AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2017
6:30-8:45 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

PUBLIC HEARING

5. 6:35 Public hearing on the draft 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan, draft 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program, and associated air quality conformity determinations
   (Attachment A) Jacob Riger, Long Range Transportation Planning Manager, and Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner; Transportation Planning & Operations

6. 6:50 Report of the Chair
   • Report on Regional Transportation Committee Meeting
   • Report on Performance and Engagement Committee
   • Report on Finance and Budget Committee
   • Appointment of a member and alternate to represent DRCOG on the State Transportation Advisory Committee
   • Appointment of a member and alternate to represent DRCOG on the E-470 Authority Board

7. 7:00 Report of the Executive Director
   *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.
8. 7:05  **Public Comment**
Up to 45 minutes is allocated at this time for public comment and each speaker will be limited to 3 minutes. If there are additional requests from the public to address the Board, time will be allocated at the end of the meeting to complete public comment. The chair requests that there be no public comment on issues for which a prior public hearing has been held before this Board. Consent and action items will begin immediately after the last speaker.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

9. 7:20  *Move to Approve Consent Agenda*
- Minutes of February 15, 2017  
  (Attachment B)

**ACTION AGENDA**

10. 7:25  *Discussion of confirming continuation of Douglas W. Rex as acting executive director*  
(Attachment C) Roxie Ronsen, Administrative Officer, Administration & Finance

11. 7:40  *Discussion of solicitation of interest to serve on Performance and Engagement, Finance and Budget, and Regional Transportation committees*  
(Attachment D) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations

12. 7:55  *Discussion of State Legislative issues*
A. **Bills on Which Positions Have Previously Been Taken**  
(Attachment E) Presentation by Rich Mauro, Senior Policy and Legislative Analyst  
Rich Mauro will respond to questions and current status, if requested. These bills require no additional action by the Board unless individual bills are pulled from the package for reconsideration of the Board-adopted position. **To change the Board's position on specific legislative bills requires affirmative action by 2/3 of those present and voting.**

B. **New Bills for Consideration and Action**  
(Attachment F) Presentation by Rich Mauro, Senior Policy and Legislative Analyst (if necessary)  
Rich Mauro will present a recommended position on any new bills based on the Board’s legislative policies. If a bill requires additional discussion it may be pulled from the package and action will be taken separately. **Positions on specific legislative bills require affirmative action by 2/3 of those present and voting.**

*Motion requested*
INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS

13. 8:10 2016 Federal Planning Certification Review of the Denver-Aurora Transportation Management Area
(Attachment G) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations

14. 8:25 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Schedule
(Attachment H) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations

15. 8:40 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. 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program Administrative Modifications
(Attachment I) Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations

17. Relevant clippings and other communications of interest
(Attachment J)
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

18. Next Meeting – April 19, 2017

19. Other Matters by Members

20. 8:45 Adjourn
SPECIAL DATES TO NOTE

DRCOG Awards Event
April 26, 2017

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

CALENDAR OF FUTURE MEETINGS

March 2017
14 Regional Transportation Committee 8:30 a.m.
15 Finance and Budget Committee 5:30 p.m.
15 Board of Directors 6:30 p.m.
17 Advisory Committee on Aging Noon – 3 p.m.
27 Transportation Advisory Committee 1:30 p.m.

April 2017
5 Board Work Session 4:00 p.m.
5 Performance and Engagement Committee 6:00 p.m.
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 Noon – 3 p.m.
24 Transportation Advisory Committee 1:30 p.m.

May 2017
3 Board Work Session 4:00 p.m.
3 Performance and Engagement Committee 6:00 p.m.
16 Regional Transportation Committee 8:30 a.m.
17 Finance and Budget Committee 5:30 p.m.
17 Board of Directors 6:30 p.m.
19 Advisory Committee on Aging Noon – 3 p.m.
22 Transportation Advisory Committee 1:30 p.m.
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

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

Meeting Date  | Agenda Category  | Agenda Item #
-------------|-----------------|--------------
March 15, 2017 | Public Hearing | 5            

SUBJECT
Public hearing on proposed 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2040 MVRTP), 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (2018-2021 TIP), and associated air quality conformity determination documents.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
No action at this time; this is a public hearing. The Board is anticipated to act on the proposed documents at its April 2017 meeting.

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
The draft 2040 MVRTP integrates the transportation theme of DRCOG’s new Metro Vision Plan and the 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan adopted in 2015 to present a complete picture of the region’s envisioned and fiscally constrained (cost feasible) multimodal transportation system through 2040.

The 2018-2021 TIP is a four-year document that lays out how federal, state, and local transportation funding is programmed to projects in the Denver metro area. The TIP includes projects selected by DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD, each with their own selection processes and funding sources. The 2018-2021 TIP is an update to the 2016-2021 TIP to be consistent with CDOT’s Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. Accordingly, a new call for projects for DRCOG-selected projects was not conducted – and no new DRCOG projects were selected – for the 2018-2021 TIP.

Per federal transportation planning requirements, DRCOG must show that the 2040 MVRTP and 2018-2021 TIP will not cause a violation of federal air quality conformity standards. Accordingly, the 2040 MVRTP’s roadway and transit networks (which include the air quality regionally significant projects contained in the 2018-2021 TIP) were modeled for air quality conformity. The results were used by the state Air Pollution Control Division to calculate pollutant emissions. All pollutant emission tests were passed, as shown in the air quality conformity documents (DRCOG CO and PM10 Conformity Determination and Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination).

The Board is anticipated to act on the proposed documents at its April 2017 meeting.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A
ATTACHMENTS

Staff Presentation

Links:
- Draft 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan and Appendices
- Draft 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program
- DRCOG CO and PM 10 Conformity Determination and Denver Southern Subarea 8-hour Ozone Conformity Determination
- Notice of March 15, 2017 Public Hearing

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or
- Jacob Riger (2040 MVRTP), Long Range Transportation Planning Manager, at 303-480-6751 or jriger@drcog.org
- Todd Cottrell (2018-2021 TIP), Senior Transportation Planner, at 303-480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org
DRCOG Plan Relationships

**Metro Vision Plan**
Shared vision for the future

- 20+ Year “Vision” Transportation System
  - 20-plus year “vision” transportation system
  - Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan
  - Near-term program of funded projects
  - Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

**Air Quality Conformity**
2040 MVRTP Overview

• Integrates Metro Vision Plan transportation theme with 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (2040 FCRTP)

• Shows revenues reasonably expected through 2040 to fund system preservation and new multimodal projects

• Identifies regionally significant roadway capacity & rapid transit projects

• Identifies project implementation staging periods

• 2040 MVRTP has only minor project amendments compared to current 2040 FCRTP
Federal Requirements & Topics (FAST Act)

- Fiscal Constraint
- Air Quality Conformity
- Public Engagement
- Environmental Justice
- Coordinated Transit Plan
- Freight & Goods Movement
- Initial Performance Based Planning
- Planning Factors
- Environmental Justice

Transportation Challenges & Planning Assumptions

**DRCOG Region Demographic Data 1980, 2015, and 2040**

- **Population**
  - 1980: 2 million
  - 2015: 3.2 million
  - 2040: 4.4 million
  - Increase: +1.2 million

- **Households**
  - 1980: 1 million
  - 2015: 1.5 million
  - 2040: 2 million
  - Increase: +545,000

- **Employment**
  - 1980: 1 million
  - 2015: 1.5 million
  - 2040: 2 million
  - Increase: +500,000

Source: US Census; DRCOG estimates & projections
Metro Vision Multimodal Transportation System Components

- Multimodal components, including:
  - Transit plan
  - Walking & bicycling
  - Freight & goods

- Operational elements
  - Operations
  - Transportation Demand Management

- Other topical elements
  - Technology
  - System preservation
  - Safety/security
  - Aviation

2040 MVRTP Fiscally Constrained Roadway, Managed Lane, and Bus Rapid Transit Capacity Projects
2040 MVRTP  
Fiscally Constrained  
Rapid Transit System

2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program

- The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is –  
  - Federally-required  
  - Short-range covering FY2018 - FY2021  
  - Identifies “real” transportation projects with fiscally-constrained federal and state funding  

- TIP is now updated every two years to align with the annual STIP update  

- TIP contains projects selected by DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD  

- No new DRCOG Call for Projects was completed for this TIP update
Air Quality Conformity

- 2040 MVRTP and 2018-2021 TIP must address ozone, carbon monoxide, and PM-10 pollutants

- Transportation projects included in the regional travel model transportation networks

- 2040 MVRTP and 2018-21 TIP passed pollutant emission tests for regional air quality conformity

- Air quality conformity is regional (entire MVRTP and TIP), not based on individual projects
THANK YOU
Members/Alternates Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elise Jones, Chair</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Henry</td>
<td>Adams County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Baker</td>
<td>Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Beacom</td>
<td>City and County of Broomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Wheelock</td>
<td>Clear Creek County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Kniech</td>
<td>City and County of Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crissy Fanganello</td>
<td>City and County of Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Partridge</td>
<td>Douglas County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby Szabo</td>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Fifer</td>
<td>City of Arvada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Roth</td>
<td>City of Aurora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Vittum</td>
<td>Town of Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Brockett</td>
<td>City of Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Justen</td>
<td>Town of Bow Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Baca</td>
<td>City of Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Bower</td>
<td>Town of Castle Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Truhlar</td>
<td>City of Centennial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Christman</td>
<td>City of Cherry Hills Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Champion</td>
<td>Town of Columbine Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Teter</td>
<td>City of Commerce City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Conklin</td>
<td>City of Edgewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Jefferson</td>
<td>City of Englewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Dick</td>
<td>City of Federal Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynette Kelsey</td>
<td>Town of Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Brown (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Golden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Rakowsky</td>
<td>City of Greenwood Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Walton (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakti</td>
<td>City of Lakewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Cernanec</td>
<td>City of Littleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Millet</td>
<td>City of Lone Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Peck</td>
<td>City of Longmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Stolzmann</td>
<td>City of Louisville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Sullivan</td>
<td>Town of Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Whitlow</td>
<td>Town of Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Diak</td>
<td>Town of Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Daigle</td>
<td>City of Sheridan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Dozal</td>
<td>Town of Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Montoya (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Atchison</td>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Jay</td>
<td>City of Wheat Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Perkins Smith</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair Elise Jones called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present.

New members and alternates were recognized: Jason Bower, new alternate for Castle Rock; Stephanie Walton, alternate for Lafayette, and Kathryn Wittman, new alternate for Dacono.

**Move to Approve Agenda**

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

**Report of the Chair**
- Chair Jones reported the Regional Transportation Committee unanimously approved amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program, and received a briefing on the dual TIP model and the results of the Who is TOD survey.
- Chair Jones noted she attended the Moving People Forward conference with other Board representatives. She noted she moderated a panel on Active Transportation.

