions on issues, there are some disconnects with their DRCOG representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some (though relatively few) of the discussions I’ve heard have included comments that were less collaborative and more about individual interests; however, I recognize some of that behavior may stem from &quot;election status&quot; (if someone is up for re-election) and type of constituents one represents (some very inquisitive and very vocal, very locally focused). In most cases, that behavior doesn't change the outcome of a Board decision I think/hope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Our group has set ground rules and norms about how we will work together. 81.82% 27 15.15% 5 0.00% 0 0.00% 0 3.03% 1 33 3.84

We have a method for communicating the activities and decisions of the group to all members. 73.53% 25 26.47% 9 0.00% 0 0.00% 0 0.00% 0 0 34 3.74

There are clearly defined roles for group members. 61.76% 21 29.41% 10 5.88% 2 0.00% 0 2.94% 1 34 3.58
Please provide comments for the Structure section in the space below.

These statements are true for the Finance and Admin Committee as well.

With a changing board it might be worthwhile to develop a charter that is revisited on a regular basis and can be used as a document to return to from time to time to remind us of the agreements we have made in how we work together.

I have seen respect and cooperation.

The discussion and revision to committees were a welcome improvement.

With the normal high turnover of Directors due to elections etc a key to this section is education and information. The members need to know what DRCOG is, does and needs to do. Equally important is to ensure that members know how things occur and get done.

Very positive.

Had to define clearly defined

Different board chairs have had stylistic differences when applying the rules, and each one I have encountered seems to be effective.
VI. General Success reflects the perceived level of success achieved by the collaborative and assesses the extent to which members accomplished the objectives set out for the most recent performance period. The term objectives in this section refers to for example; Reduce VMT, Improve Air Quality, Reduce GHG, etc. as opposed to 'outcomes' that describe an end state or destination point. Our Collaborative...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has accomplished its specific objectives.</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has achieved more than its original objectives.</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has led to new projects or efforts.</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has achieved extraordinary success.</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide comments for the General Success section in the space below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I still say we struggle to properly fund transportation in the Denver Metro Region. Nor do we really make an impact with the funds under our control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rest of the nation looks at DRCOG and is jealous of our successes and tries to emulate our product. Acting globally and thinking locally is the hallmark of our accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Extraordinary success&quot; is a big statement. Not sure I could agree or disagree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see regular Metro Vision updates to demonstrate progress or improvement on outcomes. This ties the board to the outcomes, defines a level of accountability and creates the opportunity for board/staff discussions to further the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are super successful with our Aging work; more progress is needed on things like VMT and GHG emissions reductions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are getting better at our job and expression goals without artificial numbers being dictated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They do the best they can with the obstacles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraordinary success as compared to: I used Atlanta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve extraordinary success we would have to do something &quot;exceptional to a very marked extent&quot; (Merriam Webster). Extraordinary would be if we could bring the regions ozone/congestion into compliance/to-target in one year to five years, not a small reduction in the amount of an increase over a base projected increase over 30+ years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. Community Involvement & Collaboration refers to the extent to which the collaborative has engaged a wider or more diverse set of partners, or has stimulated greater commitment to collaboration among communities/jurisdictions. Our Collaborative...
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has led to broader and more meaningful engagement of diverse partners.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has led to</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| has resulted in the emergence of new leaders committed to collaboration.  
| has helped improve the way our participating jurisdictions work together.  
| has increased my knowledge of resources outside of my agency/organization.  
<p>| has increased my access to resources outside of my agency/organization for my community. | 55.88% | 32.35% | 2.94% | 5.88% | 2.94% | 34 | 3.42 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please provide comments for the Community Involvement &amp; Collaboration section in the space below.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I just don't see the &quot;broader and more meaningful engagement of diverse partners&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff of DRCOG is good people, making smart decisions and directing the BOD to make regional decisions. They herd butterflies (BOD) well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are big differences between the aging work of DRCOG and the transportation work of DRCOG, with the former feeling much more community oriented and collaborative. I don't feel DRCOG reaches the general public well particularly with regards to transportation and I wonder if increased community input might help collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much so and aided by staff's considerable desire to be helpful and provide clear, timely information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The non-DRCOG board conversations are a great benefit to a board members. Learning what others are doing in the region and taking back that knowledge to your own municipality is an immense benefit. Having a knowledgeable and talented DRCOG staff provides a third-party perspective has been a great resource. I would like to have DRCOG further engage the municipalities and ask &quot;how can we help?&quot;. There is so much talent in DRCOG that I would like to continue to discover new ways to share our talent, work product and data to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The growth in understanding this involvement and collaboration is apparent over the last several years and seems to be the path DRCOG has chosen for the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This again goes to the breadth of what we do and the understanding of individual directors as to what that is. It takes quite awhile for members to get their heads around all that DRCOG offers its members, and what you don't know, you don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All interactions have been constructive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard pressed to see where access to resources outside of my agency would work for most except very small ones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. Outcomes refer to the extent to which members believe the collaborative has had an impact on the outcomes it is targeting. For example an outcome is; The built environment accommodates the needs of residents of all ages, incomes, and abilities; Development patterns are easy to navigate, enhance multimodal connectivity, and maximize the ability for all people to access opportunities. (Metro Vision)

Our Collaborative...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is committed to a “no wrong door” approach where any idea can be considered.</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has had an impact on the outcomes it is targeting.</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in improved outcomes for the population served.</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide comments for the Outcomes section in the space below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our focus on &quot;alternate transportation&quot; alternatives has taken our eyes off the ball of providing good roads that keep up with growth in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, I think this is much more positive in the realm of aging than in the realm of transportation/land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a tough one to measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See comment above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes are being achieved and an overall understanding of developmental patterns are more clearly emerging from the Metro Vision and other components of DRCOG such as AAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proof is still to be fully seen in my opinion. Much of the recent work done by the organization and board will not show outcomes for some time yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved outcomes: The needle has moved but not by much. The real key is which area over WHAT time. Example: Air Quality Last two years not much. Since the 80's huge positive movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. Quality of Services assesses members’ perceptions about the level of improvement in the quality of services for the population served, in areas such as access to needed services, navigating the system of services, time to obtain services, etc. Our Collaborative...

