AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY, July 15, 2020
6:30 – 8:20 p.m.
VIDEO/WEB CONFERENCE
Denver, CO

1. 6:30 Call to Order

2. Roll Call and Introduction of New Members and Alternates

3. Move to Approve Agenda

4. 6:35 Report of the Chair
   • Report on Performance and Engagement Committee
   • Report on Finance and Budget Committee

5. 6:40 Report of the Executive Director

6. 6:45 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

7.  7:00  Move to Approve Consent Agenda
    i.  Minutes of June 17, 2020
        (Attachment A)

ACTION ITEMS

8.  7:05  Discussion on a technical amendment to the 2040 Metro Vision Regional
        Transportation Plan (2040 MVRTP)
        (Attachment B) Jacob Riger, Manager, Transportation Planning and Operations

9.  7:15  Discussion of the project solicitation and evaluation process for the 2050 Metro
        Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2050 MVRTP)
        (Attachment C) Jacob Riger, Manager, Transportation Planning and Operations

INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS

10. 7:35  COVID-19 Impacts to the DRCOG Ombudsman program
        (Attachment D) Shannon Gimbel, Ombudsman Manager, Area Agency on Aging

11. 7:50  2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program COVID-19 Impacts
        (Attachment E) Ron Papsdorf, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations

12. 8:10  Committee Reports
        The Chair requests these reports be brief, reflect decisions made and
        information germane to the business of DRCOG
        A.  Report from State Transportation Advisory Committee – Elise Jones
        B.  Report from Metro Mayors Caucus – Herb Atchison
        C.  Report from Metro Area County Commissioners – Roger Partridge
        D.  Report from Advisory Committee on Aging – Jayla Sanchez-Warren
        E.  Report from Regional Air Quality Council – Doug Rex
        F.  Report from E-470 Authority – George Teal
        G.  Report from CDOT – Rebecca White
        H.  Report on FasTracks – Bill Van Meter

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

13. Next Meeting – August 19, 2020

14. Other Matters by Members

15. 8:20  Adjourn
# CALENDAR OF FUTURE MEETINGS

## July 2020

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

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

## August 2020

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

## September 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee/Session</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Board Work Session</td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Performance and Engagement Committee</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Committee</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Finance and Budget Committee</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>6:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Advisory Committee on Aging</td>
<td>Noon – 3 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY, June 17, 2020

Members/Alternates Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Diak</td>
<td>Town of Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Henry</td>
<td>Adams County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Baker</td>
<td>Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Coffman</td>
<td>City of Aurora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise Jones</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Brockett</td>
<td>City of Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margo Ramsden</td>
<td>Town of Bow Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Cushing</td>
<td>City of Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Lindstedt</td>
<td>City and County of Broomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Hudson</td>
<td>City of Castle Pines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Teal</td>
<td>Town of Castle Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Mauer</td>
<td>City of Centennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Weil</td>
<td>City of Cherry Hills Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Frank</td>
<td>City of Commerce City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Wittman</td>
<td>City of Dacono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Williams</td>
<td>City and County of Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Flynn</td>
<td>City and County of Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Partridge</td>
<td>Douglas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Conklin</td>
<td>City of Edgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Gippe</td>
<td>City of Erie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Olson</td>
<td>City of Englewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josie Cockrell</td>
<td>Town of Foxfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette Kelsey</td>
<td>Town of Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Binkley</td>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Dale</td>
<td>City of Golden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Lantz</td>
<td>City of Greenwood Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby Szabo</td>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Grove (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Littleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Walton</td>
<td>City of Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Strock</td>
<td>Town of Lochbuie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynne Shaw</td>
<td>City of Lone Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Peck</td>
<td>City of Longmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Stolzmann</td>
<td>City of Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Whitlow (Alternate)</td>
<td>Town of Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Daigle</td>
<td>City of Sheridan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandie Hammerly</td>
<td>Town of Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Sandgren</td>
<td>City of Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bud Starker</td>
<td>City of Wheat Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca White</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Van Meter</td>
<td>Regional Transportation District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others Present: Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, Melinda Stevens, Division Assistant, DRCOG; Chris Chovan, Steve O'Dorisio, Adams County; Bryan Weimer,
Chair John Diak called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with a quorum present.

Move to approve agenda

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

Public Hearing

Jacob Riger, Manager, provided background information on the proposed technical amendment to the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2040 MVRTP). Any public comments received before the Board meeting were provided to the directors.

Directors Jones wanted to comment that Boulder County did submit comments before the Board meeting and specified that the comments were directed more towards the Air Quality Conformity portion, regarding the increase in vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and not towards the actual project itself.

Chair Diak closed the public hearing at 6:45 p.m.

Report of the Chair

Chair Diak reported he provided public comment to the Transportation Committee in support of the Urban Arterial Multimodal Safety Improvements program. The Chair also provided opening statements for the Certification review and believes it will be a successful review.

- Director Flynn reported the Performance and Engagement Committee met on June 3rd and discussed the following:
  - The election of Herb Atchison as vice chair of the committee.
  - There was an authorization of the Collaboration Assessment for the DRCOG Board of Directors.
  - The committee was given multiple options on how to move forward with the Vision Awards. After narrowing their decision down to two options, the committee asked that DRCOG staff come back with pros and cons of both scenarios for further discussion.
  - How and when the Board Workshop will take place.

- Director Conklin reported the Finance and Budget Committee met and approved seven resolutions approving the Executive Director to:
  - negotiate and execute contracts with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) to carry out FY2020 and FY2021 Regional TDM Program activities as identified in the adopted 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program in an amount not to exceed $4.4 million.
enter into contracts with approved service providers in the amount of $450,000 for the AAA transportation voucher program and $400,000 for the AAA in-home voucher program for the period of July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021.

- reassign Human Service Transportation set-aside grant agreements previously awarded to Seniors’ Resource Center in the amount of approximately $300,000 to Via Mobility Services.

- negotiate and execute a contract with Via Mobility Services for up to $1,200,000 for the period of July 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020.

- negotiate and execute a contract with the Toole Design Group, LLC in an amount not to exceed $150,000 to develop a regional Complete Streets Toolkit.

- negotiate and execute a contract with the Regional Transportation District (RTD) to reimburse RTD for certain Reimagine RTD tasks in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) using Consolidated Planning Grant funds in the amount of $144,883.

- negotiate and execute a revenue agreement with the Regional Transportation District (RTD) to house, staff and facilitate the RTD accountability committee in an amount up to $200,000 per year.

Report of the Executive Director

- **COVID-19 update**: mandatory telework for DRCOG staff was extended to July 12th. Senior staff members are currently working on a safe workplace transition plan.

- Executive Director Rex wanted to expand on a few items that were discussed at the Finance and Budget Committee:
  - RTD accountability committee: due to COVID-19 and SB-151 being postponed indefinitely, RTD, House and Transportation chairs and Governor Polis have worked to create the accountability committee outside of the bill.
  - Transfer of transportation services from SRC to Via Mobility: Seniors’ Resource Center ceased transportation services July 1st. DRCOG’s TPO and AAA staff in collaboration with regional partners have worked very hard to try and find a replacement for these services and staff are pleased to have Via Mobility as a partner in taking over these services for our older population.