**Report of the Executive Director**
- Doug Rex reported he attended the City of Castle Pines council meeting, where they unanimously voted to become members of DRCOG. The council appointed a member and alternate to the Board.
- Mr. Rex noted the Executive Committee members recently had lunch with the CDOT Transportation Commissioners. Discussion centered around transportation issues around the state, opportunities for collaboration and coordination, and new transportation funding.
- Mr. Rex noted he attended the ADCOG dinner hosted by the City of Brighton; the North Area Transportation Alliance meeting; the South Metro Chamber Economic Development meeting; the South I-25 PEL meeting; and the C-470 Coalition meeting.
- Mr. Rex noted DRCOG has co-hosted recent meetings of the MPACT64 group. The group is focused on increasing funding for transportation. Another meeting is scheduled for tomorrow at 1:30 p.m.
- The Open House held on February 1 was very successful.
- A new member orientation is scheduled for tomorrow at 4 p.m. in Independence Pass conference room.
- The awards celebration is scheduled for April 26.
A Metro Vision Idea Exchange on Economic Vitality is scheduled for March 9 from 10 - Noon in Independence Pass conference room.

A public hearing is scheduled for March 15 for the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan, 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program, and associated air quality conformity documents.

Public comment
No public comment was received.

Move to approve consent agenda

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

Items on the consent agenda included:
- Minutes of January 18, 2017 meeting
- Approval of amendments to the Executive Policies

Election of Officers
Director Rakowsky briefed members on the Nominating Committee recommendations. No additional nominations were offered from the floor.

Director Rakowsky moved to close nominations. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Director Rakowsky moved to elect the slate of officers as recommended by the Nominating Committee. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

At this point Chair Bob Roth assumed facilitation of the meeting.

Discussion of Rules of Conduct
Doug Rex briefed members on the Performance and Engagement Committee’s recommendation on the proposed Rules of Conduct.

Director Atchison moved to adopt the Rules of Conduct. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Discussion of amendments to the Articles of Association
The proposed amendments to the Articles of Association are related to the addition of language to incorporate the Rules of Conduct.

Director Cernanec moved to adopt the proposed amendments to the Articles of Association. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.
Discussion of revisions to *Transportation Planning in the Denver Region* document
This document outlines the framework of the transportation planning process in the Denver region for DRCOG, the Regional Transportation District and Colorado Department of Transportation. It highlights policies and procedures for the process and identifies key stakeholders and participants.

Director Atchison **moved** to approve the update of the *Transportation Planning in the Denver Region* document. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.

Discussion of Transportation Improvement Program Work Group recommendations
Doug Rex noted this topic was discussed at the February 1 work session. A letter received from the Federal Highway Administration states that the proposed dual TIP model complies with federal regulation, and provides additional guidance for developing a dual model. The dual model would split funding into two shares; regional and subregional. The regional share would be programmed to projects deemed “transformative.” The term transformative has not yet been defined, but could include large regional projects submitted by CDOT or RTD. Members discussed the dual model concept and asked questions related to the proposal. A request was made to have more regular reports at the work sessions on the progress of the work group. A request was made for an additional Boulder County representative be added to the group.

Director Jones **moved** to accept the work group’s report and directed the TIP Review Work Group to continue and develop the draft 2020-2023 TIP Policy document based on the Regional/Subregional dual model framework for the Board’s consideration. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.

Discussion of amendments to the 2016-2021 Transportation Improvement Program
Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the proposed amendment. This amendment was tabled from the January meeting.

Director Rakowsky **moved** to amend the 2016-2021 *Transportation Improvement Program* as proposed. The was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.

Discussion of 2017 Federal Legislative Policy
Rich Mauro provided a brief overview of the Policy, and revisions suggested since the draft was provided to members.

Director Millet requested a modification to the last bullet on page 5, to read: “Ensuring that policies, programs and other actions that affect land use and housing support the private and public sections in providing a variety of housing sizes and types for people of all ages, incomes and abilities.”

Director Stolzmann **moved** to approve the 2017 Federal Legislative Policy as amended. The motion was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.
Discussion of State Legislative Issues
Rich Mauro, Senior Policy and Legislative Analyst, provided an update on bills previously acted on by the Board, and discussed new bills introduced since the January meeting.

Bills previously acted on:
SB 17-011 – Study Transportation Access for People with Disabilities – moved through two committee readings.

HB 17-1018 – Extend voter approval window for Regional Transportation Authority Mill Levy – has not been calendared.

    Director Jones moved to change the position on HB 17-1018 from monitor to support. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

HB 17-1031 – Hearings on Transportation Commission districts – passed out of first committee, sitting in appropriations.

SB 17-045 – Construction defect claim allocation of defense costs – waiting on next hearing in the Senate

SB 17-057 – Colorado Healthcare Affordability & Sustainability Enterprise – has not been calendared.

New bills:
HB 17-1087 – Public Guardianship Pilot Program – staff recommendation is to support. The AAA staff feels there is a need in the system for individuals with no family or friends to make decisions for those who cannot make decisions for themselves, or where no appropriate family member is available to make those decisions.

    Director Cernanec moved a position of support for HB 17-1087. The motion was seconded.

    There was discussion. A question was asked if there was a fiscal note attached. Mr. Mauro noted funding would come through gifts, grants and donations.

    A request was made for fiscal notes to be attached to bills when available.

    After discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

SB 17-153 – Southwest Chief and Front Range Passenger Rail Commission – the bill would recreate the existing Southwest Chief Commission, and adds a Front Range Passenger Rail Commission, allowing seats for MPOs. The bill is scheduled for its second reading in the Senate Finance committee tomorrow. Debra Perkins-Smith noted CDOT is currently monitoring the bill.
Director Fifer moved a position of support for SB 17-153. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

HB 17-1153 – Highway Congestion Mitigation – changes HOV 3+ back to HOV 2+ for all highways, and dedicates future federal funding to specific state projects. Director Atchison noted there is a requirement under state law for HOV 3+, and it is also included in current contracts. Ms. Perkins-Smith noted if this were to occur CDOT would lose approximately $4.3 million per year. The bill would also require that all federal funding go to projects on north and south I-25, and would take all the state’s maintenance funding as well. Ms. Perkins-Smith asked members to oppose the bill.

Director Millet moved a position of oppose for HB 17-1153. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

HB 17-1171 – Authorize new transportation revenue anticipation notes – requires the Transportation Commission to submit a ballot question to the voters in November 2017 which would authorize the state to issue additional transportation revenue anticipation notes. Debra Perkins-Smith noted that CDOT is opposed to this bill.

Director Atchison moved a position of oppose for HB 17-1171. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

SB-17-085 – Increase documentary fee & fund attainable housing – the bill was postponed indefinitely.

SB 17-098 – Mobile home parks – the bill was postponed indefinitely.

SB 17-155 – Statutory definition of construction defect –

SB 17-156 – Homeowners’ Association construction defect lawsuit approval timelines –

HB 17-1169 – Construction defect litigation builder’s right to repair –

Director Brockett moved a position of monitor for SB 17-155, SB 17-156, and HB 17-1169. The motion was seconded. There was discussion.

Members discussed the bills and the necessity of legislative action to change the current laws.

After discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

SB 17-040 – Public access to government files – this bill requires custodians of public records to provide records in a structured data format, when requested. Staff recommends a position of monitor.
Director Rakowsky moved a position of monitor for SB 17-040. The motion was seconded. There was discussion.

A question was asked about whether custodians would have to standardize formats. Ed Bowditch stated custodians would evaluate if the data is available, and would need to make the information available in whatever format it is currently in (i.e., if the information is in an excel spreadsheet you would need to provide it in excel).

After discussion, the motion passed with one opposed.

Director Shakti requested information on two bills: HB 17-1151 – electric assisted bicycles on paths, and HB 17-1166 – access from highways and adjoining businesses. Staff will bring information on these two bills at the next meeting.

Presentation on Regional Macroeconomic Forecast
Dan Jerrett, DRCOG Economist, provided a brief presentation on how regional economic forecasts are used to inform DRCOG’s land use and transportation planning and modeling efforts. In early 2017, DRCOG staff, in consultation with other economists in the region, will develop a new set of 2040 regional control forecasts. A summary and timeline of the process was presented.

Committee Reports
**State Transportation Advisory Committee** – Director Jones reported CDOT will be piloting Bustang buses for skiing traffic on I-70 west in February; the record of decision for central I-70 was finalized; CDOT will decide how to spend unused contingency funds; the conversion from HOV 2+ to HOV 3+ is going smoothly; the STAC is having a lunch meeting with the TC tomorrow; and there was discussion of how to prioritize projects in the freight program.

**Metro Mayors Caucus** – Director Atchison reported the MMC discussed construction litigation and transportation funding.

**Metro Area County Commissioners** – Commissioner Jones noted the MACC discussed regional trail connectivity.

**Advisory Committee on Aging** – Director Cernanec noted the ACA meets on Friday. The format of the meetings has changed, so that a county provides an in-depth report at each meeting on what’s happening.

**Regional Air Quality Council** – Director Atchison reported there were no legislative bills related to air quality at the time of the meeting. The new ozone outreach program was previewed.

**E-470 Authority** – Director Rakowsky reported the current bonds will be refinanced at a lower rate.

**Report on FasTracks** – No report was provided. Chair Roth noted the R Line in Aurora opens next Friday.

**Next meeting** – **March 15, 2017**
Other matters by members

- The Chair noted that this was Director Millet last meeting as representative for Lone Tree. The Chair thanked Director Millet for her work on the Board. Wynne Shaw will be the new representative for Lone Tree.
- Director Stolzmann asked who won the jelly bean counting contest from the Open House. It was noted that Director Brockett won the contest, and donated the jelly beans to staff.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

__________________________________________
Elise Jones, Chair
Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

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

Meeting Date | Agenda Category | Agenda Item #
-------------|----------------|--------------
March 15, 2017 | Action | 10

SUBJECT
This item is related to confirming authority, per the Executive Policies, for Douglas W. Rex to continue to serve as acting executive director and fulfill the duties of that position until the vacancy is filled.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Approval for Douglas W. Rex to continue to serve as acting executive director and to fulfill the duties of that position until the vacancy is filled.

ACTION BY OTHERS
The Performance and Engagement Committee, at their March 1, 2017 meeting adopted a motion to recommend to the Board of Directors approval that Douglas W. Rex continue to serve as acting executive director and to fulfill the duties of that position until the vacancy is filled. The Performance and Engagement Committee as part of its motion also recommended an increase in his salary to the current level of the executive director salary and provision of a car allowance equal to the executive director’s during this period while serving as acting executive director, with such pay to be retroactive to January 1, 2017, stipulating that salary and benefits would return to current levels once the vacancy is filled.

SUMMARY
Jennifer Schaufele tendered her resignation as DRCOG executive director effective February 17, 2017.

The Executive Policies approved by the Board state, under Section 5 – Fiscal Management and Controls, sub-section 5.8 that “[i]n the absence of the Executive Director, the Director of Transportation Planning and Operations signs on behalf of the Executive Director....” Additionally, under Section 7 – Immediate Succession, sub-section 7.1 states “[t]o protect the Board from sudden loss of Executive Director services, the Executive Director shall have at least one other member of the management team familiar with Board and DRCOG issues and processes.” Jennifer Schaufele had designated Doug Rex for that role and he has been serving in that role during Ms. Schaufele’s leave and since her resignation. While the Executive Policies are self-executing, it is appropriate for operational continuity that this succession be confirmed while the process for filling the vacancy is ongoing.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A
PROPOSED MOTION
Move to approve Douglas W. Rex to continue to serve as acting executive director and to fulfill the duties of that position until such time as the vacancy is filled, and to increase his salary to the current level of the executive director salary and provide a car allowance equal to the executive director’s during this period while serving as acting executive director, with such pay to be retroactive to January 1, 2017, stipulating that salary and benefits would return to current levels once the vacancy is filled.