Answered: 34  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True %</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False %</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has improved the quality of services for the population served.</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in more streamlined service provision across participating jurisdictions/organizations.</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in the creation of a system that is easier for the population served to navigate.</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in a system that makes it easier for population served to access needed services.</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>39.39%</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in improved quality of services within my agency/organization due to our participation on the DRCOG Board.</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has reduced the cost of delivering services for the population served by my agency/organization that are also served by DRCOG.</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide comments for the Quality of Services section in the space below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The problem is that there are still &quot;haves, and have nots&quot; in the region that DRCOG doesn't address and seemingly will not address until we return more attention and focus to roads that service the commuting public.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally, I think this is positive for the work related to aging and services; its less clear to me how DRCOG directly improves services for the population beyond aging; transportation and land use are somewhat improved but I don't think the general public is aware of DRCOG or thinks the organization affects their quality of life and/or access to services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information learned from participation in DRCOG, as well as utilizing the services available is valuable. My City has received specific funding from DRCOG which has and will continue to create a tremendous boost in multi-use transportation methods and all of the benefits thereof. Even realizing the need and value of changes via DRCOG teachings has a deep and lasting value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I view this section as more operational and the board has not been apprised of the metric, targets and benchmarks in this area. My perception is that DRCOG is working to improve services, diversifying revenue streams - based on staff reports - and sharing our knowledge - having DRCOG staff providing perspective in various media reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of services and our understanding of the how and why involved is growing. This area is difficult to administer and keep up with. State and Federal rules and reps keep changing and also the interpretation used to administer them. I think DRCOG has improved greatly with this but there is a lot of room to improve yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know that the board specifically has done all that but DRCOG has.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which services. Different results for AAA than elevator inspection (which died) (sad that it was the case)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X. **Fragmentation of Services** refers to the extent to which members of the collaborative perceive a reduction in the fragmentation of services for the population served. This reduced fragmentation may result from increased availability of continuous and uninterrupted services, greater integration of services, more comprehensive service plans, or other improvements. Our Collaborative...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has increased the availability of continuous and the population served by DRCOG, regardless of the funding source.</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has generally led to the creation of more comprehensive services plans for the population served by participating jurisdictions/organizations.</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section Avg** 3.22 / 2.74 / 2.85

---

**Please provide comments for the Fragmentation of Services section in the space below.**

Yes, but the first question still inhibits the second.

See above statement

Particularly applicable to AAA

This is also an area that has much to improve and develop. It has improved and is continuing to improve. Outside forces both help and hinder improvement.

More cohesive resulting in a more constructive effort.

Again too generalized question. Need to focus on specifics.
XI. Duplication of Services refers to two qualities of duplication: a reduction in the duplication of services; and a reduction in the number of professionals providing services for the population served by DRCOG. Our Collaborative...

![Chart showing survey responses]

**Section Avg**

2.89 / 2.65 / 2.66

### Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has led to a reduction in the duplication of overlapping services across all participating jurisdictions/organizations when serving the region's population.</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>55.88%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td><strong>2.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has led to a reduction in the number of professionals providing overlapping services for the population served.</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td><strong>2.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has increased the availability of continuous and uninterrupted services for the population served, regardless of the funding source.</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td><strong>2.92</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in greater integration of services for the population served.</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td><strong>3.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has generally led to the creation of more comprehensive services plans for the population served.</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>55.88%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td><strong>2.96</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide comments for the Duplication of Services section in the space below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, this is still an issue of &quot;haves and have not&quot;... We have growing populations in the region that must make their own plans and embark on their own projects because they are a &quot;have not&quot; population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more data or staff driven discussions to understand our progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Especially true for the AAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This issue of ‘duplication’ is difficult to eliminate with any State or Federal program. This is often increased by how money is allocated and tracked. Improvement is needed but a clear solution is not currently achievable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seems like this refers to aging and requires knowing what it was like before DRCOG became the AAA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better to answer with specific areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XII. Costs refers to the extent to which members view the collaborative as reducing costs, either by reducing the costs of delivering services to the population served or by promoting a sharing of costs between jurisdictions/organizations participating in the collaborative. Our Collaborative...

Answered: 34  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has reduced the costs of delivering services to the population</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>served.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in the sharing of costs between jurisdictions/</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations participating in the collaborative.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments for the Costs section in the space below.

I believe the cost have been reduced but cannot quantify that statement.

See above statement

DRCOG has definitely led to sharing of costs between jurisdictions as well as savings incurred through DRCOG information or direct support.

We are doing this but reduction of cost is pinpoint as a lowering in one section likely increases cost in another. The sharing is less difficult to track and see positive results.

Would have to view specific services
My community receives value from being a member of DRCOG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My community receives value from being a member of DRCOG.</td>
<td>67.65%</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide comments for the Membership Value section in the space below.

We have definitely been a "have not" community when it comes to the region. The funds we have received from the collaborative process are certainly appreciated, but far behind the rest of the region when our growth is considered against other jurisdictions.

We are a very small little town and do not have the funds to contribute to the greater good. We are in DRCOG's debt for its regional vision and I believe we receive great value from being a member.

Both in spirit, education and financial value.

We appreciate being an active regional member

Based on my personal experience and through discussions and planning session with community staff and volunteers, it is clear that we are receiving value, actually a lot of value. DRCOG is appreciated.

We like having a voice in how transportation funding is spent. We also benefit from the aging dollars and from the expertise across the board.

Particularly in the transportation area. UGB no value. AAA some not much
Responses

Great survey this year. It really allowed me to hit a few points of concern while still capturing the areas I do feel we succeed at.

You gotta reduce the paperwork for the BOD meetings. Way too much stuff to read. Also, during the meetings, use the TV screens to enhance any presentation rather than roll the DRCOG vision.

Questions 9, 10, 11 & 12 may skew the overall outcomes given the differences between levels of success.

Being a part of the Board is broadening in multiple ways.

Since our last survey, I believe that DRCOG has continued to improve and to clarify how it does its mission. Still a lot of room to improve and make more efficient but move forward.

We are collaborative, we want the best outcome for all. DRCOG serves everyone.
There is a substantial amount of information available in this year’s collaboration assessment. In the presence of an abundance of information, it is often most helpful to focus on the clearest and/or most consistent patterns that have implications for how members of the collaboration act upon that information. To that end, I find four patterns in the data to be especially noteworthy; A) Three patterns imply the continuation of your present strategies and actions. B) One pattern implies a slight but very important modification in your current collaborative strategy.

A) Three patterns strongly confirm that your collaboration is functioning unusually well. I make this claim considering how your assessment compares with those of other collaborations I have assessed, am familiar with through other assessments, and am aware of through research which has assessed collaborations.