- **DRCOG’s WayToGo team** have created and supported a new program called Telework Tomorrow, which is promoting teleworking for businesses during and after the pandemic when it is safe to return to shared office spaces.
  - Telework Tomorrow has been promoted as part of Governor Polis’ new initiative, *Can Do Colorado*, to help businesses safely re-open.

- **The next Metro Vision Idea Exchange** is on June 24th and will highlight results from a recent survey related to supporting teleworking.

- **2050 Small Area Forecast** - DRCOG’s RPD team received about 600 individual comments from local planning staff regarding regional household and employment growth assumptions. Staff is in the process of addressing these comments.

- Director Atchison celebrated his 53rd wedding anniversary with his wife Erica. Executive Director wanted to congratulate them on their celebration.
Public comment
Randle Loeb commented that the homeless population is expected to increase dramatically due to the rise in unemployment rates, and the region should begin focusing on how to assist this population. Mr. Loeb requested the Board work on strategies for housing and improving quality of life for all citizens, including essential workers, police, and public servants.

Move to approve consent agenda

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

Items on the consent agenda included:
- Summary of the May 20, 2020 meeting
- Discussion on the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments

Briefing on Legislative Updates
Rich Mauro, Senior Policy and Legislative Analyst, along with Ed Bowditch and Jennifer Cassell presented a summary of the 2020 legislative session. The Colorado General Assembly ended the 2020 legislative session on June 12, after a two-month hiatus due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The most significant subjects of legislation for DRCOG during the legislative session were:
  - Older Adults
    - SB 20-030 (medical exemptions from tiered electricity rates) – passed
    - SB 20-033 (expanding Medicaid Buy-in program to ages 65 and over) – passed
    - SB 20-022 (student loan forgiveness program for geriatric advance practice nurses and physician assistants) - postponed
  - Transportation
    - SB 20-017 (enhanced reporting for High Performance Transportation Enterprise) – passed
    - SB 20-061 (new traffic offense for failing to yield to a bicycle in a bike lane) – passed
    - SB 20-044 (directing ten percent of sales and use tax revenues) – failed
    - SB 20-067 (changes specific ownership tax from MSRP to actual purchase price) – failed
    - HB 20-1151 (a process for expanding authority of a metropolitan planning organization) – postponed indefinitely
  - Housing
    - HB 20-1009 (requiring a court to suppress court eviction records if the eviction is not granted) – passed
    - HB 20-1196 (amendments to the Mobile Home Park Act) – passed
    - HB 20-1201 (providing an opportunity for mobile homeowners to purchase a mobile home park) – passed
    - HB 20-1141 (restrictions on fees landlords can charge) – postponed indefinitely
Briefing on the status of RTD FasTracks projects
Bill Van Meter, AGM for RTD, presented the status of projects to directors. The DRCOG Board adopted Resolution No. 14 in September 2013, which modified DRCOG’s annual review process for FasTracks. The resolution requires RTD to provide a FasTracks annual status report to DRCOG by May 1 of each year. This year’s report was more comprehensive due to the many challenges RTD is facing including COVID-19, a significant budget shortfall, and driver shortages. Mr. Van Meter summarized the report for the DRCOG Board.

Director Flynn wanted to know how long RTD anticipates restrictions to be enforced, regarding mandatory face masks, limited capacity on buses/rails, and limited bus routes. Mr. Van Meter stated that RTD does not currently have a good understanding of how long public health organizations will enforce these restrictions, but RTD plans to proceed based on their direction.

Committee Reports
State Transportation Advisory Committee – Director Partridge reported they met, and action was taken to approve use of toll credits for local match on federally funded projects. Regarding the Multimodal Options Fund, 10 million dollars was diverted from state’s allocation to the general fund. DRCOG’s allocation will not be affected as a result of this action.

Metro Mayors Caucus – Director Starker reported they have been meeting weekly, focusing on opening strategies due to COVID-19. They also had a productive discussion on SB-217.

Metro Area County Commissioners – Director Partridge stated that they did not meet.

Advisory Committee on Aging – Jayla Sanchez-Warren reported that the committee met and discussed all the items that were presented to the Finance and Budget Committee and the legislative issues presented by Rich Mauro earlier in the meeting. ACA also announced their new Chair, Kathy Noon, and vice chair, Karie Erickson.

Regional Air Quality Council – Doug Rex reported that they received a briefing on the 2020 State Implementation Plan (SIP) modeling, a presentation on this year’s marketing campaign “simple steps, better air,” and an update on the ozone season.

E-470 Authority – Director Teal stated that the Board met on June 11. There were two maintenance agreements, an approval of a feasibility study for the Sable Interchange (the request was submitted by the city of Brighton), and a presentation for the E-470 master plan for 2020, which was approved.

Report from CDOT – Director White reported their focus has been on their partnership with DRCOG for the Urban Arterial Multimodal Safety Improvements program, which the Transportation Commission approved recently to move forward. Also, their partnership with Gov. Polis on the Can Do Colorado initiative, which included an announcement of a $4 million rolling grant to help surrounding communities recover from COVID-19 impacts.

Report on FasTracks – Director Van Meter did not provide an additional report.

Next meeting – July 15, 2020

Other matters by members
Director Daigle wanted to personally thank RTD, DRCOG, and all directors for their continued work to get through this current crisis.

Executive Director Rex wanted to let everyone know that there would be a July 1 Board Work Session.

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

_______________________________________
John Diak, Chair
Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

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

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

Meeting Date | Agenda Category | Agenda Item #
--- | --- | ---
July 15, 2020 | Action | 8

SUBJECT
Draft amended 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2040 MVRTP) and associated air quality conformity determination documents.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends approval of the amended 2040 MVRTP and associated air quality conformity determination documents.

ACTION BY OTHERS
- June 22, 2020 – TAC Recommended Approval
- July 14, 2020 – RTC will make a recommendation

SUMMARY
Since DRCOG is preparing the 2050 MVRTP, staff was not planning to conduct another amendment cycle for the adopted 2040 MVRTP. However, during routine coordination with the E-470 Public Highway Authority, both agencies identified the need for a technical amendment to update the completion timeframe for an E-470 project within the 2040 MVRTP. The project in question is the widening of E-470 from four to six lanes between East Quincy Avenue and I-70 (Attachment 1). To comply with federal air quality conformity requirements, the completion timeframe (air quality staging period) for the project needs to be updated in the 2040 MVRTP from the 2030-2040 staging period to the 2020-2029 staging period as the project is now anticipated to open by early 2021.

The proposed technical amendment includes the following documents:
- Amendment summary document
- Denver southern subarea 8-hour ozone conformity determination
- CO and PM10 conformity determination

The proposed amendment was the subject of a June 17th public hearing. Comments were received from Boulder County during the public hearing and the preceding 30-day public comment period. These comments, along with DRCOG staff responses, are documented in Attachment 2.