ATTACHMENT
Executive Policies

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org, or Roxie Ronsen, Administrative Officer, at 303-480-6709 or rronsen@drcog.org
Executive Policies

The following Executive Policies are contained in this document:

1. GENERAL EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CONSTRAINT
2. TREATMENT OF CITIZENS, TAXPAYERS, STAFF AND VOLUNTEERS
3. COMPENSATION, BENEFITS, EMPLOYMENT
4. FINANCIAL PLANNING AND BUDGET
5. FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND CONTROLS
6. PROTECTION OF ASSETS
7. IMMEDIATE SUCCESSION
8. COMMUNICATIONS WITH AND SUPPORT OF THE BOARD
Executive Policies

Executive policies provide the necessary guidance for the Executive Director to effectively lead the organization toward progressing the goals and priorities of DRCOG. Executive Policies state conditions that must exist in order to achieve organizational strategic initiatives. Executive Polices prevent the goals from being achieved through means that create liabilities for the organization. For purposes of this document, the term “Board” refers to the entire DRCOG Board of Directors and their alternates acting as such.

1. GENERAL EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CONSTRAINT

1.1 Within the scope of authority delegated to him/her by the Board, the Executive Director shall ensure that any practice, activity, decision or organizational circumstance is lawful and prudent and adheres to commonly accepted business and professional ethics. The Executive Director shall ensure that conditions are safe, fair, honest, respectful and dignified.

2. TREATMENT OF CITIZENS, TAXPAYERS, STAFF, INTERNS, AND VOLUNTEERS

The success of DRCOG depends upon the partnership between the Board, agencies, jurisdictions, citizens, taxpayers, elected officials and DRCOG employees.

The Executive Director shall ensure:

2.1 Community opinion/input on relevant issues is obtained when decisions materially affect a community.
2.2 Communities are informed on a timely basis about relevant decision-making processes and decisions.
2.3 Interactions with the community are organized and clear.
2.4 Relevant problems raised by the community are addressed in a timely manner.
2.5 Staff is competent, respectful and effective in interactions with the Board, public, etc.
2.6 Confidential information is protected from unauthorized disclosure.

Accordingly, pertaining to paid staff, interns and volunteers within the scope of his/her authority, the Executive Director shall ensure:

2.7 Written personnel policies and/or procedures, approved by legal counsel, which clarify personnel rules for staff, provide for effective handling of grievances, and protect against wrongful conditions are in effect.
2.8 Staff, interns and volunteers are acquainted with their rights upon entering and during their work/time with DRCOG.
2.9 Avenues are available for non-disruptive internal expressions of dissent, and protected activities are not subject to retaliation.
2.10 Established grievance procedures are readily available and accessible to staff. The Board is appropriately apprised of violations of Board policies and of matters affecting the Board.
3. COMPENSATION, BENEFITS, EMPLOYMENT

With respect to employment, compensation, and benefits to employees, consultants, contract workers and volunteers, the Executive Director shall ensure:

3.1 The fiscal integrity of DRCOG is maintained.

Accordingly, the Executive Director shall ensure:

3.2 His/her own compensation is approved by the Performance and Engagement Committee according to adopted procedures.
3.3 Compensation and benefits are consistent with wage data compiled in DRCOG’s regular independent salary survey and approved in the annual budget.
3.4 Adherence to appropriate employment law practices.
3.5 Deferred or long-term compensation and benefits are not established.

4. FINANCIAL PLANNING AND BUDGET

With respect to strategic planning for projects, services and activities with a fiscal impact, the Executive Director shall ensure:

4.1 The programmatic and fiscal integrity of DRCOG is maintained.

Accordingly, the Executive Director shall ensure:

4.2 Budgets and financial planning are aligned to Board-adopted strategic initiatives.
4.3 Financial solvency is maintained by projecting in two- to five-year increments, in addition to annual budgeting.
4.4 Financial practices are consistent with any applicable constitutional and statutory requirements.
4.5 Adherence to Board-adopted strategic initiatives in its allocation among competing budgetary needs.
4.6 Adequate information is available to enable: Credible projections of revenues and expenses; separation of capital and operational items; cash flow projections; audit trails; identification of reserves, designations and undesignated fund balances; and disclosure of planning assumptions.
4.7 During any fiscal year, plans for expenditures match plans for revenues.
4.8 Maintain at a minimum 3 months of operating expenses, excluding amounts for in-kind and pass-through expense or as recommended by the independent auditor.
4.9 A budget Contingency Plan is capable of responding to significant shortfalls with the DRCOG budget.
4.10 No risks are present based on situations described in the Fiscal Management Control Policy.
4.11 Board activities during the year have been adequately funded.
4.12 Reserves and designations are available according to applicable constitutional and statutory requirements and “Generally Accepted Accounting Principles” consistently applied.
5. FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND CONTROLS

With respect to the actual, ongoing financial condition of DRCOG, the Executive Director shall ensure:

5.1 Board-adopted strategic initiatives are adhered to and financial controls prevent fiscal jeopardy.
5.2 Funds for expenditures are available during each fiscal year.
5.3 DRCOG obligations are paid in a timely manner and within the ordinary course of business.
5.4 Prudent protection is given against conflicts of interest in purchasing and other financial practices, consistent with the law and established in DRCOG Fiscal Management Control Policy.
5.5 Funds are used for their intended purpose.
5.6 Competitive purchasing policies and procedures are in effect to ensure openness and accessibility to contract opportunities.
5.7 Purchases, contracts and obligations which may be authorized by the Executive Director do not exceed the financial authority approved by the Finance and Budget Committee. Purchases, contracts and obligations exceeding the Executive Director’s authority are approved by the Finance and Budget Committee.
5.8 In the absence of the Executive Director, the Director of Transportation Planning and Operations signs on behalf of the Executive Director. If the Executive Director and Director of Transportation Planning and Operations are unavailable for a signature, the Administrative Officer provides authorizing signatures.
5.9 Adequate internal controls over receipts and disbursements prevent the material dissipation of assets.
5.10 DRCOG’s audit is independent and external monitoring or advice is readily accepted and available.
5.11 Revenue sources are consistent with the Board-adopted strategic initiatives and operations are financed without incurring debt that exceeds the Executive Director’s authority unless approved by the Finance and Budget Committee.
5.12 Reserved, designated and undesignated fund balances are at adequate levels to mitigate the risk of current and future revenue shortfalls or unanticipated expenditures.
5.13 Creditworthiness and financial position are maintained from unforeseen emergencies.

6. PROTECTION OF ASSETS

Within the scope of his/her authority in the Executive Director and given available resources, the Executive Director shall ensure:

6.1 Assets are protected and adequately maintained against unnecessary risk.
6.2 An insurance program exists to protect DRCOG in the event of a property and/or liability loss, including coverage insuring the Board, officers, employees, authorized volunteers and DRCOG against liabilities relating to the performance of their duties and DRCOG’s activities in an amount equal to or greater than the average for comparable organizations and, for tort liabilities, in an amount equal to
greater than statutory limits on amounts DRCOG may be legally obligated to pay.

6.3 A policy exists to insure against employee dishonesty and theft.

6.4 Facilities and/or equipment are used properly and maintained (except normal deterioration and financial conditions beyond the Executive Director’s control.)

6.5 Practices and policies are in place for DRCOG, Board and staff to minimize or prevent liability claims.

6.6 A policy exists to ensure protection from loss or significant damage of intellectual property (including intellectual property developed using DRCOG resources), information, files.

6.7 Internal control standards for the receipt, processing and disbursements of funds are at adequate levels to satisfy generally accepted accounting/auditing standards and costs for internal controls shall be consistent with the benefits expected.

6.8 DRCOG’s public image, credibility, and its ability to accomplish Board-adopted strategic initiatives goals are upheld.

6.9 Adequate planning is done for short and long-term capital or facility needs.

6.10 Board auditors or other external monitors or advisors are independent from internal influence.

7. IMMEDIATE SUCCESSION

7.1 To protect the Board from sudden loss of Executive Director services, the Executive Director shall have at least one other member of the management team familiar with Board and DRCOG issues and processes.

8. COMMUNICATIONS WITH AND SUPPORT OF THE BOARD

The Executive Director shall ensure:

8.1 The Board is informed and supported in its work.

8.2 The Board is provided complete, clear information for the accomplishment of its job.

8.3 The Board is informed in a timely manner about relevant events and issues regardless of reporting/monitoring schedule.

8.4 Required reports to the Board are submitted in a timely, accurate, and understandable fashion.

8.5 The Board is aware of actual or anticipated non-compliance with Board-adopted strategic initiatives or Executive Policies.

8.6 The Board is provided decision information it requests, information on relevant trends, or other points of view, issues and options for well-informed Board decisions.

8.7 The Board is aware of incidental information it requires, including anticipated adverse media coverage or material external and internal/organizational changes. Notification of planned, non-personnel-related internal changes is provided in advance when feasible.

8.8 In consultation with legal counsel, Board is appropriately apprised of pending or threatened litigation.
8.9 The Board is informed when the Board is not in compliance with its own policies, particularly in the case of the Board behavior that is detrimental to the work relationship between the Board and the Executive Director.

8.10 Information provided to the Board is not overly complex or lengthy.
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February 15, 2017 – Deleted reference to Administrative Committee and changed to Performance and Engagement Committee and Finance and Budget Committee, as appropriate.
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 # |
--------------|----------------|--------------|
March 15, 2017 | Action | 11 |

**SUBJECT**

This item is related to soliciting interest for serving as a member of the Finance and Budget or Performance and Engagement committees. Interest is also solicited for serving as a member on the Regional Transportation Committee.

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**

Solicit interest from members to serve on the Finance and Budget Committee, Performance and Engagement Committee, and Regional Transportation Committee.

**ACTION BY OTHERS**

N/A

**SUMMARY**

In April 2016, the Board of Directors appointed members to the Finance and Budget and Performance and Engagement committees. Half of the initial appointments made were for one year, to establish staggered two-year appointments to the committees. The Nominating Committee will meet and recommend appointees at the April Board meeting for new two-year terms to begin in May.

Additionally, interest is being solicited for two members to participate on the Regional Transportation Committee. The Board Chair and Vice Chair serve as Chair and Vice Chair of the Regional Transportation Committee. Two additional members are needed, as well as alternates. Previously these appointments were made from the Metro Vision Issues Committee. Two members and a minimum of four alternates will be selected at the April Board meeting to serve on the Regional Transportation Committee.