1. **Your scores are unusually high.** Not uniformly high, a fact we will consider later, but predominately high, a pattern not typical of mandated or legislated collaboratives. If you look at the dimension scores (average rating across the items within a particular dimension, such as Structural Integrity, Strong Leadership, General Success, etc.) you will see that most of the dimension averages are at or around 3.0 or higher. All dimension averages are above the mid-point (2.5 on a 4-point scale). And some of the dimension averages are atypically high, which relates to the second pattern.

2. **The critical dimensions are in excellent shape.** Over the years some aspects of collaboration have emerged as more critical to the achievement of the collaboration’s objectives. For example, Strong Leadership is one of (much research reports ‘the’) most important conditions for success. Your dimension average for Strong Leadership is 3.66, a very high score in this area.

Another dimension which is critical in almost all successful collaboratives is a clear and sensible working structure (some call it “results-driven structure”). Your structure score is 3.72, a very high score for this area also.

A very interesting indicator of success was discovered early in the research on collaboration. Unusually successful community collaborations typically generate a specific energy among their members, an energy that comes from the contagion of optimism and enthusiasm and is manifested in spontaneous collaboration among members, often outside the original collaboration which brought the members together. There is some evidence of this in your data. Within the General Success dimension is the item, “has led to new projects or efforts”. Your score on this item is 3.41, unusually high. Perhaps equally noteworthy is that your score on this item last year was 2.91. (Think about it this way: the most you could have changed given absolute perfection, was 1.09 from last year’s score. You gained .5 points, almost half of the maximum possible gain, in this year’s score). This interesting change leads to the next noteworthy pattern, the overall change from last year.

3. **Your change from last year is overwhelmingly positive.** The assessment contains 51 items that are assessed on a 4-point scale. Your score from last year to this year improved on 45 of 51 items. Your change is positive on 90% of the items. To be sure,
later we will examine the five items on which you exhibited negative change but for now, let’s pause and appreciate the implications of this result. One important implication is that you are establishing positive momentum on the issues which justify the very existence of your collaborative. General Success is improving (2.79 to 3.06). Community Involvement & Collaboration is improving (3.0 to 3.47). Outcomes is improving (2.91 to 3.24). Quality of Services is improving (2.86 to 3.22). Fragmentation of Services is improving (2.74 to 3.22). Duplication of Services is improving (2.65 to 2.89). Costs is improving (2.8 to 3.15) and the value of your collaborative to the member communities is improving (3.43 to 3.72).

This is not the typical pattern which describes how collaboratives change over time. In fact, they usually move away from their original goals, investing more and more time, energy, and resources into building, maintaining, and survival of the infrastructure of the organization itself. Some scholars call this pattern ‘distanciation’. Over time, the more ‘distance’ members put between themselves and the original goal or problem that created the collaborative, the less energy they will invest in that original goal or problem. Your members seem to have reversed this pattern and gotten in closer touch with the original reasons for collaborating.

Taken as a whole, these three patterns strongly suggest that your collaboration is effective, your momentum is positive, and your energy is focused productively. You are definitely doing the ‘right things’.

B) One pattern is also clear, but very subtle and wide-ranging in its implications. Consider the five items which move negatively from last year.

1. The process responds fairly to the needs of its members (3.21 to 3.18).
2. The allocation of resources is decided fairly (2.97 to 2.91).
3. The criteria for allocations are fairly applied (3.27 to 3.06).
4. The process gives some people more than they deserve, while shortchanging others (3.0 to 2.85).
5. Members are effective liaisons between their home organization and our group (3.38 to 3.32).

These are the only five items in the assessment which moved negatively from last year. Though the amount of the negative change is small for four of the five items, they form a very tight cluster conceptually. Even the last item on effective liaisons is often seen as a byproduct of the first four items. That is, being ‘effective’ involves managing the tensions between the back-home priorities and the collective priorities of the collaborative, and everyone doing it ‘fairly’.

Collaboratives that manage these issues well become very highly regarded. Their experiences have given rise to concepts such as:

- ‘Profound shift’ – the point at which the members of a collaborative see the problems/issues from the perspective of the whole.
- ‘Fair process effect’ – the discovery that if individuals experience the process as fair they are likely to accept a decision even if it conflicts with their own ‘wants’.
• ‘Collective identity’ – sharing goals, aspirations, values, norms, etc. with a group to the extent that membership in the group becomes part of how members define themselves. In some research, this is a very strong predictor of successful outcomes.

Collaboratives that manage issues of fairness poorly are also memorable. I have done analysis of private-sector organizations that have suffered serious economic setbacks, governmental organizations that have lost their best employees, and collaboratives so embarrassed by their performance that they were reluctant, in one case, refused to be interviewed by our research team. All of these consequences and more, are results of perceived unfair or unjust processes.

Your data is not alarming, as were the conditions present in troubled organizations. But the pattern discussed above reveals the tip of a dangerous iceberg. Fortunately, your strengths in collaborating far outweigh this potential problem. The advantages that come from your strengths and the positive momentum you have created suggest your best course of action. Given a choice between ‘watch and wait’ versus ‘do something’, the advice from research and applied professionals favors taking action. Some would suggest to ‘tag it’ (identify the issue, describe it, discuss its impact on the performance of your group and take the first step toward removing it). Others would suggest ‘adopting an experimental mindset’ (try something, and if that doesn’t work, try something else). Of course, any of these action strategies are more complex than my descriptions imply but they are quite workable, and much preferable to ignoring a potential contentious issue.

Fortunately, you have an unusually strong organization and one of the roles that successful collaboratives have is that of a facilitator to help groups diagnose issues and develop viable solutions to address those that are negatively affecting the group. After many years of working with your OD Director, I have complete confidence in Jerry Stigall to facilitate these types of discussions and assist the group in designing action strategies to improve Board performance.

We have already discussed some follow-up analyses on your data, and some clear priority differences among members in the open-ended comments. Attending to this one emerging issue in your data can build upon the remarkable improvements you already have achieved over the last few years.
Consultation between Dr. Larson and Dr. Darrin Hicks, University of Denver Professor and expert on fairness and ‘reasonableness’, resulted in the following observations.

If there is a relationship between length of experience and perceptions of fairness, it may be at least partially because allocation decisions are seen as influenced "too much" by rhetorical assertiveness and size of coalitions, and a corresponding emphasis on member priorities relative to the priorities of the collaboration. The impact of these tensions is experienced more negatively over time. The experience is more of an "energy drain" if the members tend to accept the tension as irresolvable.