Finally, per federal transportation planning requirements, DRCOG must show that the amended 2040 MVRTP will not cause a violation of federal air quality conformity standards. Accordingly, the 2040 MVRTP’s roadway network was modeled for air quality conformity. The results were used by the state Air Pollution Control Division to calculate pollutant emissions. All pollutant emission tests were passed, as shown in the air quality conformity documents linked above.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
- May 20, 2020 BOD Meeting – Briefing on proposed technical amendment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED MOTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Move to approve the amended 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan and associated DRCOG CO and PM-10 Conformity Determination, and the Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTACHMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Proposed amendment location and description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public comments received and staff responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draft Resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at <a href="mailto:drex@drcog.org">drex@drcog.org</a> or (303) 480-6701; or Jacob Riger, Manager, Long Range Transportation Planning, at 303-480-6751 or <a href="mailto:jriger@drcog.org">jriger@drcog.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed amendment is to change project staging period from 2030-2040 to 2020-2029
In response to DRCOG’s request for comments on the proposed amendment to the DRCOG 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (MVRTP), Boulder County submitted the following:

- While Boulder County does not oppose the specific E-470 project that is the subject of this proposed amendment, this air quality conformity information raises serious questions about the required air quality conformity modeling methodology and how well it does - or doesn’t - align with broader DRCOG MVRTP goals.

  **Response:** The air quality modeling process itself does not consider the specific category of designation for an area. The air quality modeling estimates regional mobile source emissions that are compared to the emissions budgets set in the current State Implementation Plan (SIP). The Denver Metro/North Front Range Nonattainment area’s reclassification from a Moderate nonattainment to Serious nonattainment triggers the development of a new State Implementation Plan (SIP), currently underway at the Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC). As part of that process, DRCOG will receive new, lower Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets for use in future air quality conformity determinations after the new SIP is adopted.

- Are there factors in the air quality modeling methodology that favor multimodal infrastructure investment, including managed express/HOV lanes more so than adding more general purpose lanes?

  **Response:** The modeling effort looks at the entire transportation system network as a whole for future staging years, which includes dozens of future projects and services. The regional travel model results generate the regional inputs to the air quality model used to determine regional emissions. Air quality conformity modeling is done for the entire MVRTP, and produces regionwide results of mobile source emissions.

- Trying to improve air quality by building wider and wider roads is not a realistic long-term strategy as demonstrated throughout the Denver metro and Front Range communities and by other US metropolitan regions (Los Angeles, Phoenix, etc.). This continual road widening approach to improve air quality is similar to trying to lose weight by buying bigger pants.

  **Response:** Comment noted.

- In addition, we are curious how the MVRTP air quality conformity modeling process evaluate infrastructure investments in alignment with Colorado’s greenhouse gas reduction targets and climate goals as outlined in HB19-1261:
  - Colorado shall have statewide goals to reduce 2025 greenhouse gas emissions by at least 26%, 2030 greenhouse gas emissions by at least 50%, and 2050 greenhouse gas
emissions by at least 90% of the levels of statewide greenhouse gas emissions that existed in 2005.

Response: The air quality conformity modeling process, as legally defined by the US EPA, does not evaluate specific individual infrastructure or service investments or strategies. Air quality conformity modeling for the MVRTP is federally required to use the Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets (MVEBs) contained in the most current SIP. That said, DRCOG has Metro Vision objectives and targets for reducing GHG emissions that are part of the 2050 MVRTP planning process.

- If the current federal, state, and regional air quality conformity modeling requirements are not designed to measure how well projects align with more recent MVRTP air quality and climate goals, then modified methodologies should be considered as part of the DRCOG 2050 MVRTP update process to ensure that future transportation investments work in concert with the broader MVRTP goals and support Colorado’s critical environmental and public health goals.

Note: During the public hearing, Director Elise Jones of Boulder County provided commentary very similar to this point.

Response: A foundational principle for DRCOG’s 2050 MVRTP planning process that DRCOG has consistently communicated to stakeholders and the public is that, since the region is not yet on track to reach the Metro Vision Plan targets for GHG reduction, non-SOV mode share increase, VMT/capita, safety and other targets, the 2050 MVRTP will identify multimodal investment priorities which help the region achieve the vision Metro Vision articulates for the region.
DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
STATE OF COLORADO  

BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
RESOLUTION NO. __________, 2020

A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE 2040 METRO VISION REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AS AMENDED, AND THE ASSOCIATED DRCOG CO AND PM-10 CONFORMITY DETERMINATION AND THE DENVER SOUTHERN SUBAREA 8-HOUR OZONE CONFORMITY DETERMINATION, CONCURRENTLY.

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

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

WHEREAS, the Denver Regional Council of Governments periodically amends and updates its Regional Transportation Plan; and

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

WHEREAS, the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan, including the 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan, was amended by the Denver Regional Council of Governments in cooperation with the Regional Transportation District and the Colorado Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the amended 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan identifies fiscally constrained air quality regionally significant highway capacity and rapid transit projects that can reasonably be provided over a 20-year time horizon; and

WHEREAS, the financial plan of the amended 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan meets fiscal constraint based on a reasonable estimate of funds available from 2016 to 2040; and

WHEREAS, an air quality analysis of the amended 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan has been prepared consistent with the requirements of the Clean Air Act as amended, and regulations promulgated by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, which indicates that the 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan conforms to the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality; and
WHEREAS, a public hearing before the Denver Regional Council of Governments was held on June 17, 2020 and comments received on the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan were addressed; and

WHEREAS, the Transportation Advisory Committee and the Regional Transportation Committee have recommended that the Board of Directors adopt the amended 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan and associated air quality conformity determinations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, pursuant to its Articles of Association, and the authority granted under sections 30-28-106 and 43-1-1101 through 1105 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Denver Region, the Denver Regional Council of Governments hereby adopts the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan as amended. This amended plan supersedes any Regional Transportation Plan previously adopted by the Denver Regional Council of Governments.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Denver Regional Council of Governments, and as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, hereby determines that the 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan conforms to the applicable implementation plans approved or promulgated under the Clean Air Act, as amended, by virtue of the demonstrations incorporated in the associated DRCOG CO and PM-10 Conformity Determination and the Denver Southern Subarea 8-Hour Ozone Conformity Determination, concurrently.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chair of the Denver Regional Council of Governments is hereby authorized to certify copies of the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan to all counties and municipalities lying wholly or partly in the Denver region.

RESOLVED, PASSED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of __________________, 2020 at Denver, Colorado.

__________________________________________
John Diak, Chair
Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

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

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

SUBJECT
Consideration of the project solicitation and evaluation process for developing the 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2050 MVRTP)

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends approval of the proposed 2050 MVRTP candidate project solicitation and evaluation process and criteria documented in Attachments 1 and 2.

ACTION BY OTHERS
June 22, 2020 – TAC Recommended Approval
July 14, 2020 – RTC will make a recommendation

SUMMARY
Background
As the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Denver region, DRCOG is charged under federal regulations with leading a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3C) multimodal transportation planning process for the Denver region, including developing a long-range transportation plan, in cooperation with the State and public transportation operators. Further, DRCOG’s Transportation Planning in the Denver Region document specifies the roles of each of the partner agencies (DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD) in developing the MVRTP (Exhibit 7). Finally, DRCOG also has a federally required Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Transportation Planning and Programming with CDOT and RTD that further specifies how the three partner agencies work together. Accordingly, DRCOG staff has proposed a planning process for developing the 2050 MVRTP that addresses DRCOG’s federal requirements to lead the region’s multimodal transportation planning process while respecting the close collaboration with CDOT, RTD, and local governments.