Statements of interest for serving on any of the committees should be submitted in writing to Connie Garcia, Board Coordinator, no later than March 29, 2017.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**

N/A

**PROPOSED MOTION**

Move to open solicitation of interest for serving on the Performance and Engagement, Finance and Budget, and Regional Transportation committees.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Current Finance and Budget and Performance and Engagement committee member lists, with 1-year terms highlighted.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director, at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Connie Garcia, Executive Assistant/Board Coordinator at 303-480-6701 or cgarcia@drcog.org.
DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
FINANCE AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
March 2017

Jeff Baker
Commissioner
Arapahoe County

Elise Jones
Commissioner
Boulder County

Crissy Fanganello
Mayor’s Representative
City & County of Denver

Roger Partridge
Commissioner
Douglas County

Libby Szabo
Commissioner
Jefferson County

Wynne Shaw
Mayor Pro Tem
Lone Tree

Ashley Stolzmann
Council Member
Louisville

Connie Sullivan
Mayor
Lyons

Doris Truhlar
Council Member
Centennial

Joan Peck
Council Member
Longmont

John Diak**
Council Member
Parker

Rita Dozal
Trustee
Superior

**Committee chair
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>March 15, 2017</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
This item concerns updates to the status of bills previously acted on by the Board at its February meeting.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
No action requested.

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
The attached matrix updates the status of all bills previously acted upon by the Board as of March 8. Staff can provide more detailed updates on the bills as requested by the Board.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
The Board took positions on these bills at the January and February Board meetings.

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
Status of Bills—2017 Session

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Should you have any questions regarding the bills, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations, at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Rich Mauro, Senior Policy & Legislative Analyst, at 303-480-6778 or rmauro@drcog.org.
# Denver Regional Council of Governments

## Status of Bills--2017 Session

As of 3-8-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Short Title/Bill Summary</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>Staff Comments</th>
<th>Legislative Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGING BILLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 17-011</strong></td>
<td>Study Transportation Access For People With Disabilities - The bill creates a technical demonstration forum to study and document how advanced technologies can improve transportation access for people with disabilities.</td>
<td>Lambert/Lawrence</td>
<td>Passed Both Houses</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>To demonstrate the transportation access needs of people with disabilities in both urban and rural areas of the state, the forum is directed to study the transportation access needs of people with disabilities in El Paso and Teller counties and explore technological and transportation business solutions that could increase transportation access for people with disabilities in those areas.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports the following: A system that effectively and efficiently coordinates the resources and delivery of transportation services between providers, the federal government, counties, RTD, and the state; increased funding for transportation services for older adults and persons with disabilities; and increased state funding for Medicaid transportation services for older adults and persons with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **HB 17-1087** | Public Guardianship Pilot Program - The bill creates the office of public guardianship as a pilot program within the Judicial Department to provide legal guardianship services to indigent and incapacitated adults who have no responsible family members or friends who are available and appropriate to serve as a guardian; and lack adequate resources to compensate a private guardian and pay the costs and fees associated with an appointment proceeding. | Young/Lundberg | House Appropriations | Support | FN | This bill addresses a need in the care industry that has been a concern for a long time. It is the result of a stakeholder process that has been working since a report on the issues in 20114. The pilot program will operate in three judicial districts - Ninth (Denver), Seventh (Montrose) and Sixteenth (Otero). | DRCOG supports increases in the quality of care and consumer protections for older adults and their caregivers. |

**NOTE:** "FN" indicates a link to the bill's fiscal note when available.
### TRANSPORTATION BILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Short Title/Bill Summary</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>Staff Comments</th>
<th>Legislative Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 17-1018</td>
<td><strong>Extend Voter Approval Window For RTA Regional Transportation Authority Mill Levy</strong></td>
<td>Mitsch Bush &amp; Liston/Gardner</td>
<td>Signed by the Governor</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>This bill was introduced last session but failed to pass. DRCOG supported the bill.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports legislation that promotes efforts to create and fund a multimodal transportation system. DRCOG supports funding for programs that provide transportation for “access to jobs” for low-income workers who cannot afford to live near where they work, and for safe routes to schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Current law authorizes a regional transportation authority to seek voter approval for a uniform mill levy of up to 5 mills on all taxable property within its territory, but the authorization is scheduled to repeal on January 1, 2019. The bill extends the authorization until January 1, 2029.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 17-1031</td>
<td><strong>Hearings On Transportation Commission Districts</strong> - Transportation Legislation Review Committee. The bill requires the TLRC to meet 5 times before November 15, 2017, once in each geographic quadrant of the state and once in the Denver metropolitan area, to: Make available to meeting attendees the 2016 Legislative Council Staff research study of changes to the state transportation commission districts since the boundaries of the districts were last redrawn in 1991; and Offer opportunities to members of the public to express their opinions regarding the districts or the research study and offer comments and suggestions regarding whether the districts should be modified.</td>
<td>Carver &amp; Mitsch-Bush/Todd</td>
<td>House Appropriations</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>The 2016 report was prepared with the cooperation of CDOT as required by House Bill 16-103. This bill is the response of the TLRC to get public input. DRCOG had a position of “Actively Monitor” a similar bill last year.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports legislation that reinforces collaboration between state and regional transportation agencies and recognizes their respective roles, responsibilities and interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title/Bill Summary</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 17-153</td>
<td>Southwest Chief And Front Range Passenger Rail Commission - The bill replaces the existing Southwest Chief rail line, the statutory authorization for which expires on 7-1-17, with an expanded Southwest Chief and Front Range Passenger Rail Commission (new commission).</td>
<td>Crowder &amp; Garcia/Esgar</td>
<td>House Transportation (3-22)</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>The new commission must: assume the old commission's powers, duties and mission of preserving existing Amtrak rail line service in the state, extending such service to Pueblo, and exploring the benefits of extending such service to Walsenburg; and facilitate the future of front range passenger rail and specifically present to the legislature by 12-1-17, draft legislation to facilitate the development of a front range passenger rail system that provides passenger rail service in and along the interstate 25 corridor. MPOs, including DRCOG, have representation on the commission.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports legislation that reinforces collaboration between state and regional transportation agencies and recognizes their respective roles, responsibilities and interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title/Bill Summary</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 17-1153</td>
<td>Highway Congestion Mitigation - The bill clarifies that HOV lanes are lanes on which a vehicle carrying 2 or more individuals, including the driver, may travel and that HOV lanes are lanes on which a vehicle carrying fewer than 2 individuals, including the driver, must pay a toll. The bill also raises the priority of currently unfunded projects to expand the capacity of I-25 between Castle Rock and Monument and between SH-14 and SH-66 by requiring: • CDOT to put the high priority projects above all other unfunded projects on its priority list; • all federal money received by CDOT that the federal government does not require to be allocated for other projects and that CDOT has not previously allocated for other projects to be used to fund the high priority projects before being used to fund other projects; and • any environmental or other studies required to be completed before the projects may begin to be completed no later than 6 months following the effective date of the bill.</td>
<td>Williams &amp; McKean/ Gardner</td>
<td>House Transportation (3-8)</td>
<td>Oppose FN</td>
<td>This bill dedicates future federal funding solely to I-25 (outside of the planning process). CDOT says it would cause them to divert funding from maintenance of the system. It also changes the requirement for high occupancy vehicle lanes from 3+ persons in the vehicle to 2+ persons. This contradicts legal and contractual requirements on CDOT.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports regional and statewide efforts at consensus-building and will work to pursue multimodal transportation solutions. DRCOG supports using the regional and statewide transportation planning processes to explore and identify transportation solutions and will evaluate state legislative and administrative actions for consistency with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title/Bill Summary</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 17-1171</td>
<td>Authorize New Transportation Revenue Anticipation Notes - Requires the Transportation Commission to submit a ballot question to the voters at the November 2017 election which, if approved, would authorize the state to issue additional transportation revenue anticipation notes for the purpose of addressing critical priority transportation needs in the state; and dedicating ten percent of state sales and use tax net revenue for state transportation purposes and one percent of such revenue less ten million dollars for other capital construction purposes.</td>
<td>Buck &amp; Carver/ House State Affairs/ House Finance/ House Appropriations (3-29)</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>This bill is essentially the reinstatement of a statutory appropriation of General Fund revenues (sales tax) similar to Senate Bill 97-001. Ever since the SB-001 mechanism was repealed in 2009, DRCOG has expressed concerns about transportation funding bills, such as the TRANS bills of the last two years, that did not include new sources of revenue. Especially when the state is in TABOR rebate situation, removal of such a significant amount from the General Fund would mean major cuts in other programs, such as education, health care and possibly services for seniors.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports legislation that promotes efforts to create and fund a multimodal transportation system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOUSING BILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Short Title/Bill Summary</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>Staff Comments</th>
<th>Legislative Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 17-045</td>
<td>Construction Defect Claim Allocation Of Defense Costs - In a construction defect action in which more than one insurer has a duty to defend a party, the bill requires the court to apportion the costs of defense, including reasonable attorney fees, among all insurers with a duty to defend. An initial order apportioning costs must be made within 90 days after an insurer files its claim for contribution, and the court must make a final apportionment of costs after entry of a final judgment resolving all of the underlying claims against the insured. An insurer seeking contribution may also make a claim against an insured or additional insured who chose not to procure liability insurance for a period of time relevant to the underlying action. A claim for contribution may be assigned and does not affect any insurer's duty to defend.</td>
<td>Grantham &amp; Williams A. / Duran &amp; Wist</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>This bill (sponsored by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House) is an attempt to reduce the insurance costs associated with owner-occupied affordable housing projects. The Metro Caucus had a discussion about the bill with the Speaker at its annual retreat where it was noted the bill does not address concerns with litigation issues.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports an adequate supply and mix of housing options, including actions to provide more accessible and obtainable housing options for older adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 17-155</td>
<td>Statutory Definition Of Construction Defect - The bill separately defines and clarifies the term &quot;construction defect&quot; in the &quot;Construction Defect Action Reform Act&quot;.</td>
<td>Tate / Saine</td>
<td>Senate Business, Labor and Technology</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>&quot;Construction defect&quot; is defined as a defect in the design or construction of any improvement to real property that causes any damages to, or the loss of use of, real or personal property; or personal injury.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports an adequate supply and mix of housing options, including actions to provide more accessible and obtainable housing options for older adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title/Bill Summary</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 17-</td>
<td>Homeowners’ Association Construction Defect Lawsuit Approval Timelines</td>
<td>Hill/ Saine &amp; Wist</td>
<td>Passed Senate</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Before a construction defect claim is filed on behalf of the association: the parties must submit the matter to mediation before a neutral third party; and the board must give advance notice to all unit owners, together with a disclosure of the projected costs, duration, and financial impact of the construction defect claim, and must obtain the written consent of the owners of units to which at least a majority of the votes in the association are allocated.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports an adequate supply and mix of housing options, including actions to provide more accessible and obtainable housing options for older adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 17-</td>
<td>Construction Defect Litigation Builder's Right To Repair</td>
<td>Leonard/ Tate</td>
<td>Postponed</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>This bill addresses one of the issues of concern regarding construction litigation.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports an adequate supply and mix of housing options, including actions to provide more accessible and obtainable housing options for older adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indefinitely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title/Bill Summary</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 17-040</td>
<td>Public Access To Government Files - The bill modifies the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) with respect to digital or electronic records. It requires custodians of public records to provide records in a structured data format, when requested. Structured data means digital data capable of being automatically read, processed, or manipulated by a computer, and it includes data in relational databases and spreadsheets. If digital records are searchable, custodians must provide them in that format, when requested. Nothing in the bill requires custodians to provide digital records in their native format, meaning the format in which they were created or are stored on the custodian's computer or server. The bill does provide certain exceptions.</td>
<td>Kefalas/ Pabon</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations (3-14)</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>From DRCOG's attorney: Our main concern with this bill is the additional administrative burden it places on the custodian to provide structured data to requestors, or provide a declaration why the custodian is not able to provide the records in the requested format. The bill also authorizes a requestor to legally challenge an alleged failure to provide documents as structured data, and this is another type of claim for which there is a “one-way” attorney fee shifting provision against the public entity. Also, while the custodian is not required to convert a record into structured data or searchable format, the custodian must make inquiries within the agency to determine if this can be done. In a larger organization, this means the custodian may end up spending considerable time trying to track down whether a record exists in, or can be readily converted to, the requested form. DRCOG would have a right to charge a fee for “programming, coding, or custom search queries so as to convert a record into a structured data or searchable format,” but the administrative burden in responding to structured data CORA requests may be significant.</td>
<td>No specific Board adopted policy. But DRCOG, as a public entity, is subject to CORA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 17-057</td>
<td>Colorado Healthcare Affordability &amp; Sustainability Enterprise - The bill creates the Colorado Healthcare Affordability and Sustainability Enterprise (enterprise) as a replacement for the current Hospital Provider Fee.</td>
<td>Guzman/</td>
<td>Senate Finance</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>The new enterprise would be exempt from TABOR and so long as it qualifies as a TABOR exempt enterprise, fee revenue does not count against either the TABOR state fiscal year spending limit or the referendum C cap, the higher statutory state fiscal year spending limit established after the voters of the state approved referendum C in 2005. This would make additional revenues available for the state budget.</td>
<td>No specific Board policy on the Hospital Provider Fee issue but there are Board policies in support of increased funding for transportation and aging services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>March 15, 2017</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
This item concerns adoption of positions on state legislative bills as presented by staff.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Motions to adopt positions on bills presented.