We should remember that the priorities of the different members are "real" rather than ideological. The allocation decisions have real consequences for the members' back-home communities. The liaison issues are almost always very difficult for members to manage. They are extremely sensitive to the motivations of other members. A "credible process" and "strong process leadership" are among the most necessary conditions for successful collaboration.

A healthy balance between member priorities and the collaborative's priorities requires hard work and frequent reinforcement of the reasons for, and consequences of, success in achieving collaborative goals.

If fairness issues are ignored, they tend to increase rather than decrease, and often contribute to the relatively high failure rate of collaboratives.
DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment 2017
Comparative Summary by Board Director Tenure
(Total number of items = 51)
(Total number of respondents = 34)

Summary: The information below highlights some of the differences in viewpoints based on Board Director tenure. The number in parentheses next to each category is the total respondents in that grouping. While the number of Board directors responding in the first and last categories are relatively small, it’s helpful to see the variance between the groups based on time as a Board Director. The first two dimensions of the assessment, Structural Integrity and Authenticity, represent the most important dimensions to get right early since virtually every other dimension in the assessment is influenced by these two areas. Therefore, the Total Process Quality (TPQ) score is calculated using the two averages of these dimensions and is reported below for each Board Director group. While all TPQ scores are above the mid-point (2.5) there is a notable difference in this score between the two groups who have been a Board Director the longest and the two that have been in the role the shortest period. It’s possible that over time, Board Directors become less optimistic about the decisions on projects, etc. This is an area worth exploring with Board Directors who have been around longer to observe and participate in the process at DRCOG. Despite variances in item scores, there is still close agreement between all the groups in the Membership Value score, reflecting that a significant majority of members see value for their community by belonging to DRCOG.

Overall Total Process Quality Score = 3.09

* Total Process Quality score is the average between Structural Integrity and Authenticity scale/section scores.

Overall Membership Value Score = 3.72

Board Directors @ 6+ years: (3)

- 33 items at least .25 points below group average
- 18 items in ‘close agreement’ with group average
- 18 items were at least .5 points below group average
- 2 items were at least 1 point below group average
- Total Process Quality Score = 2.76
- Membership Value score = 3.33

Board Directors @ 3-5 years: (14)

- 14 items were at least .25 points below group average
- 36 items in ‘close agreement’ (less than .25-point variance)
- 2 items were at least .5 points below group average
- 1 item was .63 points below the group average
- Total Process Quality Score = 2.94
- Membership Value score = 3.62
Board Directors @ 1-2 years: (11)

- 48 items above group average
- 26 items at least .25 points above group average
- 2 items lower (small variance)
- 1 item = to group average
- Total Process Quality Score = 3.32
- Membership Value score = 4.00

Board Directors @ less than 1 year: (6)

- 29 items at least .25 points above group average
- 20 items in ‘close agreement’ with group average
- 1 item at least .25 points below group average
- Total Process Quality Score = 3.15
- Membership Value score = 3.60
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director
303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 19, 2017</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
June and July administrative modifications to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program.

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

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
Per the DRCOG Board-adopted Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation, administrative modifications to the 2018-2021 TIP are reviewed and processed by staff. Administrative modifications represent revisions to TIP projects that do not require formal action by the DRCOG Board.

Once processed, the projects are posted on the DRCOG 2018-2021 TIP web page and emailed to the TIP Notification List, which includes members of the Regional Transportation Committee, the Transportation Advisory Committee, TIP project sponsors, staff of various federal and state agencies, and other interested parties.

The June and July 2017 administrative modifications are listed and described in the attachment. Highlighted items in the attachment depict project revisions.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
June and July 2017: 2018-2021 TIP Administrative Modifications

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director, at (303) 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, at (303) 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.
To: TIP Notification List

From: Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations

Subject: June 2017 Administrative Modifications to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

Date: June 29, 2017

SUMMARY

- Per the Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation covering the 2018-2021 TIP, administrative modifications are reviewed and processed by staff. They are emailed to the TIP Notification List, and posted on the DRCOG 2018-2021 TIP web page.

- The TIP Notification List includes the members of the DRCOG Regional Transportation Committee and Transportation Advisory Committee, TIP project sponsors, staffs of various federal and state agencies, and other interested parties. The notification via email is sent when Administrative Modifications have been made to the 2018-2021 TIP. If you wish to be removed from the TIP Notification List, please contact Mark Northrop at (303) 480-6771 or via e-mail at mnorthrop@drcog.org.

- Administrative Modifications represent minor changes to TIP projects not defined as “regionally significant changes” for air quality conformity findings, or per CDOT definition.

- Projects included through this set of Administrative Modifications are listed below. The attached describes the modifications.

PROJECTS TO BE MODIFIED

- **2007-078:** Region 1 Bridge On-System Pool
  - Adjust funding by year and update pool project names and funding amounts

- **2008-076:** Region 1 FASTER Pool
  - Add pool projects and funding

- **2008-077:** Region 4 FASTER Pool
  - Add pool project

- **2012-121:** Region 4 Non-Regionally Significant RPP Pool
  - Add pool project and funding
**2007-078:** Adjust funding by year and add funding. Reorganize/rename and adjust funding of pool projects

### Existing

**Title:** Region 1 Bridge On-System Pool  
**TIP-ID:** 2007-078  
**STIP-ID:** SR16712  
**Open to Public:**  
**Sponsor:** CDOT Region 1

#### Project Scope
The Bridge On-System Pool funds various bridge, culvert and wall projects throughout CDOT Region 1.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name (Cont)</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential Culvert Repairs</td>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>Essential Wall Repairs</td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilder Cleanout and Form Removal</td>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>Preventative Bridge Maintenance</td>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$3,266</td>
<td>Expansion Joint Replacement/Repair</td>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>Deck Rehab and Replacement includes overlays</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name (Cont)</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential Culvert Repairs</td>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>Preventative Bridge Maintenance</td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$3,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Wall Repairs</td>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$3,266</td>
<td>Joint Treatments</td>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Replacement</td>
<td>FY19</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>Deck Treatments</td>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>$6,838</td>
<td>Resurfacing/overlays</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY21</td>
<td>$11,461</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,461</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Federal (BR)                         | FY18                | $11,092       |                       | $11,092             | $0            |
| State                                | FY19                | $6,838        |                       | $6,838              | $0            |
| Local                                | FY20                | $11,461       |                       | $11,461             | $0            |
| Total                                | FY21                | $0            |                       | $0                  | $29,391       |
| **Total Funding**                    |                     |               |                       |                     |               |
2008-076: Add pool projects and funding

**Existing**

**Revised Pool Projects and Funding Table**
**Administrative Modifications – June 2017**

**2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program**

**2008-077**: Add pool project using unallocated balance

---

### Existing

**Title**: Region 4 FASTER Pool  
**TIP-ID**: 2008-077  
**STIP-ID**: SR46068  
**Cost (1,000s)**: $20,080

#### Project Scope

Pool contains safety-related improvements and upgrades based on the FASTER funding program (Colorado Senate Bill 108) in CDOT Region 4.