Investment Priorities Framework
One of the most important concepts in developing the 2050 MVRTP is the “Policy Framework and Desired Outcomes” in Attachment 1. This framework is comprised of the various major plans, priorities and studies identified by DRCOG, CDOT, RTD, and local governments. Together, this framework represents the region’s major multimodal transportation vision, needs, and priorities. This framework informed the development of the 2050 transportation and land use scenarios and is also proposed to inform the identification of regional investment priorities to develop the 2050 MVRTP.

Major Projects to Solicit
Regional investment priorities are expressed in the RTP in several ways: as specific projects, project categories, financial plan investment allocations, narrative content, etc.

In soliciting priorities, DRCOG staff is seeking specific projects to evaluate for inclusion in the 2050 Fiscally Constrained RTP. The specific projects/project types in question include:
• The air quality regionally significant roadway capacity, interchange, and fixed guideway transit projects that are federally required to be identified in the 2050 MVRTP.

• Other major multimodal investment priority projects consistent with the local, regional, and state plans and studies contained in the Policy Framework and Desired Outcomes.

As noted, there are many important priorities, such as maintenance, traffic operations, local bus service, smaller-scale priorities, and others that do not lend themselves to identification as specific “projects,” but will be included in the 2050 MVRTP in the other ways described above (project categories, financial plan investment allocations, narrative content, etc.).

Additionally, what about projects currently contained in the 2040 FCRTP? DRCOG staff proposes the following steps to address these projects:

• Projects that have been completed or will be completed by the end of 2020 are no longer by definition part of the MVRTP.
• Projects under construction for completion beyond 2020 will be included in the 2050 FCRTP.
• Projects that have completed or are in the federal project development (NEPA) process will be included in the 2050 FCRTP.
• Projects funded for NEPA and/or construction in the 2020-2023 TIP will be included in the 2050 FCRTP.
• Projects that have or are planning to conduct PEL, corridor planning, or other pre-NEPA activities are eligible to compete through the solicitation described above for inclusion in the 2050 FCRTP.
• Projects for which no activities have yet occurred are also eligible to compete for inclusion in the 2050 FCRTP.
• Locally funded projects within the 2040 FCRTP meeting the above guidelines are also eligible to compete for inclusion in the 2050 FCRTP.

Process to Solicit Regional Investment Priorities
DRCOG staff proposes to solicit major projects using the “dual-track” process described below. This process was developed to address CDOT’s feedback about its role in this process and to be consistent with the “3C” planning process described above. The proposed solicitation process has two parallel tracks:

• County transportation forums: DRCOG will solicit investment priority projects through each forum. The number of proposed candidate projects each forum can submit will be based on each county’s share of regional population, employment, and VMT as was done for the 2020-23 TIP (shown in Attachment 3).
• Inter-Agency Coordination Process: DRCOG, CDOT and RTD will develop draft regional investment priorities through a series of workshops based on the Policy Framework and Desired Outcomes in Attachment 1.

Evaluation of Regional Investment Priorities
DRCOG staff proposes to qualitatively evaluate major projects using the Metro Vision Plan transportation-related primary objectives and federally required FAST Act
performance measures. Attachment 2 provides draft proposed content for a project solicitation form.

Candidate projects will be evaluated via a committee comprised of DRCOG, CDOT, RTD, and a staff representative from each county transportation forum. The Inter-Agency Coordination Process will review those outcomes, along with the Draft Financial Plan and the broader Policy Framework and Desired Outcomes to develop draft program and project investment priorities. The draft will be reviewed through DRCOG’s committees and Board to develop final draft investment priorities for the 2050 Fiscally Constrained RTP. This process is illustrated in Attachments 1 and 3.

Conclusion
DRCOG staff will summarize these concepts at the July 15th Board or Directors meeting.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
BOD – November 20, 2019
December 18, 2019

PROPOSED MOTION
Move to approve the proposed 2050 MVRTP candidate project solicitation and evaluation process and criteria documented in Attachments 1 and 2.

ATTACHMENTS
- DRCOG 2050 Fiscally Constrained RTP Draft Investment Priorities Process
- Draft content for solicitation of 2050 MVRTP major investment priority candidate projects
- Staff presentation

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at drex@drcog.org or (303) 480-6701; or Jacob Riger, Manager, Long Range Transportation Planning, at 303-480-6751 or jriger@drcog.org
**Policy Framework and Desired Outcomes (“Vision & Needs”)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY FRAMEWORK AND DESIRED OUTCOMES</th>
<th>REGIONAL</th>
<th>RTD</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>FEDERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro Vision Plan</td>
<td>FasTracks</td>
<td>Statewide Plan</td>
<td>FAST Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 RTP &amp; Coord. Transit Plan</td>
<td>Regional BRT Study</td>
<td>10-Year Strategic Projects</td>
<td>Planning Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Asset Management Plans/Priorities</td>
<td>Strategic Transportation Safety Plan</td>
<td>National Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Freight Plan</td>
<td>Reimagine RTD</td>
<td>Express Lanes</td>
<td>Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vision Zero Plan</td>
<td>Asset Management Plans/Priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Choice Blueprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Choice Blueprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenarios Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vision & Needs**

- Metro Vision Plan
- 2040 MV RTP
- 2020-23 TIP
- Active Transportation Plan
- Regional Freight Plan
- Regional Vision Zero Plan
- Mobility Choice Blueprint
- Coordinated Transit Plan
- Congestion Management Process
- Regional ITS Architecture
- Scenarios Analysis
  - Transportation plans
  - Comprehensive plans
  - Subareas/District plans

**USDOT**

- FAST Act
- Planning Factors
- National Goals
- Performance Measures

**CDOT**

- Statewide Plan
- 4-P Process
- 10-Year Strategic Projects
- Strategic Transportation Safety Plan
- Express Lanes Master Plan
- Asset Management Plans/Priorities

**RTD**

- FasTracks
- Regional BRT Study
- Asset Management Plans/Priorities
- Reimagine RTD
DRCO 2050 FCRTP Investments Priorities Process – DRAFT

**Subregional Forum Process**
- Solicit Investment Priorities through county transportation forums
- Non-interstate projects, except NEW interchange proposals
- Number of projects varies by TIP share (5-25 per subregion)

**Inter-Agency Coordination Process**
- DRCOG, RTD, CDOT Work Sessions
- Review Policy Framework and Desired Outcomes
- Review CDOT 10-Year Strategic Projects
- Review RTD FasTracks & other plans
- Draft Regional Investment Priorities

**Financial Plan**
- Demonstrates how the plan can be implemented
- Indicates resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be available
- MPO, transit operator and State cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available

**Evaluation Process**
(DRCOG, CDOT, RTD, Subregional Forum representatives)

**DRAFT Program & Project Investment Priorities**
(Inter-Agency Coordination)

**TAC, RTC, Board Work Sessions**

**FINAL DRAFT Investment Priorities**

**DRAFT Financial Plan**

---

**Notes:**
- Subregional Forum process includes solicitation of investment priorities through county transportation forums.
- Inter-Agency Coordination involves DRCOG, RTD, and CDOT work sessions focused on policy framework, CDOT's 10-Year Strategic Projects, RTD's FasTracks, and other plans.
- Financial Plan outlines how the plan can be implemented, indicating resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be available, developed cooperatively by MPO, transit operator, and State.