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
The attachment summarizes the bills introduced since the February Board meeting relative to the Board adopted Policy Statement on State Legislative Issues.

The bills are presented with staff comments and staff recommended positions.

Any bills of interest introduced after March 8 will be emailed to Board members by the Monday before the meeting with staff recommendations for review at the meeting (per current Board policy).

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
New Bills—2017 Session

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Should you have any questions regarding the bills, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning & Operations, at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Rich Mauro, Senior Policy & Legislative Analyst, at 303-480-6778 or rmauro@drcog.org.
## Aging Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Short Title/Bill Summary</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommended Position</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>Staff Comments</th>
<th>Legislative Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1191</td>
<td>Demographic Notes for Certain Legislative Bills - The bill requires the staff of the</td>
<td>KC Becker &amp; Herod/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This bill relates to the fiscal notes for bills produced by Legislative Council</td>
<td>It is appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legislative council to prepare demographic notes on legislative bills in each regular</td>
<td>House Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff has estimated they would hire one FTE to implement the bill. DRCOG staff</td>
<td>for state agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title/Bill Summary</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Recommended Position</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 205</td>
<td>Multimodal Transportation Infrastructure Funding - This bill requires the state Transportation Commission to submit a ballot question to the voters at the November 2017, 2018. It would increase the state sales and use tax from 2.9% to 3.15% to back a new round of TRANs bonds, with a 20 year repayment period. Any money left over after paying the bonds must be used on state transportation projects. At least $500 million of TRANs proceeds shall be used only for passenger rail service in the interstate 25 corridor and the remaining TRANs proceeds shall be used only to fund projects on CDOT’s “priority list” (the Strategic Transportation Project Investment Program) for, which would include “at least ten percent for transit-related capital improvements.”</td>
<td>Kefalas/ Rosenthal</td>
<td>Senate Transportation</td>
<td>Board Direction Requested</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>This is the third transportation funding bill introduced so far and the second providing for a new round of TRANs bonding. The Board has opposed the other two bills - HB1153 and HB1171. One difference with this bill is it creates a new, dedicated funding source: an increase of .25% in the state sales tax. At the same time, House and Senate leadership are discussing the elements of a possible bipartisan bill to refer to the voters.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports legislation that promotes efforts to create and fund a multimodal transportation system. DRCOG supports regional and statewide efforts at consensus-building and will work to pursue multimodal transportation solutions. DRCOG supports using the regional and statewide transportation planning processes to explore and identify transportation solutions and will evaluate state legislative and administrative actions for consistency with this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title/Bill Summary</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Recommended Position</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 213</td>
<td>Automated Driving Motor Vehicles - Expressly authorizes the use of automated driving systems if the system is capable of conforming to every state and federal law applying to driving. If not, a person testing a system is required to coordinate with the Colorado state patrol and the Colorado Department of Transportation. Also declares that the regulation of automated driving systems is a matter of statewide concern, and, therefore, local authorities are prohibited from regulating these systems. Specifically, it prohibits municipalities from any actions that &quot;burden, regulate or prohibit.&quot; Also clarifies that this law supersedes any authority otherwise granted to local governments under C.R.S. Section 42-4-111 which has to do with the general regulation of vehicles and traffic.</td>
<td>Hill &amp; Moreno/Winter &amp; Bridges</td>
<td>Senate Transportation</td>
<td>Board Direction Requested</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>A range of connected and autonomous vehicles are expected to soon be available to the public. While this raises the prospect for new and exciting mobility options, as these vehicles become commonplace, they may dramatically transform every aspect of livability in the communities in which they are driven – for better or for worse. While these vehicles bring the possibility of improved safety, reduced congestion, reduced parking demand and a route to faster adoption of electric vehicles, it has been suggested that these benefits could be undermined by widespread individual ownership and dramatic increases in vehicle miles traveled. CML has a position to oppose the bill unless amended on the basis the bill usurps local control. CCI has not taken up the bill yet. Also, staff has heard concerns the bill does not contain mechanisms to ensure or even encourage clean-fueled and safe vehicles that do not sacrifice the safety of other modes of travel, that are shared and accessible and that lead to a decrease in parking demand and vehicle miles driven when compared to conventional vehicles.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports building consensus among state, local and regional entities in developing and implementing new and existing programs and improved approaches to planning and service provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HOUSING BILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Short Title/Bill Summary</th>
<th>Sponsors</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Recommended Position</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>Staff Comments</th>
<th>Legislative Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HB 1159</td>
<td>Remedies for Forcible Entry and Detainer - The bill adds to the current descriptions of forcible detainer: the act of a person preventing an owner from access to or possession of property by locking or changing the lock on the property. The bill creates a procedure for the plaintiff to seek a temporary, mandatory injunction giving the plaintiff possession of the property if a complaint for forcible entry or detainer is filed. The procedure requires the plaintiff to store any personal property found on the property but allows the plaintiff to recover the costs of the storage. The bill establishes as new crimes related to forcible entry and detainer the crimes of unlawful occupancy and unlawful reentry.</td>
<td>J. Becker/ Cooke</td>
<td>Housie Judiciary &amp; House Appropriations</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Staff is concerned about the effect this bill could have on persons with disabilities and Older Coloradans. This bill allows a landlord to shortcut the eviction judicial process by obtaining a court order that would give the landlord possession of a property before a tenant can offer their perspective at an eviction hearing. It expands the legal definition of forcible entry and detainer. And it creates two new crimes—unlawful occupancy and unlawful reentry—that would be punishable by a fine as high as $25,000. This bill seems odd as there already are laws to address both forcible entry and detainer and trespassing. It seems targeted at homeless squatters but also has raised concerns about adversely impacting domestic violence victims. A fast track eviction process would be particularly harmful for people who need time to gather medications or medical equipment, circumstance that could be life threatening. Also, find another accessible, affordable living space without notice is almost impossible.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports actions to provide more accessible and obtainable housing options for seniors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title/Bill Summary</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Recommended Position</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 157</td>
<td>Construction Defects Action Notice Vote Approval - This bill provides that, before a homeowners' association (HOA) can bring a lawsuit against a developer or builder in a construction defect case, the HOA's executive board first obtain approval from a majority of the unit owners. In seeking prior approval, the bill details various disclosures that must be made to unit owners, including details about the lawsuit, and its potential costs and benefits. The bill limits the amount and type of contact that a developer who is subject to the lawsuit may have with the unit owners in the HOA. Prior approval by unit owners is not required for cases in which the alleged construction damages are valued under $100,000.</td>
<td>A. Williams/ Melton</td>
<td>Senate Business Affairs</td>
<td>Board Direction Requested</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Yet another construction litigation bill, this one also addresses an important issue but does not address construction litigation in a comprehensive manner.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports an adequate supply and mix of housing options, including actions to provide more accessible and obtainable housing options for older adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Short Title/Bill Summary</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Recommended Position</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Staff Comments</td>
<td>Legislative Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB 1187</td>
<td>Change Excess State Revenues Cap Growth Factor</td>
<td>Thurlow/Crowder</td>
<td>House Floor</td>
<td>Board Direction Requested</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>This is a bill to change the TABOR spending calculation. It would replace the inflation + population growth formula with a rolling five year average of annual personal income growth. Proponents argue personal income is a better measure of growth or retraction in the economy. Opponents argue it is just a clever way to allow government to grow more. This change would only take affect if the voters approve it at the November 2017 election. CML supports it; CCI hasn’t taken it up yet. The Denver Post has editorialized in support. The Denver Metro Chamber and the North Front Range Chamber both support the bill. The Fiscal Note reports that’s during the period 2011-2019, the personal income measure would be lower than the inflation + population measure three times. It also estimates the bill would reduce TABOR refund obligations for FY17-8 and FY18-19. This in turn would increase General Fund transfers to the Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF) and the Capital Construction Fund (CCF) by $116.4 million and $58.2 million, respectively, for FY 2018-19. Staff also believes the bill could have the effect of reducing pressures to balance the budget by cutting state programs, such as State Funding for Senior Services.</td>
<td>DRCOG supports increased funding for programs providing services to older adults, persons with disabilities, and their caregivers, especially services that support individuals continuing to live independently in their homes and communities. DRCOG supports increased funding for transportation to preserve the system, address congestion and safety, and provide multi-modal options for people of all ages, incomes and abilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>March 15, 2017</td>
<td>Informational Briefing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT  

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

ACTION BY OTHERS  
N/A

SUMMARY  
Every four years the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conduct a joint review of the transportation planning process carried out by DRCOG and its planning partners, the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Regional Transportation District (RTD).

The review process began in November 2015 with the release of a questionnaire packet. DRCOG staff coordinated the preparation of responses to the questions, which were submitted to FHWA in January 2016. A public meeting was held in March and the final certification review report was provided to DRCOG in December 2016.

The report highlights recommendations required to completely implement activities and guidance set by federal agencies; recommendations to enrich current planning activities; and commendations noted during the review.