- **Affected County(ies)**: Boulder, Weld

#### Project Type: Safety  
**Sponsor**: CDOT Region 4

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-119</td>
<td>Safety Improvements Gilpin Cl to Boulder City Limits</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>SH-7</td>
<td>Safety Improvement (CDROG portion)</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11th St signals including bicycle</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Amounts in $1,000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong> (FASTER-S)</td>
<td>$14,924</td>
<td>$15,542</td>
<td>$16,075</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$6,037</td>
<td>$14,924</td>
<td>$15,542</td>
<td>$16,075</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$52,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revised Pool Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-119</td>
<td>Safety Improvements Gilpin Cl to Boulder City Limits</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>SH-119</td>
<td>11th St signals including bicycle</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-287</td>
<td>Peak Rd Intersection improvements</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong> (FASTER-S)</td>
<td>$14,924</td>
<td>$15,542</td>
<td>$16,075</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$6,037</td>
<td>$14,924</td>
<td>$15,542</td>
<td>$16,075</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$52,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2012-121: Add funding to pool project**

**Existing**

### Title: Region 4 Non-Regionally Significant RPP Pool

- **TIP-ID:** 2012-121
- **STIP-ID:**
- **Project Type:** Roadway Operational Improvements
- **Sponsor:** CDOT Region 4

**Project Scope**

Pool contains projects selected under the Non-Regionally Significant Regional Priority Program in CDOT Region 4 (DRCOG-TIP area only).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Start-At and End-At</th>
<th>Cost (1,000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-68: WCR 7 Intersection Imp</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>SH-7: Adaptive Signals</td>
<td>$1,147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-68: Lyons to I-25 Access and PEL</td>
<td>$2,187</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cherryvale Rd to N. 75th St</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Amounts in $1,000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (RPP)</td>
<td>$2,147</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$1,887</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$2,147</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$1,887</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revised Funding Table and Pool Projects

- **SH-68: WCR 7 Intersection Imp**
- **SH-7: Adaptive Signals - SH-287 to 28th St**

#### Amounts in $1,000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (RPP)</td>
<td>$2,447</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$1,887</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$2,447</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$1,887</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: TIP Notification List
From: Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations
Subject: July 2017 Administrative Modifications to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program
Date: July 19, 2017

SUMMARY

- Per the Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation covering the 2018-2021 TIP, administrative modifications are reviewed and processed by staff. They are emailed to the TIP Notification List, and posted on the DRCOG 2018-2021 TIP web page.

- The TIP Notification List includes the members of the DRCOG Regional Transportation Committee and Transportation Advisory Committee, TIP project sponsors, staffs of various federal and state agencies, and other interested parties. The notification via email is sent when Administrative Modifications have been made to the 2018-2021 TIP. If you wish to be removed from the TIP Notification List, please contact Mark Northrop at (303) 480-6771 or via e-mail at mnorthrop@drcog.org.

- Administrative Modifications represent minor changes to TIP projects not defined as “regionally significant changes” for air quality conformity findings, or per CDOT definition.

- The project included through this set of Administrative Modifications is listed below and was approved by the Board in August 2016. The attached describes the modification.

PROJECT TO BE MODIFIED

- **New Project:** Mobility Choice Blueprint
  - Add new project
**New Project:** Add new project

**Title:** Mobility Choice Blueprint

**Project Type:** Other

**Sponsor:** CDOT

**Project Scope**
Collaborative study effort between DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD to further understand the future of transportation technology and what is needed to prepare the region for its inevitable expansion.

The purpose is to maximize existing investments in the metro Denver transportation system by leveraging technology to meet future workforce mobility needs, resulting in enhanced economic opportunity and quality of life.

**Affected County(ies):**
Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP-M)</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (Planning)</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (RTD)</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0 $1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0 $1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DBJ partners with DRCOG to encourage businesses to participate in Bike to Work Day challenge

May 26, 2017, 12:53pm MDT

In just over a month, a lot of Denver commuters will put down their car keys and hop on a bicycle for the city's annual Bike to Work Day event.

The one-day event on June 28 encourages people to ride their bikes to work. Companies, nonprofits and government organizations set up stations along popular routes, offering food, water and giveaways.

Peter Roper, owner of the Denver Bicycle Café in City Park West, has organized a station for the last three years.

"Participating in Bike to Work Day as a station demonstrates our mission to provide high-quality bicycle service and encourage greater use of bicycles in Denver while we increase our interaction within our local community," Roper said.

This year, the Denver Business Journal is teaming up with the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) to encourage businesses to take part in the "Business Challenge."

The Business Challenge asks companies to compete against each other to get the greatest number of employees to bike on June 28. Results are calculated in real time on the Bike to Work Day website.

Chatham Financial, based in Littleton has participated in the event for three years running.

"Our office culture promotes health, well-being and making sure we do our part to take care of the environment, values that align with Bike to Work Day," said Jessica Schmidt, Chatham hedge account consultant.

The DBJ also does live coverage of Bike to Work Day. All day long, we'll post participant photos on our website shared with us on social media.
WeDriveU Salutes SendGrid on Denver’s Top Honor for Commuting Excellence

DRCOG Names SendGrid “Way to Go” Champion for Transforming Its Commute to Work

DENVER, May 18, 2017 (GLOBE NEWSWIRE) -- WeDriveU, Inc., the leader in corporate transportation solutions, is proud to announce SendGrid has been named the 2017 “Way to Go” Employer Champion for its employee shuttle program powered by WeDriveU.

Presented annually by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG), Way to Go Champions demonstrate leadership in promoting or advocating commute options other than driving alone. The program aims to reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality and enhance the health of Denver residents with commute options, including carpooling, vanpooling, transit, biking and walking.

“This award celebrates the innovative efforts and commitment to offering employee commute choices demonstrated by SendGrid and WeDriveU,” said Steve Erickson, Communications Director at DRCOG. “By offering this service, they’re not only making life better for commuters within their organization, but for the region as a whole.”