---

**Additional Information:**
- The process involves multiple stages, from solicitation to final priorities, ensuring comprehensive evaluation and coordination across agencies and forums.
2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan

DRAFT Content for Solicitation of Candidate Investment Priority Projects – June 16, 2020

- Project Sponsor (jurisdiction and contact person)
- Proposed Project Name & Location (start and end points)
- Brief Project Description:
- Estimated Total Project Cost (FY 2020 $)
- Proposed Project Implementation Timeframe:
  - 2020-2029
  - 2030-2039
  - 2040-2044
  - 2045-2050
- Why is this project a priority for your jurisdiction?
- Is this a priority project in a local/county plan?
  - Local Plan: _______________
  - County Plan: _______________
- Is this a priority project within – or consistent with – a regional plan in the “Policy Framework & Desired Outcomes”?
  - Project in a Regional Plan(s): _______________
  - Project consistent with a Regional Plan(s): _______________
Please explain how your proposed project addresses the following objectives from DRCOG’s Metro Vision Plan, using qualitative and/or quantitative data as appropriate:

**Metro Vision Theme: An Efficient and Predictable Development Pattern**
- Increase housing and employment in urban centers.

**Metro Vision Theme: A Connected Multimodal Region**
- Improve and expand the region’s multimodal transportation system, services and connections.
- Operate, manage and maintain a safe and reliable transportation system

**Metro Vision Theme: A Safe and Resilient Natural and Built Environment**
- Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Connect people to natural resource and recreational areas.
- Reduce the risks of hazards and their impact.

**Metro Vision Theme: Healthy, Inclusive, and Livable Communities**
- Increase access to amenities that support healthy, active choices.
- Improve transportation connections to health care facilities and service providers.

**Theme: A Vibrant Regional Economy**
- Improve access to opportunity.
- Improve the region’s competitive position.

Please explain how your proposed project addresses the following Transportation Performance Management requirements from the federal Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, using qualitative and/or quantitative data as appropriate:

*(For the application form, the FAST Act measures will be combined with the Metro Vision Plan objectives.)*

**Safety**
- Reduce fatalities and serious injuries, especially for non-motorized travel

**Infrastructure Condition**
- Improve pavement and/or bridge condition

**System Performance (Mobility)**
- Improve travel time reliability
- Improve truck travel time reliability
- Reduce peak hour delay
- Increase mode choice
- Reduce emissions

**Transit**
- Improve transit asset management/State of Good Repair
- Improve transit safety
Board of Directors Meeting
July 15, 2020

2050 Metro Vision
Regional Transportation Plan
Proposed Candidate Project Solicitation & Evaluation Process
Committees Review of Proposed Process

- **Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC):**
  - May 18th TAC meeting
  - June 8th TAC work session
  - June 15th TAC work session
  - June 22nd TAC meeting

- **Regional Transportation Committee (RTC):**
  - July 14th RTC meeting

- **2050 MVRTP candidate project solicitation & evaluation process:**
  - Overall planning framework ("Policy Framework & Desired Outcomes")
  - Investment priority project types & eligibility
  - Candidate project solicitation process
  - Candidate project evaluation process
Policy Framework & Desired Outcomes

"Vision & Needs"

USDOT:
- FAST Act
- Planning Factors
- National Goals
- Performance Measures

CDOT:
- Statewide Plan
- 4-P Process
- 10-Year Strategic Projects
- Strategic Transportation Safety Plan
- Express Lanes Master Plan
- Asset Management Plans/Priorities

DRCOG:
- Transportation plans
- Comprehensive plans
- Subarea/District plans

Vision & Needs:

RTD:
- FasTracks
- Regional BRT Study
- Asset Management Plans/Priorities
- Reimagine RTD

Local:
- Metro Vision Plan
- 2040 MVRTP
- 2020-23 TIP
- Active Transportation Plan
- Regional Freight Plan
- Regional Vision Zero Plan
- Mobility Choice Blueprint
- Coordinated Transit Plan
- Congestion Management Process
- Regional ITS Architecture
- Scenarios Analysis
MUST BE INCLUDED:
• Roadway widenings of one center-line mile or more on the regional roadway system
• New interchanges and interchange improvements that add or delete travel movements (new or deleted ramps)
• New rapid transit lines (light rail, commuter rail, BRT)

DOES NOT INCLUDE:
• Local/Collector Roads (Changes not on the regional roadway system)
Expressing Investment Priorities in the MVRTP

Will be determined through inter-agency process:
- Multimodal Safety
- Active Transportation (Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit)
- Operations and Technology
- Maintenance
Current 2040 MVRTP Projects

Projects to be Complete by 2021
- NO NEED TO INCLUDE

Projects Under CONST or in NEPA
- WILL BE AUTOMATICALLY INCLUDED

Projects with NEPA/CONST in the S/TIP

Projects Planning for Pre-NEPA Studies
- CAN BE SUBMITTED FOR EVALUATION

Other 2040 Projects

Locally Funded Projects
Investment Priorities Framework - Overall Process

- **Subregional Priorities**
- **Inter-Agency Priorities**

**Evaluation Process**

**Policy Framework & Desired Outcomes**

- "Vision & Needs"

**Inter-Agency Coordination Process**

**Revenue Assumptions**

**Draft Financial Plan**

**DRAFT Program and Project Investment Priorities**

**TAC, RTC, Board Review Period**

**FINAL Program and Project Investment Priorities**
“Dual-Track” Coordination Process

- Local Project Sponsors Submit to County Forums
- County Forums Prioritize Subregional Candidate Projects
- Evaluation Committee evaluates ALL Candidate Projects
- DRCOG, CDOT, RTD review “Vision & Needs”
- DRCOG CDOT, RTD Prioritize Regional Candidate Projects
- Inter-Agency Coordination to determine ALL Investment Priorities

Policy Framework & Desired Outcomes “Vision & Needs”
County Transportation Forum Priorities

These priorities would represent the greatest transportation needs within the Policy Framework and Desired Outcomes for each forum area as determined by the forums.