A summary of the planning certification review will be presented by FHWA and FTA staff at the March meeting.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS  
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION  
N/A

ATTACHMENTS  
1. Federal Planning Certification Review of the Denver-Aurora Transportation Management Area (December 19, 2016)  
2. Certification compliance letter from FHWA (December 19, 2016)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations at 303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org.
Federal Planning Certification Review

Denver-Aurora Transportation Management Area

Prepared by:

Federal Highway Administration, Colorado Division

Federal Transit Administration, Region 8

Report Issued December 19, 2016
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Foreword

Pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 134(k)(5) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(k)(5), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) must jointly certify the metropolitan transportation planning process carried out in Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) at least every four years. A TMA is an urbanized area with a population of over 200,000, as defined by the U.S. Census. In general, the reviews consist of three primary activities: review of planning products, a site visit, and preparation of a report that summarizes the review and offers findings. The reviews focus on compliance with Federal regulations, challenges, successes, and experiences of the cooperative relationship between the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), State Department of Transportation (DOT), and transit operator in the conduct of the metropolitan planning process. Joint FTA/FHWA certification review guidelines provide agency field reviewers with latitude and flexibility to tailor the review to reflect local issues and needs.

The certification review process is only one of several methods used to assess the quality of a local metropolitan planning process, compliance with applicable statutes and regulations, and the level and type of technical assistance needed to enhance the effectiveness of the planning process. Other activities provide opportunities for this type of review and comment, including Unified Planning Work Program approval, the regional transportation plan, Metropolitan and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program Findings, and air quality conformity determinations. A range of other formal and less formal contacts provide both FHWA and FTA opportunities to comment on the planning process. The results of these other processes are considered in the certification review process.

While the planning certification review report itself may not fully document those many intermediate and ongoing checkpoints, the "finding" of the certification review is, in fact, based upon the cumulative activities of all the metropolitan planning partners throughout the planning process.

The review process is individually tailored to focus on topics of significance in each metropolitan planning area. Federal reviewers prepare certification reports to document the results of the review process. The reports and final actions are the joint responsibility of the appropriate FHWA and FTA field offices and content will vary to reflect the planning process reviewed.

To encourage public understanding and input, FHWA/FTA will continue to improve the clarity and documentation of the certification review reports.
Executive Summary

In 2016 the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Colorado Division and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) region VIII conducted the certification review of the transportation planning process for the Denver-Aurora urbanized area administered by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG). FHWA and FTA are required to jointly review and evaluate the transportation planning process for each urbanized area over 200,000 in population at least every four years to determine if the process meets the Federal planning requirements. The first certification review for the Denver-Aurora metropolitan area was conducted in 2001 followed up by reviews in 2004, 2008 and 2012.

2016 Denver Metropolitan Planning Certification

As a part of this review, FHWA and FTA document the findings identified for the transportation planning process conducted by the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), the DRCOG, and the Regional Transportation District (RTD) within the Denver-Aurora Region. Findings are statements of fact that define the conditions found during the data-gathering activities of the review. These statements provide the primary basis for determining the actions (Required Recommendations, Recommendations, or Commendations) contained in the Certification Report. See page 10 for details on what required recommendations, recommendations and commendations mean.
### Required Recommendation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Recommendation</th>
<th>Federal Regulation</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Planning for the FCRTP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The revised 2040 Financial Plan must be finalized by DRCOG, and made publicly available. Similarly, the 2045 Financial Plan should provide the foundation for financial transparency, precision, and consistency throughout all of DRCOG’s planning documents and processes.</td>
<td>23 CFR 450.324 (f)(11)(ii)</td>
<td>The 2040 Financial Plan should go through the DRCOG approval process and be published in a publicly accessible location in a timely fashion. In addition, the 2045 Financial Plan needs to be developed in association with the 2045 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan and provide the foundation for financial information within all subsequent planning documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Planning MOA between DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD must document the cooperative development of funding estimates for the Financial Plan for the MVRTP and TIP. The Planning MOA between DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD needs to document the specific procedures of the cooperatively agreed upon STIP/TIP Amendments process.</td>
<td>23 CFR 450.314 (a) 23 CFR 450.314 (b) 23 CFR 450.324 (f)(11)(ii) 23 CFR 450.326 (a) 23 CFR 450.326 (p)</td>
<td>This MOA needs to be finalized and signed by all regional planning partners before the 2045 regional transportation plans are developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security in the Planning Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DRCOG needs to clearly identify its role and responsibilities in providing security provisions including to what</td>
<td>23 CFR 450.306 (b) (3) 23 CFR 450.324 (h)</td>
<td>The DRCOG needs to outline its roles and responsibilities when providing security provisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
security considerations in the transportation planning process in the Regional Transportation Plan.

### Public Participation Plan

The DRCOG Public Participation Plan (PPP) needs to evaluate the effectiveness of the public procedures and strategies and incorporate those findings into practice.  

**23 CFR 450.316 (a)(1)(x)**

This revised evaluation process that identifies evaluation outcomes and measures of effectiveness needs be included in the next PPP that will guide the efforts surrounding the 2045 MVRTP development cycle.

### Public Outreach Strategies

The PPP should include explicit procedures, strategies and outcomes for seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services.  

**23 CFR 450.316 (a)(1)(vii)**

The DRCOG PPP for the 2045 MVRTP must incorporate explicit procedures, strategies, and outcomes for seeking out and considering the needs of the traditionally underserved communities by the existing transportation system, such as low-income and minority households.

### Self-Certification and the Americans with Disabilities Act

The DRCOG needs to complete an ADA Program Access Plan that includes a self-evaluation, a demonstration of addressing barriers, and public coordination with stakeholders.  

**23 CFR 450.336 (a)(7)**

The updated *Transportation Planning in the Denver Region* document is expected to show in one location how DRCOG addresses ADA requirements. The ADA Program Access Plan needs to be completed before the end of 2017.

### Congestion Management Process

The DRCOG needs to improve the reporting of the Congestion

**23 CFR 450.322 (d)(2)**

**23 CFR 450.322 (d)(4)**

An update and integration of the identified enhancements to the CMP must be completed before the 2045
Management Process by documenting the impacts of implemented projects and demonstrating the relationship between implemented strategies, effectiveness, and performance objectives.

| 23 CFR 450.322 (d)(6) | MVRTP and TIP update cycles in order to provide multimodal system performance management and strategies. |

**Travel Demand Modeling**

DRCOG needs to work with their regional transportation partners, RTD and CDOT, to further develop and document a standardized process for the calibration and validation of the land-use and transportation forecasting models, including documenting the results of the model calibration and validation process.

| 23 CFR 450.324 (c) | This activity should be completed concurrent with the UPWP activity under land-use modeling and forecasting and transportation modeling and forecasting, and no later than the delivery of the 2045 MVRTP. |
**Transportation Management Area Overview**

**MPO Official Name**

The official name of the Denver metropolitan planning organization is the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG).

**Year Founded**

The DRCOG was founded as an institution in February 1955. It was given Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) designation and responsibilities in 1977.

**Annual Budget**

The DRCOG receives approximately $5,200,000, including local and in-kind match, in combined FHWA and FTA planning dollars through a consolidated planning grant from the CDOT. The DRCOG has programmed their Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to include upwards of $1,000,000,000 in 2016 and $1,500,000,000 in 2017, with rail transit projects in the region are a large portion of these amounts. When those investments are completed, the annual TIP program settles in at around $500,000,000 in FY18 and $361,000,000 in FY19.

**Member Jurisdictions and Number Represented**

**COUNTIES (9)**

- Adams County
- Arapahoe County
- Boulder County
- City and County of Broomfield
- City and County of Denver
- Clear Creek County
- Douglas County
- Jefferson County
- Gilpin County

**MUNICIPALITIES (47)**

- City of Arvada
- City of Aurora
- Town of Bennett
- City of Black Hawk
- City of Boulder
- Town of Bow Mar
- City of Brighton
- Town of Castle Rock
- City of Centennial
- City of Central City
- City of Cherry Hills Village
- Town of Columbine Valley
City of Commerce City  City of Glendale  Town of Mead
City of Dacono  City of Golden  Town of Morrison
Town of Deer Trail  City of Greenwood Village  Town of Nederland
City of Edgewater  City of Idaho Springs  City of Northglenn
Town of Empire  City of Lafayette  Town of Parker
City of Englewood  City of Lakewood  City of Sheridan
Town of Erie  Town of Larkspur  Town of Silver Plume
City of Federal Heights  City of Littleton  Town of Superior
Town of Firestone  City of Lone Tree  City of Thornton
Town of Foxfield  City of Longmont  City of Westminster
Town of Frederick  City of Louisville  City of Wheat Ridge
Town of Georgetown  Town of Lyons

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Headquarters and Regions, the Regional Transportation District (RTD), while non-voting members, are active participants in the transportation planning process. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are non-voting members and provide program oversight and technical assistance.

MPO Area Boundaries

Purple Box = DRCOG TMA Boundary
Yellow/Orange Shade = Urbanized Areas
Blue Lines = Interstate Highways
Population Served

The DRCOG collaborates with 56 member municipalities and counties, along with CDOT and RTD. The entire region contains about 3,100,000 people as of 2015. The population is expected to balloon to over 4,300,000 by 2040. Employment is forecasted to increase from 1,800,000 in 2015 to over 2,400,000 by 2040. The region has 8 cities that have over 100,000 inhabitants. The rest of the jurisdictions range in population from 100,000 to 10,000 or less.

Major Transit Operators

The major transit operator in the region is the Regional Transportation District.

Classification of Findings

Recommendations – Items that, while somewhat less substantial and not regulatory, are still significant enough that FHWA and FTA are hopeful that State, local officials, and transit operators will consider taking some action. Typically, Recommendations involve the state of the practice or technical improvements instead of regulatory requirements.

Required Recommendations – This category identifies activities currently being done to reflect the regulations and guidance set by the federal agencies, but has not been completely implemented, or activities do not yet reflect revised regulations or guidance. While these activities do not seriously diminish the regional planning process, they are in danger of becoming future corrective actions if not remedied within the next certification cycle. Typically, recommendations highlight minor misinterpretations of regulations or guidance and identify inadequate or incomplete procedures or actions taken to accomplish the federal planning requirements.

Recommendations – This category identifies activities that substantially met the requirements of the transportation planning laws and regulations, but have the potential for enhancement. These elements could benefit by adopting proven best practices or other improvements that would noticeably enrich the planning process. In this category, outdated concepts or older procedures that haven’t been recently updated are brought into the spotlight as methods and techniques to handle such have progressed.

Commendations – Elements that demonstrate innovative, highly effective, well-thought out procedures for implementing the planning requirements. Elements addressing items that have frequently posed problems nationwide could be cited as noteworthy practices. Recognizing best practices through Commendations helps build good relations with the region under review and also provides a way to identify and share good practices with other planning agencies through technical assistance.
Commendations

Commendations are activities that the regional planning partners engage in that are innovative, highly effective, and well-thought-out procedures for implementing the planning requirements. Credit is given to significant improvements or resolutions from past findings that are above and beyond compliance with Federal requirements. These features contribute to the general advancement of transportation planning as they can be shared with other agencies around the country.