In 2016, SendGrid and WeDriveU launched Colorado’s first WiFi-enabled employer-sponsored Residential Bus Service. SendGrid’s shuttles connect employees in Boulder and Longmont with its new global headquarters at 1801 California Street in downtown Denver.

“SendGrid’s WiFi shuttle bus enables us to recruit from both Denver and Boulder in an innovative and productive way that is critical to our 4H culture of being happy, humble, hungry and honest,” says Scott Heimes, Chief Marketing Officer at SendGrid. “The buses allow our employees that live in Boulder and Longmont to continue working on the bus but get home in time to make it to school functions, spend time with their friends and families and unplug in the evening. We’ve seen employees engaging in both personal and professional conversations and having team and cross-functional meetings to discuss anything from 2017 planning to budget reviews.”

“WeDriveU is proud to partner with SendGrid on commute alternatives that alleviate parking demand, relieve traffic congestion and promote sustainability,” said Dennis Carlson, CEO, WeDriveU. “We join DRCOG in congratulating SendGrid on creating a thriving workplace for commuters that is making a positive impact throughout the region.”

For details or to view the list of winners, visit www.drcog.org and www.waytogo.org.

SendGrid is the leading delivery platform for customer communication that drives engagement and growth. Visit www.sendgrid.com.
About WeDriveU

WeDriveU is the leader in corporate transportation management with a vision to improve mobility. Founded in 1988, WeDriveU serves the world’s leading brands with Commute Alternative Solutions and Managed Solutions. www.wedriveu.com @WeDriveU

WeDriveU is a registered trademark of WeDriveU, Inc. Other marks are the property of their respective owners.
Proposals would make it easier — and safer — to walk, bike and drive to light rail stations in south Denver

University and Colorado light rail mobility study moves forward

By JOE VACCARELLI | jvaccarelli@denverpost.com | YourHub

May 11, 2017 at 1:22 pm

A plan to improve access to two light rail stations in south Denver could make it safer for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers to use the commuter trains and navigate their neighborhoods.

The proposal calls for more bike lanes and improved crosswalks near the University and Colorado Boulevard light rail stations. Funding for these improvements will be sought through this year’s general obligation bond.

Transportation Solutions, along with OV Consulting, Denver Public Works, Community Planning and Development and the University of Denver have studied the area between and around the two stations for a year. Their recommended improvements were presented to the community at a May 9 open house.

“There is clearly a desire to get to the station, there’s a lot of interest in not having to drive there,” Transportation Solutions executive director Stuart Anderson said.

A highlight of the University and Colorado Light Rail Station Mobility Study is a proposed transit plaza at the University Station that would eliminate the High Street entrance to the parking garage and provide an easy drop-off location. Currently, drivers must make an illegal turn if they wish to drop off a passenger without entering the garage.

Also proposed are improvements to key intersections — Buchtel and University boulevards and Buchtel and Colorado boulevards — and a two-way bike track between the two stations along Buchtel. Those intersections, along with Evans Avenue at both Colorado and University, are difficult to cross for pedestrians, and the proposed changes would increase safety features. The bike track is intended to create a safe and easy way for cyclists to access both stations.

“I love the vision for Buchtel and the vision for University Station. … I’m a kid in a candy store right now,” said Piep Van Hueven, Denver director for Bicycle Colorado. She’s also encouraged that DU contributed financially to improve access to the stations, which might encourage students to walk or bike and ride the light rail rather than drive around campus.

Transportation Solutions led the study, which primarily was funded by a $200,000 grant from the Denver Regional Council of Governments. DU chipped in about $15,000 toward a required match for the grant.
The city is funding some further design and the groups aim to get on the list for Denver’s General Obligation Bond that will go to voters in November. The groups hope to receive just under $9 million to complete the projects.

Several residents at the meeting said they want to see more parking at the Colorado Station, which attracts a lot of riders from the south who seek to pay a lesser fare into downtown. Anderson said the groups will look at alternatives to adding parking spaces such as subsidized ride-sharing services like Olli — a driverless shuttle bus that can run a route or pick up people at their home.

“I really think we’re going to find some creative things,” Anderson said.

Community input was key to the current proposals and University Park Community Council member Rosemary Stoffel said she was pleased her neighborhood was so involved. She echoed calls for improved street crossings in the neighborhood.

“We’re so excited,” she said. “We have wanted additional crosswalks for a very long time.”
Land market taking center stage at CREJ conferences

Land demand in the Denver area is off the charts.

“On activity, it probably is record as far as buyers of land,” said Mike Kboudi, a land broker with Cushman & Wakefield.

Competition is fierce.

“It is really hard to get a good piece of ground,” said Kboudi, who during the past five years has sold more than 3,000 acres in the metro area for more than $215 million.

Shown is the Denver Regional Council of Governments planning area. DRCOG will make a presentation at the upcoming commercial land conference sponsored by CREJ.

“There aren’t a lot of distressed pieces of ground out there.”

Developers, users and homebuilders are on the hunt for sites.

“On the home side, there are 15 builders competing for single-family lots,” said Kboudi, who will be one of the keynote speakers at the 2017 Residential Land Development Conference & Expo, sponsored by the Colorado Real Estate Journal.

More than 500 are expected to attend the half-day conference from 7:30 to 11 a.m May 24 at Hyatt Regency Aurora. It will be the largest conference of its kind in the Rocky Mountain region.

The residential land conference will be followed by the Commercial Land Development Conference & Expo, also sponsored by CREJ. The afternoon conference will run from 12:30 until 4:45 p.m.

In addition to builders, there is demand for land from all commercial real estate food groups.

“There are multiple buyers for office and industrial and retail, as well as hospitality and senior centers,” Kboudi said.

Even multifamily land is hot.

“Theoretically, that has slowed down” with fears of overbuilding, he said.

“But if you are out there, demand for multifamily ground doesn’t seem to be slowing down,” Kboudi said. “It seems like there is at least one warm body that wants to buy every apartment site out there.”

“I would say the hottest areas for land are Douglas County, the Boulder County corridor and DIA,” Kboudi said.

“Infill sites in Denver also remain hot,” he said.
The one area where demand has slowed down is for marijuana growhouses and distribution centers, he said.

“It is still a huge part of the economy,” but there is not as much growth in the grass business as before, he said.

If you are buying land, the one bright spot, sort of, is that land prices have not risen as much as other construction costs, such as labor and fees, he said.
See how Denver grew to have the second biggest Bike to Work Day

Megan Arellano

Posted on June 28, 2017 6:00 am

It’s here, the day when you can get pancakes just for riding your bike to work.