• Subregional Forum Solicitation
• Number of candidate project submittals varies by TIP share (5-25 per subregion)
• Focus on non-interstate projects, except new interchange proposals
Subregional Candidate Project Submittals*

- Adams County: 15 Submittals
- Arapahoe County: 19 Submittals
- Boulder County: 10 Submittals
- Broomfield: 5 Submittals
- Clear Creek County: 5 Submittals
- Denver: 25 Submittals
- Douglas County: 10 Submittals
- Gilpin County: 5 Submittals
- Jefferson County: 16 Submittals
- Weld County: 5 Submittals

Total: 115 Candidate Project Submittals

*These are candidate projects submitted for evaluation – NOT a guarantee of inclusion in the 2050 Fiscally Constrained RTP.
Subregional Solicitation Process

• Basic project information from local project sponsors
  • Project Sponsor – Jurisdiction & Contact Info
  • Project Name
  • Termini – Starting & End Points
  • Brief Description
  • Cost – Planning-Level Estimate (FY 2020 Dollars)
  • Proposed Implementation Timeline
  • Narrative – Explain how the project achieves MV themes/objectives
  • Screener Questions – Consistency with local, regional, state plans/studies

• Subregional Forums will prioritize submittals and forward to DRCOG staff the number determined by TIP Share
Evaluation Process

- Evaluation Committee made up of DRCOG, CDOT, RTD, and Subregional Forum Representatives
- Investment priorities evaluated against Metro Vision Objectives (Yes/No; High/Medium/Low)
  - Performance Measures from the FAST Act will be included in the evaluation
- This evaluation will be combined with the draft financial plan and coordination between all partner agencies will determine DRAFT program and project investment priorities.
Metro Vision Plan Objectives

- **Metro Vision Theme: An Efficient and Predictable Development Pattern**
  - Increase housing and employment in urban centers. *(Yes/No)*

- **Metro Vision Theme: A Connected Multimodal Region**
  - Improve and expand the region’s multimodal transportation system, services and connections. *(High/Medium/Low)*
  - Operate, manage and maintain a safe and reliable transportation system *(High/Medium/Low)*

- **Metro Vision Theme: A Safe and Resilient Natural and Built Environment**
  - Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. *(High/Medium/Low)*
  - Connect people to natural resource and recreational areas. *(Yes/No)*
  - Reduce the risks of hazards and their impact. *(Yes/No)*

- **Metro Vision Theme: Healthy, Inclusive, and Livable Communities**
  - Increase access to amenities that support healthy, active choices. *(Yes/No)*
  - Improve transportation connections to health care facilities and service providers. *(Yes/No)*

- **Metro Vision Theme: A Vibrant Regional Economy**
  - Improve access to opportunity. *(Yes/No)*
  - Improve the region’s competitive position. *(High/Medium/Low)*
Next Steps & Key Milestones

TAC Endorsement of Framework

RTC/Board Endorsement of Framework

Financial Plan Development

TAC Endorsement of FCRTP Networks to Model

RTC/Board Endorsement of FCRTP Networks to Model

TAC Recommends 2050 MVRTP Approval

RTC/Board Approves 2050 MVRTP

Submit 2050 MVRTP to Feds

Feds Approve 2050 MVRTP

Draft 2050 MVRTP Complete

Public Review

Determines Investment Priorities (Subregional & Interagency)

Evaluates Investment Priorities

Staff Conducts AQ Conformity Model Runs
Proposed Motion

Move to approve the proposed 2050 MVRTP candidate project solicitation and evaluation process and criteria documented in Attachments 1 and 2.
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 2020</td>
<td>Informational Briefing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
COVID-19 impacts to DRCOG’s Ombudsman program

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
DRCOG Long Term Care/PACE (Program of All-inclusive Care for the Elderly) Ombudsman Programs have been working to advocate on behalf of nursing home and assisting living facility residents, participants, and families for over 40 years.

DRCOG’s Ombudsman programs have received numerous calls since COVID-19 as facilities and PACE centers have been put on strict lock-down leaving residents, participants, and families with many concerns about care and quality of life. Staff will provide information on the trends and patterns the Ombudsman program is seeing, as well as what work is being done with the State Ombudsman’s office and Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment/Health Care Policy and Finance.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at drex@drcog.org or (303) 480-6701; Shannon Gimbel, Ombudsman Manager, at 303-480-5621 or sgimbel@drcog.org.
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

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

Meeting Date | Agenda Category | Agenda Item #
-------------|----------------|-------------
July 15, 2020 | Informational Briefing | 11

SUBJECT
2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program COVID-19 Impacts

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Information and discussion only

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
The extent and duration of the economic impacts from COVID-19 is still uncertain. We know however, that there will be state and local government financial impacts resulting from reduced tax and fee revenue as well as increased costs related to responding to COVID-19.

This will no doubt impact to some degree the ability of local jurisdictions to implement locally sponsored TIP projects. DRCOG staff desire to understand, to the extent possible, these fiscal impacts and begin a discussion of possible options to keep programmed federal funds flowing as much as possible.

While there is some variation depending on the funding source, federal funds awarded through the DRCOG TIP generally require a minimum non-federal share of 17.21%. Under the FY2020-2023 TIP Policy, a minimum 20% local match is required for federally funded projects. In addition, the State Multimodal Options Funds (MMOF) allocated during the last TIP cycle required a minimum 50% local match under state law. All told, there are approximately $125.7 million in local agency funds committed to match federal funds and an additional $120.9 million to match state MMOF dollars over the four year TIP.

Budget Impacts
Recognizing that each jurisdiction’s revenue and budget structure is different, we do know that several of the most common transportation funding sources are being impacted: state gas tax, sales taxes, use taxes, car rental fees, lodging taxes. Less certain will be potential impacts to vehicle registration fees and surcharges, property taxes, development fees, etc.

Based on an April 16, 2020 State estimate, CDOT is anticipating a $50m reduction in State Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF) revenue from FY 2020 through FY 2023. Based on that estimate, we can calculate the commensurate HUTF revenue reductions for cities and counties (attached). For the DRCOG region, that means a total local government reduction in HUTF revenue of approximately $13.1 million, the majority of which would occur in State FY 21 and FY 22.

DRCOG staff also distributed a short questionnaire to member jurisdictions in late April to assess each agency’s situation. DRCOG received responses from 18 local jurisdictions, plus CDOT Region 1 and RTD. 15 jurisdictions indicated that there was currently an impact to progress on TIP projects based on staff working remotely, staff
reductions, and court closures, among other impacts. Most jurisdictions did not indicate an immediate impact on local match for TIP-funded projects, but most indicated a high level of uncertainty in the future. Likewise, a small number or responses indicated immediate/current impacts on local transportation staff, but many indicated a high level of uncertainty in the future.

The ultimate depth and breadth of COVID-19 economic impacts will determine the extent of the impacts on local agencies. Staff believe that there is value in keeping the resources we do have (namely federal funds) flowing as much as possible in order to not exacerbate the financial impacts. Therefore, staff is exploring various options to respond to local agency financial impacts while maintaining our ability to invest in priority transportation improvements.

Options

Delay Policy Waiver/Extension: Retain current project programming. Pursue a TIP Project Delay Policy amendment to adjust project delay penalties or extend the “cure” period for project sponsors. Require documentation of financial hardship

- Pro: maintains a level of flexibility to respond to dynamic local financial situation.
- Con: does not provide an opportunity to advance projects from future years for sponsors that are able.