Travel Demand Modeling Administration

DRCOG has developed a travel demand model process that has undergone significant computational efficiency enhancements that have reduced run-times from weeks to a day or less with the same precision and versatility. Cost savings derived from quicker run times have reduced the demand for staff and technological resources. The timely and cost effective availability of analytical insights from this advanced travel model will likely maximize the use of forecast data by DRCOG planning partners (consistent with the below Recommendation) and contribute to an enhanced transportation planning process in the Denver metropolitan area.

For land use modeling, DRCOG utilizes UrbanSim. It is a microsimulation model that forecasts the location choice behavior of households and firms. The model mimics the behavior of real estate developers, simulating future growth patterns using the current and future regulatory environment as well as the supply and demand conditions of the real estate market. DRCOG’s implementation of UrbanSim has gained national praise for improvements in both the speed of the model and innovations in various modeling components.

DRCOG staff has complemented the UrbanSim model by developing a 3D software package to visualize current and future results. This allows staff to put future growth patterns in context and understand the various density and zoning patterns throughout the region. DRCOG is of the first MPOs to build a 3D model in house to support its planning efforts.

DRCOG is being seen as leading its peers in both land use and economic forecasting. Experts in macroeconomic forecasting, computer programming, and software development enable the agency to produce creative, low-cost solutions for its member governments, stakeholders, and peer organizations.

Planning Partner Relationships

The DRCOG and the regional transportation planning partners have developed and maintained great working relationships that allow interagency collaboration to operate at high levels. Considering the multitude of transportation related agencies the DRCOG works with, having effective communication channels and amicable interactions removes barriers from the process and improves results. These agencies include, but are not limited, air quality agencies, environmental resource agencies, state government, local jurisdictions, county officials, and federal agencies.
Since 2002, DRCOG has partnered with over 50 local and regional partners to purchase high-resolution imagery of the region. In recent years, DRCOG leveraged this successful model of collaboration and joint-fundraising to purchase other valuable datasets that would be cost-prohibitive for any one entity to fund on their own. These data ventures, including detailed elevation (LIDAR) and built-environment (planimetric) data have created a foundation for analysis across our region that is providing insights for such things as bicycle and pedestrian planning, energy efficiency simulations, water runoff studies, urban development scenario planning, and improved emergency response.

DRCOG has also taken steps to empower local planning partners and residents by using local, state, and federal data to tell compelling stories that explain demographic, economic, and transportation topics in our region. DRCOG’s Denver Regional Visual Resources (DRVR) site offers interactive graphics and dynamic webmaps that promote informed decision-making, encourage engagement within communities, and contribute to a broader understanding of key regional issues like a rapidly-aging population and changes in commuting behavior.
Required Recommendations

1) Financial Planning for the 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (FCRTP)

**Basic Requirement:** The metropolitan planning statute states that the long-range transportation plan and TIP [23 U.S.C. 134 (j) (2) (B)] must include "financial plans" that "indicate(s) resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be available to carry out the program" for the purpose of demonstrating fiscal reasonableness of the Plan. These regulations provide, in essence, that a long-range transportation plan can include only projects for which funding "can reasonably be expected to be available" [23 CFR 450.324(f)(ii)(ii)].

**Finding of Federal Review:** During the course of the certification review, DRCOG prepared a revised financial plan supporting the Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (FCRTP) that included a significant amount of financial detail not originally provided, including revenue and cost assumptions based upon historic trends and inflation factor estimates. This document provides a vital link between the financial numbers and how the strategies and projects in the FCRTP can be achieved. Now that the document has been developed, the DRCOG should seek the approval of various committees to accept this information for demonstrating fiscal constraint in the current RTP. It needs to be made publicly available so that the demonstration of federal and state financial accounting can be seen by citizens and decision-makers alike.

The 2045 Financial Plan needs to be developed for inclusion in the final suite of DRCOG’s 2045 planning documents. The financial plan provides a foundation for the presentation of funding sources, cost projections, and accounting in a consistent manner across all the DRCOG plans and documents. One improvement regarding the revenue and cost estimates, as well as comparisons between them, is the disaggregation of totals over the RTP horizon. The planning regulations state that only after the first 10 years of the planning horizon can the financial information be aggregated/cost-banded for reasonably expected fund estimates. The first 10 years of the planning horizon need to be displayed at a micro level that can precisely document available funds from different sources. This level of detail demonstrates fiscal constraint and shows how the immediate strategies of the RTP and TIP can be implemented.

**Recommendation:** The revised 2040 Financial Plan must be finalized by DRCOG, and made publicly available. Similarly, the 2045 Financial Plan should provide the foundation for financial transparency, precision, and consistency throughout all of DRCOG’s planning documents and processes.

**Resolution:** The 2040 Financial Plan should go through the DRCOG approval process and be published in a publicly accessible location in a timely fashion. In addition, the 2045 Financial Plan needs to be developed in association with the 2045 Metro Vision Regional Transportation
Plan and provide the foundation for financial information within all subsequent planning documents.

**Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance:** FHWA/FTA will continue to work with DCROG, CDOT and RTD to provide assistance on financial planning topics, and provide examples of financial plans supporting metropolitan transportation plans from comparably-sized TMAs.

2) **Planning Agreement**

**Basic Requirement:** In accordance with 23 CFR §450.314, the MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall cooperatively determine their mutual responsibilities in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. These responsibilities shall be clearly identified in written agreements among the MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) serving the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA). To the extent possible, a single agreement between all responsible parties should be developed. The written agreement(s) shall include specific provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to the development of financial plans that support the metropolitan transportation plan (see §450.324) and the metropolitan TIP (see §450.326) and development of the annual listing of obligated projects (see §450.334). The agreement must include consensus among the agencies dealing with the TIP/STIP amendment procedures. This is an explicit consideration of shared procedures between agencies that both achieve agreement intents and are consistent with agency principles.

**Finding of Federal Review:** The core principle of fiscal constraint, comparing revenue with costs, is relatively straightforward. Yet in practice it varies greatly between agencies and presents challenges when developing regional financial information. The quality of cost and revenue estimates is important in the development of the Metro Vision Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (FCRTP) and TIP and can be linked to the cooperative development of estimates based on agreed upon procedures. DRCOG and its planning partners do not have an agreement that outlines a cooperative development process of the financial plan, cost and revenue forecasts, consistency of forecasting methods across different agencies, and inflation factors. One practice that causes confusion is CDOT’s program and budget information presented as funding programs, which lacks specific detail on the origin of the funding sources. A funding program combines multiple funding sources into a program intended for a specific purpose, instead of listing original funding sources and how those contribute to the complex web of budgetary decisions. The financial plan should lay the foundation for both the RTP and the TIP and include a process for updates or amendments when the financial environment changes.

**Recommendation:** The Planning MOA between DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD must document the cooperative development of funding estimates for the Financial Plan for the MVRTP and TIP.
The Memorandum of Agreements (MOA) pertaining to the Concurrence on Public Involvement for the TIP and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Amendments and the Concurrence on the TIP and STIP Amendments needs to be updated to account for changes in federal legislation and CDOT STIP procedures. The Planning MOA update should capture the current state of practice for processing TIP and STIP amendments. Either included in the document or as a separate attachment, explicit procedures for TIP and STIP amendments within the MPO area should be agreed upon. Changes to the STIP that are important for consideration in TIP procedures include the new annual STIP Update cycle, the constant official 4 year period, and an awareness of the STIP amendment schedule.

**Recommendation:** The Planning MOA between DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD needs to document the specific procedures of the cooperatively agreed upon STIP/TIP Amendments process.

**Resolution:** This MOA needs to be finalized and signed by all regional planning partners before the 2045 regional transportation plans are developed.

**Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance:** The FHWA/FTA will provide technical assistance in developing financial planning and STIP/TIP amendment procedures.

### 3) Security in the Planning Process

**Basic Requirement:** Federal legislation cites an individual security factor as a stand-alone element of the planning process (both metropolitan 23 CFR 450.306(b) (3) and Statewide 23 CFR 450.206(a) (3) planning). The regulations also state that the degree and consideration of security should be based on the scale and complexity of many different local issues.

**Finding of Federal Review:** Security is an important planning factor that covers events such as preparedness, adaptiveness, and rehabilitation of infrastructure before, during, and after emergency incidences. The FHWA and FTA don’t prescribe a strict definition of what security planning means to a region and MPOs are encouraged to collaboratively define their security approach based on regional needs and agreement among planning partners. It isn’t always the DRCOG that leads these efforts, but the DRCOG has a responsibility to incorporate security elements and awareness into the transportation planning process.

The security section in the 2035 MVRTP introduces security concepts, but does not explain how the DRCOG is involved nor their importance or contribution to the regional transportation planning process. The DRCOG needs to provide a clear picture of its security duties. From there, it can provide coordination with regional efforts and productively integrate them into the transportation planning process. It would be beneficial to have the DRCOG identify agencies they work with and the outcomes that contribute to the regional transportation planning.
process. Enabling a connection between projects and policies that support regional emergency planning would have great impact on understanding the integrity of the transportation network.

**Recommendation:** The DRCOG needs to clearly identify its role and responsibilities in providing security considerations in the transportation planning process.

**Resolution:** The DRCOG needs to outline its roles and responsibilities when providing security provisions including to what extent they are involved in evacuation planning, providing information to other agencies, and incorporating security information in the 2045 MVRTP.

**Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance:** The FHWA/FTA can provide examples of how similar TMAs have demonstrated security considerations into their planning process at varying degrees.

### 4) Public Participation Plan

**Basic Requirement:** The MPO is required, under 23 CFR 450.316, to engage in a metropolitan planning process that creates opportunities for public involvement, participation and consultation throughout the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the TIP and is also included in 23 CFR 450.322 (f) (7) and (g) (i) (2), (i) and 23 CFR 450.324 (b). One critical element of this regulation is the periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the public participation plan (PPP) [23 CFR 450.316 (a) (i) (x)]. This refers not just to reviewing the implementation of strategies, but their ability to reach and engage the stakeholders and the general public in terms of productive comments and conversation.

**Finding of Federal Review:** The federal planning regulations require that the MPO periodically review the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the Public Participation Plan (PPP). This goes beyond commonly used performance metrics including data collection, providing information, and attendance at public events. These elements are necessary to collect and build the foundation in which the MPO can examine the impact of its preferred strategies. Additionally, DRCOG should allow participants attending public events an opportunity to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the activity from their perspective. Combining these data sources, user feedback and the implementation of identified strategies, contribute to a comprehensive evaluation leading to a meaningful understanding of the program’s true effectiveness. The evaluation should highlight successful and unsuccessful events and how these results have changed future decisions and engagement techniques. This activity should be explained in the PPP as well as be identified in the UPWP.
**Recommendation:** The DRCOG PPP needs to evaluate the effectiveness of the public procedures and strategies and incorporate those findings into practice.

**Resolution:** This revised evaluation process that identifies evaluation outcomes and measures of effectiveness needs be included in the next PPP that will guide the efforts surrounding the 2045 MVRTP development cycle.

**Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance:** The FHWA/FTA will provide technical assistance in gathering examples of public participation effectiveness evaluation from other TMAs and contribute to reviewing and commenting on any DRCOG draft plans.