Of course, if you want the pancakes that will be in Skyline Park, courtesy of the Downtown Denver Partnership, you better get there fast. (You could also just go to one of the other 87 stations for refreshments.) The Denver Regional Council of Governments expects that roughly 30,000 people will participate in this year’s Bike to Work Day.

Let’s take a closer look at those Bike to Work Day numbers.

Data from DRCOG shows that the event grew pretty steadily from 2010 to 2015. But in 2015, the participation peaks.

Still, nearly 30,000 people is pretty good, and good enough to be the second biggest in the country, according to DRCOG. So how many more people do we have to get in order to be number one? Just 70,000 more.

That’s right, San Francisco will be pretty hard to beat for a while. This year, organizer counted “nearly 100,000 people.”

With 23 Bike to Work Days and counting, they’ve had lots of time to build it up. Still, DRCOG first started working on their event around the same part of the mid 1990s.

But whether you’re interested in unseating San Francisco or just using your bike, the numbers of Bike to Work Day are important. DRCOG uses participant registration data to gauge how much people care about bike commuting. Down the line, that impacts decisions on infrastructure projects like bike paths and bike lanes.

And maybe that’s a better goal than trying to unseat San Francisco. If DRCOG manages to add the 3,000 or so participants they’re aiming for, it’ll still be quite a climb to beat San Francisco at that pace. Still, it seems Denver’s event is poised for growth.

“Last year, 37 percent of riders were first-timers and 38 percent of all participants said they were motivated to continue cycling after the event,” said Steve Erickson, DRCOG Communications and Marketing Director.
After a successful Bike to Work Day there’s a question left to ask: How bikeable is Denver?

“We’re not at the top, but we are very close”

By DANIKA WORTHINGTON | dworthington@denverpost.com and ERIN DOUGLAS | edouglas@denverpost.com | The Denver Post
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Coming off a successful Bike to Work Day that saw at least 2,000 more cyclists than last year, it’s easy for Denver riders to pat themselves on the back.

But just how bikeable is the Mile High City?

Turns out that it’s not the best, but it’s not the worst. In fact, it’s pretty good.

“We’re not at the top, but we are very close and we are striving to get to the top,” Denver’s urban mobility manager Emily Snyder said. “There’s really nothing standing in our way as far as geography and climate.”

Preliminary estimates show that Bike to Work Day 2017 either reached or exceeded its pre-event prediction of 34,000 participants, Denver Regional Council of Governments spokesman Steve Erickson wrote in an email. Over the past five years, the event, sponsored by DRCOG, has grown 35 percent.

In several different rankings, Denver often lands in the top 10, if not the top five, for bikeability among similarly sized cities, Snyder said. In May, real estate brokerage Redfin ranked downtown Denver as the fourth most bikeable downtown in the country.

“(Biking to work) is one of the best things that has ever happened to me,” said Arno Vanzyl, an employee at Hard Rock Cafe downtown who started riding his bike to work every day about three months ago. He said it has saved him money and helped him meet new people. He’s also in better shape and in a better mood. “I’ve seen parts of Denver that I’ve never seen before. And I don’t miss the road rage.”

Roughly 6 to 7 percent of downtown employees commute on a bike, Snyder said. But citywide, the percentage drops to 3 percent. By comparison, 6 to 10 percent of people bike to work in Portland, Ore., one of the most bike-friendly U.S. cities.

Snyder said Portland started its bike push in the 1990s, giving it a leg up on Denver, which started just 10 years ago. The Mile High City was spurred into action ahead of hosting the 2008 Democratic National Convention. The city was also looking for a way to handle the increased number of people on the roads. It helped, too, that younger generations like to bike.

“We didn’t start as early in our bikeway network as some of these cities, so we’re catching up — and I think we’re catching up quickly,” Snyder said.
About 33 percent of Denver’s population say they will never get on a bike, Snyder said. Meanwhile, 7 percent are confident riding to work. About 60 percent say they’re in the middle — they’re interested in riding but would feel better if there was a greater sense of safety.

That’s not surprising: Safety, confidence and not wanting to sweat are some of the biggest reasons people say they don’t bike to work, she said. And they are fair concerns.

In 2016, four people died and 30 were seriously injured in bicycle crashes that involved automobiles, according to data from the Denver Police Department.

Denver resident Zack Smith said he has gone to the emergency room twice for bike crashes. As a motorist, he never noticed how much turn signals matter. But when on the bike, he has had to slam on brakes to avoid cars. In those instances, he’ll pound on a car’s window to draw attention. There are also some areas, such as the Highlands, that are just too hilly and too full of cars for him to bike.

“I was new to commuting, so I was pretty careless,” he said, referring to his two ER trips. “It taught me a lot about traffic laws that drivers don’t pay attention to. It’s up to everyone to be aware. I’ve seen drunk motorcyclists, distracted drivers, it’s just a recipe for disaster.”

One of the ways the city addresses safety is its creation of more protected bike lanes, which put physical barriers between bicyclists and drivers. The city takes on 15 to 20 miles of bike improvements a year, Snyder said.

Denver also is working to create safer neighborhood bikeways and improving wayfinding signage.

For people interested in riding a bike to work, Snyder had some advice: Plan your route, which won’t necessarily be the same way as you go by car. Have patience because it probably won’t go smoothly at first. And go slow, which takes care of the sweat problem.
Formerly homeless man given bike in DRCOG’s ramp up to Bike to Work Day

DRCOG partnered with non-profits, and bike shops to give bikes to four struggling people.
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Klint Spickelmier is well on the way to recovery from a hit-and-run accident that sent him into a spiral of opioid addiction and homelessness, and on Wednesday, he received a gift expects to help speed his return to stability: a bicycle.

“I think when I get back to that bike and get core strength back up, it’s going to be a little while and I can get back to full-time” work, he said.

The Denver Regional Council of Governments’ Way to Go Program gave Spickelmier and three other people bikes in a run up to Bike To Work Day on June 28.

The giveaways in Aurora, Boulder and Denver were part of an effort to draw attention to the statewide event that encourages commuters to leave their cars at home and bike for the day.

Spickelmier is currently working part-time as a laborer and living at the Comitis Crisis Center, in Aurora.

Comitis and three other non-profits identified the recipients for the bikes, and DRCOG surprised them with a $750 gift certificate to the cover the cost of the bike and accessories.