Reprogram Federal Funds: Allow project sponsors to request reprogramming federal/state funds to another year based on demonstrated financial hardship without triggering a project delay penalty.

- Pro: provides opportunity to advance projects from future years for sponsors that are able, to the extent that projects are reprogrammed to future years.
- Con: provides somewhat less flexibility to respond to dynamic local financial situation.

Backfill Local Match with Toll Credits: Allow project sponsors to request utilizing state toll credits as non-federal match based on demonstrated financial hardship. Because toll credits are applied in order to fully fund a project with federal funds, but do not actually provide project funding, there are two alternatives:

(A) Reduce project scope to the amount of awarded federal funds.

- Pro: relieves financial pressure on local agency budgets.
- Con: reduces overall investment in regional transportation projects by up to $126 million.

(B) Increase federal funds to the full cost of the project. Either through additional federal appropriation (uncertain) or utilizing current unprogrammed federal funds (approx. $13 million)

- Pro: relieves financial pressure on local agency budgets while maintaining as much regional investment as possible.
- Con: uncertainty over additional funds. If use unprogrammed funds, eliminates ability to fund TIP Wait List projects.
Finally, DRCOG and many other agencies, jurisdictions, and state and national associations are also advocating for additional federal infrastructure funding to help with economic recovery. We are also advocating for non-federal match relief for current federal funding with additional federal funds to maintain project scopes of work.

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

**ATTACHMENT**
- Staff Presentation
- Highway Users Tax Fund Estimates
- Toll Credits Fact Sheet

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at drex@drcog.org or (303) 480-6701; or Ron Papsdorf, Division Director, Transportation Planning and Operations Division at 303-480-6747 or rpapsdorf@drcog.org.
2020-23 TIP Local Projects

COVID-19 Impacts and Options
Introduction

• Full impact still uncertain
• The most common local transportation funds are being impacted
• DRCOG city/county share of state HUTF could be reduced by $13 million over next three years
• Some agencies will have difficulty implementing projects
• Other impacts: court closures, remote work processes, staff reductions, etc.
Local Match

• Federal funds awarded through DRCOG TIP generally require a minimum non-federal share of 17.21%

• 2020-23 TIP Policy: 20% minimum local match for federal funds; 50% minimum match for state MMOF
  • $125.7 million committed to match federal funds
  • $120.9 million committed to match state MMOF
Local Match

- **Wave/Extend TIP Delay Policy** - adjust project delay penalties or extend the “cure” period for project sponsors based on demonstrated hardship
- **Reprogram Federal Funds** - allow project sponsors to request reprogramming federal/state funds to another year based on demonstrated hardship
- **Backfill Local Match with Toll Credits** - allow project sponsors to utilize state toll credits as non-federal match based on demonstrated financial hardship
Toll Credits

- Toll credits applied as non-federal match in order to reduce non-federal funds, but **does not provide project funding**
- Two alternatives:
  - Reduce project scope
  - Increase federal funds
- Policy issues for DRCOG:
  - Allow scope reductions?
  - Allocate unprogrammed federal funds ($13m) to reduce non-federal match?
Discussion

• **Allow scope reductions?**
  • relieves financial pressure on local agency budgets.
  • reduces overall investment in regional transportation projects
  • what to do with scope rection?

• **Allocate unprogrammed federal funds ($13m) to reduce non-federal match?**
  • relieves financial pressure on local agency budgets while maintaining as much regional investment as possible.
  • eliminates/reduces ability to fund TIP Wait List projects

• **Concept: allow discussion through subregional forums with recommendations to RTC and the Board**
## Estimated Changes to City HUTF Payments FY20-FY23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>FY 19 Allocation</th>
<th>FY 20 Budget</th>
<th>FY 20 Reduction</th>
<th>FY 21 Reduction</th>
<th>FY 22 Reduction</th>
<th>FY 23 Reduction</th>
<th>Total Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>$4,082,925.52</td>
<td>$4,120,807.69</td>
<td>$57,663.18</td>
<td>$139,938.69</td>
<td>$155,409.30</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$353,011.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>$147,000</td>
<td>$147,000</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$18,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Estimated Reduction Due to COVID-19-Based on 4/16/2020 State Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARVADA $4,082,925.52</td>
<td>$353,011.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AURORA $12,237,109.49</td>
<td>$1,058,024.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENNETT $72,166.00</td>
<td>$6,240.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK HAWK $13,654.95</td>
<td>$1,180.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOULDER $231,427.07</td>
<td>$208,492.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOW MAR $33,804.86</td>
<td>$2,922.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGHTON $1,077,131.99</td>
<td>$93,129.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOKFIELD $2,126,050.70</td>
<td>$183,819.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTLE PINES NORTH $274,260.72</td>
<td>$2,712.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTLE ROCK $1,833,773.09</td>
<td>$158,548.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTENNIAL $35,328.19</td>
<td>$463,196.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL CITY $49,001.35</td>
<td>$4,236.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERY HILLS VILLAGE $239,075.67</td>
<td>$207,670.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBINE VALLEY $45,598.40</td>
<td>$3,942.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCE CITY $1,746,333.80</td>
<td>$150,988.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DACONO $183,276.17</td>
<td>$15,846.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEER TRAIL $34,499.58</td>
<td>$2,982.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENVER $31,826,488.73</td>
<td>$2,751,729.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDGEWATER $112,852.53</td>
<td>$9,757.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPIRE $11,958.52</td>
<td>$1,033.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLEWOOD $986,831.94</td>
<td>$85,321.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIE $754,294.69</td>
<td>$2,816.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL HEIGHTS $269,564.29</td>
<td>$65,216.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRESTONE $423,587.82</td>
<td>$2,306.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOXFIELD $39,984.05</td>
<td>$36,523.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREDERICK $458,832.62</td>
<td>$45,323.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGETOWN $46,923.88</td>
<td>$39,670.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENDALE $754,856.73</td>
<td>$4,070.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDEN $530,883.26</td>
<td>$18,669.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENWOOD VILLAGE $541,923.77</td>
<td>$4,654.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO SPRINGS $68,533.93</td>
<td>$5,925.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFAYETTE $797,094.99</td>
<td>$68,917.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKESIDE $2,297.74</td>
<td>$196.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKEWOOD $5,111,931.30</td>
<td>$441,979.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLETON $1,361,749.59</td>
<td>$117,737.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCHBUIE $190,704.15</td>
<td>$16,488.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONETREE $358,740.34</td>
<td>$30,166.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONGMONT $2,819,818.15</td>
<td>$243,802.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISVILLE $605,246.84</td>
<td>$392.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYONS $61,797.49</td>
<td>$5,343.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAD $215,933.50</td>
<td>$18,669.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRISON $10,768.84</td>
<td>$932.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEDERLAND $54,056.35</td>
<td>$4,879.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHGLENN</td>
<td>$1,000,265.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKER</td>
<td>$1,435,618.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVER PLUME</td>
<td>$9,025.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERIOR</td>
<td>$298,674.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THORNTON</td>
<td>$3,965,261.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTMINSTER</td>
<td>$3,493,953.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEAT RIDGE</td>
<td>$1,025,742.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total All Cities** $145,648,643.95 | $147,000,000.00 | $2,056,996.59 | $4,991,979.52 | $5,543,856.66 | $0.00 | $12,592,832.76