DRCOG provided $500, and the remainder comes from bike shops, Bicycle Village, Golden Bear Bikes, and Republic Cycles, DRCOG spokeswoman W. Celeste Davis Stragand said.

Spickelmier, 35, was hospitalized for 45 days after he was struck by a driver doing 45 mph. The accident left him with a broken hip, and back, punctured lung, extensive injury to his face, and other injuries.

Doctors prescribed “copious amounts of opiates,” he said.

He lost his job during the extended hospital stay and he became homeless.

He became chemically dependent. “My kids were fading from my life, my sanity was questionable at best, my addiction was raging out of control,” he said.

Last year, he checked into a rehab facility, and later was given shelter and support at Mile High Behavioral Healthcare Comitis.
Injured Construction Worker Surprised By Free Bicycle

June 21, 2017 5:08 PM

By Kathy Walsh

AURORA, Colo. (CBS4) – A construction worker, hit by hard times, was thrilled to get a brand new bicycle.

Klint Spickelmier of Aurora was one of four lucky people surprised with bikes by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG).

All four recipients have struggled. They were given the bikes by the “Way to Go” program in partnership with a nonprofit. A set of wheels will help Spickelmier rebuild from rock bottom.

“Klint, how’s it going? Come on over here,” said “Biker,” a “Way to Go” ambassador sporting a cape and a mask.

Spickelmier was shocked to see “Biker” and another caped crusader wheeling a shiny new bike with his name on it.

“Are you guys serious?” a shaking Spickelmier said.

The bike was free, courtesy of DRCOG and the Comitis Crisis Center where Spickelmier lives.

“I’m getting back on my feet and this is right on time,” he said.

It’s been a year and a half since Spickelmier was knocked off his feet. The skilled construction worker was struck by a car at a busy intersection in Aurora.

“Broke my back, broke my hip, shattered my wrist, plastic surgery on my face,” he told CBS4 Health Specialist Kathy Walsh.

He spent three months in the hospital and got hooked on painkillers.

“It transferred over into alcohol and problems like that and it led to homelessness,” he explained.

That brought Spickelmier to the Comitis shelter and sobriety. Now, he’s working day labor. “This is awesome. It saves me from the bus hassle, it saves me from the gas thing and I get healthy doing it,” he said.

The ambassadors dropped off the bike just a week before “Bike to Work Day” on June 28.

“You guys are truly a blessing in disguise, literally,” he laughed.

Spickelmier is already comfortable on his new wheels. He is thankful for the lucky break, a free ride to help him rebuild.
Colorado Bike To Work Day Draws 2nd Largest Crowd In The Nation

June 27, 2017 7:47 PM

DENVER (CBS4) – Bike to Work Day is a free regional event that encourages commuters to ride to work on two-wheels. People from all nine counties of the Denver Metro area will get on their bikes to get to work. It stretches from Boulder to Castle Rock, from Golden to Aurora.

“It’s purpose is to introduce bike commuting as an alternative for folks in the region. And what we’ve seen is that 40-percent of people who participate in Bike to Work Day actually use biking as a commute moving forward,” said Celeste Davis Stragand, Regional TDM Program & Marketing Manager, for the Denver Regional Council of Governments.

Colorado hosts the second biggest Bike to Work Day in the nation. As many as 32,000 commuters will hit the road on their bikes on June 28. The day is designed to make it easy for people to map their route and to have access to breakfast and beverages along the way.

“We see about 40-percent of all new participants being new to biking. So they’re in, what the League of American Bicyclists call, the ‘interested by concerned.’ Maybe they’ve never done it before but they’re excited about it,” Davis Stragand told CBS4.

Bike to Work Day is organized by Way to Go, a regional program and partnership between the Denver Regional Council of Governments and seven transportation management associations. This year, they’ve identified some bike routes that will make it easy and safe to get into downtown.

“We have active bike corridors this year, which are new and different. And so it’s on street cycling from five different areas of the region, so two from the east, two from the west, and one from the south, that will bring you into the downtown area. So we’ve, kind of, taken the work out of it for you and mapped it,” Davis Stragand said.

Bike to Work Day is also fully supported, with rest stops located all over the Denver Metro Area.

“Along the way, when you cycle in, we have about 260 breakfast stations throughout the region, that have everything from food and fun, to bike mechanics to entertainment, from the 6:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. period,” Davis Stragand explained.

Organizers have grouped some of the stations together along the active bike corridors to make them easier to access. There will also be some bike parties going on during the ride home.

“Civic Center Park is a cluster station, what we call it, or a party station, where you’ll have probably like 20 booths in one location. Or you can go to the Denver Museum of Nature and Science and the Zoo, which is a new station location for us, and there will be 5 to 8 locations,” Davis Stragand said.

Way to Go helps people plan alternative commutes to reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, and enhance the health of residents in the Denver Metro Region.

“We’re ideally looking for that commuter, that person who is normally driving alone and is interested in maybe trying something else out. The benefits of doing something like cycling to work would be that it’s
not only healthier for you, it’s less stressful, it’s easier on your wallet, and it’s way more fun,” Davis Stragand said.

On average, bikers commute about 9 miles each way to work. A trip that takes about 30 to 40 minutes on a bike.

“We’re the second largest Bike to Work Day in the nation, which is very exciting, and we normally have around 30,000 people participate in Bike to Work Day. Our goal this year is 34,000 to 35,000 people,” Davis Stragand explained.

If you participate in Bike to Work Day, it’s important that you register your ride.

“Registering allows us to tell a story. As the Regional Council of Governments, we’re able to kind of aggregate all of this information so that advocacy groups and others in the future then have all of this data to understand how important cycling is, when it comes to building infrastructure and building bike facilities in the region,” said Davis Stragand.

Registration is easy and doesn’t require you to provide any personal information.

“Registration is free and actually quite easy, just go to biketoworkday.us. The only information that we gather, that is personal if you will, is we ask for your starting zip code and your ending zip code, and the approximate number of miles that get you from point-a to point-b,” explained Davis Stragand.

The theme of this year’s Bike to Work Day is “Bike Today for a Better Tomorrow,” in a nod to the health and environment benefits from biking to work. Organizers are hoping to draw more businesses into the mix through an online challenge designed just for them.

“We have a business challenge, and last year, we had over 800 businesses participate. And what that is is basically within the industry, within the region, it allows each of the businesses to roll up their sleeves and compete amongst one another to see who can get the most riders within their organization,” Davis Stragand told CBS4.

Bike to Work Day is Wednesday, June 28th 2017, organized by the Denver Regional Council of Governments’ Way to Go program.