**DRCOG City Total** $90,785,642.64 | $91,627,969.24 | $1,282,166.12 | $3,111,598.27 | $3,455,594.06 | $0.00 | $7,849,358.46
## Estimated Changes to County HUTF Payments FY20-FY23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>FY20 Budget ($m)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY 20 ($m)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY 21 ($m)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY 22 ($m)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY 23 ($m)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>$586.00</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>$8.20</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>$19.90</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>$22.10</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$50.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>$147.00</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>$2.06</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>$4.99</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>$5.54</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$12.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>$218.00</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>$7.40</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$8.22</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$18.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Reduction Due to COVID-19-Based on 4/16/2020 State Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>FY 19 Allocation</th>
<th>FY 20 Budget</th>
<th>FY 20 Reduction</th>
<th>FY 21 Reduction</th>
<th>FY 22 Reduction</th>
<th>FY 23 Reduction</th>
<th>Total Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAMS</td>
<td>$9,465,918.28</td>
<td>$9,739,362.91</td>
<td>$136,284.60</td>
<td>$330,739.46</td>
<td>$367,303.62</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$834,327.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAHAOE</td>
<td>$9,072,966.48</td>
<td>$9,335,059.80</td>
<td>$130,627.12</td>
<td>$317,009.71</td>
<td>$352,056.01</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$799,692.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOULDER</td>
<td>$6,102,818.23</td>
<td>$6,279,112.05</td>
<td>$87,864.71</td>
<td>$213,232.64</td>
<td>$236,806.10</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$537,903.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEAR CREEK</td>
<td>$985,884.86</td>
<td>$1,014,364.39</td>
<td>$14,194.18</td>
<td>$34,446.85</td>
<td>$38,255.04</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$86,896.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS</td>
<td>$8,577,687.44</td>
<td>$8,825,473.50</td>
<td>$123,496.39</td>
<td>$299,704.65</td>
<td>$332,837.82</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$756,038.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILPIN</td>
<td>$650,210.51</td>
<td>$668,993.32</td>
<td>$9,361.34</td>
<td>$22,718.37</td>
<td>$25,229.95</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$57,309.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>$14,601,997.48</td>
<td>$15,023,809.47</td>
<td>$210,230.78</td>
<td>$510,194.21</td>
<td>$566,597.59</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,287,022.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELD</td>
<td>$11,026,449.13</td>
<td>$11,344,973.25</td>
<td>$158,752.19</td>
<td>$385,264.45</td>
<td>$427,856.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$971,873.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Counties</td>
<td>$211,879,381.00</td>
<td>$218,000,000.00</td>
<td>$3,050,511.95</td>
<td>$7,403,071.67</td>
<td>$8,221,501.71</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$18,675,085.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal DRCOG Counties</td>
<td>$60,483,932.41</td>
<td>$62,231,148.70</td>
<td>$870,811.30</td>
<td>$2,113,310.34</td>
<td>$2,346,942.64</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,331,064.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the purpose of this Fact Sheet?

In response to the 2020 economic downturn associated with COVID-19, CDOT is developing guidance and recommendations for local agencies and planning organizations on how to maintain delivery of the Federal Aid Program, primarily Congestion Mitigation Air Quality, Transportation Alternatives, Bridge Off-System, Surface Transportation Block Grant (Urban Areas), Highway Safety Improvement Program, and any other locally administered projects.

What are Toll Credits?

CDOT is able to provide some relief by using its balance of “toll credits” with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Toll credits are earned when the state, a toll authority, or a private entity funds a capital transportation investment with toll revenues earned on existing toll facilities. Toll credits act as a “soft match” and are not “real dollars,” but rather a tool which State DOTs can utilize to reduce or eliminate requirements for non-federal matching funds. Note: Increasing federal share in projects come from existing resources and are not additional federal apportionments or obligation authority to the state.

How can Toll Credits be applied to a Project?

For projects selected through Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) processes, requests for match relief should be made through the MPO and then submitted to CDOT. Requests for projects not in an MPO should be made through the appropriate CDOT Region Office, or in the case of federal transit (FTA) projects, through the CDOT Division of Transit and Rail.

There are 2 scenarios where toll credits may be used to assist:

1. If the scope of the project can be reduced, the project can proceed with no local match and 100% federal funding. Example, a $100,000 project is reduced in scope to $80,000 and eliminate the match element.

2. If additional federal funding can be identified and programmed within the TIP and STIP a project can proceed with no local match and 100% federal funding. Example, a $100,000 project is kept at $100,000 by procuring additional federal funds being sourced (from existing available funding) to replace the diminished local contribution, thus eliminating the match.

Key Points

- For existing project awards
- Determined on case by case basis
- In response to permanent reduction of local revenue
- May require a reduction of scope equal to lost local contribution
- Eliminates required match, but NOT a cash replacement
- IGA revisions may be required due to scope reduction and change in reimbursement terms

For more information contact:
Eric Ehrbar – CDOT Finance
eric.ehrbar@state.co.us

MPOs should contact:
Marissa Gaughan – CDOT DTD
marissa.gaughan@state.co.us
**Scenarios**

Below are a few examples of how Toll Credits can be used on a project. In some cases it may be necessary to identify other available resources including federal funds.

**REDUCED TOTAL COST - NO LOCAL OVERMATCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Original Rates</th>
<th>Revised Project Cost</th>
<th>Revised Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &quot;Match&quot;</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &quot;Over Match&quot;</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No change to total cost - NO LOCAL OVERMATCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Original Rates</th>
<th>Revised Project Cost</th>
<th>Revised Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &quot;Match&quot;</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &quot;Over Match&quot;</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REDUCED TOTAL COST - LOCAL OVERMATCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Original Rates</th>
<th>Revised Project Cost</th>
<th>Revised Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &quot;Match&quot;</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &quot;Over Match&quot;</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO CHANGE TO TOTAL COST - LOCAL OVERMATCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Original Cost</th>
<th>Original Rates</th>
<th>Revised Project Cost</th>
<th>Revised Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &quot;Match&quot;</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &quot;Over Match&quot;</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What does this mean?**

- **REDUCED TOTAL COST - NO LOCAL OVERMATCH**
  - Your project must reduce scope by the amount of the local match to fit in the revised budget.

- **NO CHANGE TO TOTAL COST - NO LOCAL OVERMATCH**
  - You must secure additional federal resources in the amount of the lost match and program them in the STIP. These funds may be available currently as unprogrammed dollars or may require the cancellation or reduction of other projects.

- **REDUCED TOTAL COST - LOCAL OVERMATCH**
  - Your project must reduce scope by the amount of both the local match AND the local overmatch to fit in the revised budget.

- **NO CHANGE TO TOTAL COST - LOCAL OVERMATCH**
  - You must secure additional federal resources in the amount of the lost match AND the local overmatch and program them in the STIP. These funds may be available currently as unprogrammed dollars or may require the cancellation or reduction of other projects.