### 5) Public Outreach Strategies

**Basic Requirement:** The MPO is required, under 23 CFR 450.316, to engage in a metropolitan planning process that creates opportunities for public involvement, participation and consultation throughout the development of the MTP and the TIP and is also included in 23 CFR 450.322 (f) (7) and (g) (1) (2), (i) and 23 CFR 450.324 (b). Under §450.316(a)(1)(vii), DRCOG shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing citizens and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process. The participation plan shall be developed by the MPO in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services.

**Finding of Federal Review:** The 2035 MVRTP, Policy #14 strategies are intended to ensure consideration of transportation disadvantaged and traditionally underserved, including minority, low-income, elderly, and disabled households. Additionally, since the 2012 Planning Certification Review, DRCOG has developed and implemented a Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan. However, the current PPP does not contain explicit procedures, strategies, and outcomes for seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, and LEP populations. Further development of traditionally underserved engagement should involve greater representation throughout the planning process in a manner that benefits those communities and strengthens their impact on the regional transportation process.

**Recommendation:** The PPP should include explicit procedures, strategies and outcomes for seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services.
**Resolution:** The DRCOG PPP for the 2045 MVRTP must incorporate explicit procedures, strategies, and outcomes for seeking out and considering the needs of the traditionally underserved communities by the existing transportation system, such as low-income and minority households.

**Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance:** The FHWA/FTA will provide technical assistance in gathering examples of documented public participation from traditionally underserved communities from other TMAs and contribute to reviewing and commenting on any DRCOG draft plans.

### 6) Self-Certifications and Americans with Disabilities Act

**Basic Requirement:** Self-Certification of the metropolitan planning process, at least once every four years, is required under 23 CFR 450.336. The State and the MPO shall certify to FHWA and FTA that the planning process is addressing the major issues facing the area and is conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of 23 CFR 450.300 and:

- 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303 and Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act (if applicable)
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each State
- 49 U.S.C. 5332, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age in employment or business opportunity
- Section 101(b) of SAFETEA-LU and 49 CFR Part 26, regarding involvement of DBE in U.S. DOT-funded planning projects
- 23 CFR Part 230, regarding the implementation of an equal employment opportunity program on Federal and Federal-aid highway construction contracts
- **ADA and U.S. DOT regulations governing transportation for people with disabilities [49 CFR Parts 27, 37, and 38]**
- Older Americans Act as amended, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age Section 324 of Title 23 U.S.C., regarding the prohibition of discrimination based on gender
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and 49 CFR Part 27, regarding discrimination against individuals with disabilities
- All other applicable provisions of Federal law (e.g., while no longer specifically noted in a self-certification, prohibition of use of Federal funds for “lobbying” still applies and should be covered in all grant agreement documents (see 23 CFR 630.112).

**Finding of Federal Review:** Both the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 prohibit discrimination against individuals on the basis of their disability. To satisfy these regulations, public agencies need to adopt either an ADA
Transition Plan or a Program Access Plan based on the amount of employees. Since the DRCOG has fewer than 50 employees, it needs only complete a Program Access Plan. This action requires that a self-evaluation is completed to account for any infrastructure owned within the public rights-of-way to determine if they are accessible to persons with disabilities and meet the laws’ regulatory requirements. The results are captured as part of the Program Access Plan along with a demonstration of any actions needed to reach compliance. Depending on the results of the completed document, further actions include a Board resolution, coordination and comments from relevant stakeholders, and public access to the completed document.

**Recommendation:** The DRCOG needs to complete an ADA Program Access Plan, including a self-evaluation, a demonstration of addressing barriers, and public coordination with stakeholders.

**Resolution:** The *Transportation Planning in the Denver Region* document currently being updated is a good DRCOG planning document to show in one location how DRCOG addresses ADA requirements. The ADA Program Access Plan needs to be completed before the end of 2017.

**Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance:** The FHWA/FTA will provide guidance on how DRCOG should approach this activity including details on what constitutes an ADA Program Access Plan.

### 7) Congestion Management Process

**Basic Requirement:** The State (s) and the MPO must develop a systematic approach for managing congestion through a process that “provides for safe and effective integrated management and operation of the multimodal transportation system. The Congestion Management Process (CMP) applies to transportation management areas (TMA’s) based on a cooperatively development and implemented metropolitan-wide strategy of new and existing transportation facilities eligible for funding under 23 U.S.C. and title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 through the use of travel demand reduction and operational management strategies.” [23 CFR 450.322 (a)]. Specifically, the CMP must include a periodic assessment of the effectiveness of implemented strategies, in terms of the area’s established performance measures, as guidance for the public and decision-makers to consider effective strategies for future implementation [23 CFR 450.322 (d) (6)].

**Finding of Federal Review:** CMP requirements of performance reporting and evaluation of post-implementation impacts of strategies and projects is minimal in the DRCOG process. The DRCOG does not deploy methods to identify and evaluate alternative strategies, provide information supporting the implementation of actions, nor evaluate and report the effectiveness
of implemented actions. In the Congestion Mitigation Toolkit, the listings of strategies should incorporate the evaluation of the project through documented performance standards including both before and after implementation measures and impacts on congestion within that type of corridor. Findings that show improvement in congested conditions due to specific strategies can be used to encourage further implementation of these strategies under similar conditions, while negative findings may be useful for discouraging or downplaying the effectiveness of similar strategies in similar situations.

The Annual Report summarizes types of congestion measures and highlights data in an effort to relate to an individual’s experience of congestion. This approach doesn’t fully address the planning requirement’s intention. Further development and incorporation of regionally agreed-upon levels of system performance achieved through performance measures will better allow the determination of a strategy’s congestion reduction effectiveness. The CMP Transportation Projects Recently Completed or Underway section should include a column to identify the evaluation of how those implemented strategies positively or negatively affected congestion. These results can be fed back into the Congestion Mitigation Toolkit to identify the anticipated performance and expected benefits of appropriate congestion management strategies that will contribute to the effective use and improved safety of existing and future transportation systems based on established performance measures.

The current DRCOG Prospectus states that only the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) projects are evaluated for effectiveness with the MPO Board reserving the right to ask for similar evaluations on other projects. There needs to be an effort to record the positive or negative impacts of congestion projects to inform decision makers and provide guidance on effective strategies for future implementation.

**Recommendation:** The DRCOG needs to improve the reporting of the Congestion Management Process by documenting the impacts of implemented projects and demonstrating the relationship between implemented strategies, effectiveness, and performance objectives.

**Resolution:** An update and integration of the identified enhancements to the CMP must be completed before the 2045 MVRTP and TIP update cycles in order to provide multimodal system performance management and strategies.

**Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance:** The FHWA/FTA will provide guidance on how the DRCOG should approach this activity including the reporting of data elements and what information is necessary for inclusion.

8) **Travel Demand Forecasting Methods**
**Basic Requirement:** As a key product of the metropolitan planning process, transportation plans must be prepared “through a performance-driven, outcome-based approach” [23 CFR 450.306(a)] that considers the current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over period of the transportation plan [23 CFR 450.324(f)(1)]. Further, in establishing and maintaining the Plan’s 20-year horizon, MPOs must confirm the plan’s validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends [23 CFR 450.324(c)]. Accordingly, preparation of a RTP requires the availability of reliable forecasts of future demand for the major travel modes, and in large metropolitan areas, these forecasts are typically prepared using travel demand models through the partnership of regional transportation agencies. Use of reliable travel demand models enables the MPO to systematically and consistently evaluate the impacts of alternative transportation investments being considered in the RTP.

**Finding of Federal Review:** DRCOG is using an Activity-Based Model (ABM) for preparation of regional multimodal forecasts in partnership with RTD and CDOT on examining the model’s capabilities to adequately support the forecast of both transit and highway system usage. DRCOG works with planning partners to ensure that its modeling capabilities reliably support multimodal travel forecasting for both highway and transit system usage and the systems-level travel forecasting needs of those agencies. Verification of the model’s performance, where model results are ‘validated’ to travel data, is a critical step to ensuring reliable estimates of systems-level impacts that result from transportation investments. Validation checks typically include reporting on how the model reacts to changes in networks (highway and transit), land-use, and policy scenarios.

Under the desktop review, the Federal Review Team reviewed the DRCOG UPWP over recent years to assess activity towards the validation of travel forecasting. The FY12 – 13 UPWP contained activity to maintain, upgrade, evaluate and refine FOCUS model, as necessary. However, the FY12 – 13 UPWP did not contain any express activity towards the calibration or validation of the land-use or travel forecasting models, although activity did include collection of transit ridership and park-n-ride lot user data from RTD, as available.

The FY14 – 15 UPWP included resources and activities to calibrate and validate the UrbanSim land use model and use for regular planning products, as well as to incorporate specific enhancements to the travel forecasting, Focus model to support development of the 2040 Plans, which included completion of a commercial vehicle survey as part of the Front Range Travel Counts project; collection and processing traffic counts from CDOT and all member governments/consultants, performing QC, and adding to the traffic count database; collection of transit ridership, park-n-ride lot user data, and other transit-related data from RTD, as available; and summarizing Front Range Travel Counts data for use in model calibration. However, there is no documentation to describe how the land-use model or transportation forecasting model is validated, or depicting the results of the validation activity.

The FY16 – 17 UPWP commits resources to calibrating and validating DRCOGs land use modeling and forecasting, by updating UrbanSim land use model to a more recent base year data. The FY16 -17
UPWP further commits activity to the calibration and validation of a 2015 base year model for transportation modeling and forecasting, including the completion of a commercial vehicle survey as part of the Front Range Travel Counts project, as well as the incorporation of the Front Range Travel Counts/Household Travel Survey into the Focus model. In doing so, DRCOG further commits to maintaining a cohesive storage area to keep all travel model related files including documentation, scenario analysis, calibrations, and inputs & outputs for RTP Cycle runs. However, DRCOG does not maintain accessible documentation of the validation process and associated tests of the model’s ability to replicate or forecast current and future year system conditions.

During the site visit, DRCOG noted that DRCOG staff annually reviews all procedures, data formulas/factors, and data sources (e.g., traffic counts and associated techniques) to ensure the most accurate analytic methods are used and results are obtained. New real-world data is also reviewed, and adjustments are made to calibrate/validate the CMP database and the regional FOCUS travel model. The FOCUS model then provides the basis for forecasting traffic volume growth. DRCOG also notes that RTP update cycles (once or twice per year) typically provide opportunities to re-calibrate a limited number of model components deemed priorities for proper model function.

DRCOG reports several challenges tied to calibration and validation, including (1) understanding the definitions, nuances, and limitations of input and calibration target data, (2) striking a balance between estimating and calibrating the model to replicate household survey data (which proved more difficult to expand than initially anticipated) versus regional travel behavior embedded in aggregate measures such as VMT, due to issues such as sampling error and non-response bias, (3) developing methods to merge the data obtained by the external video survey and the external travel postcard survey, and (4) turnover of senior modeling staff (lost or less-available institutional memory).

To address these challenges, in part, DRCOG notes that Senior DRCOG TPO staff track RTP forecasts over time to ensure that forecast changes logically reflect changes to inputs and assumptions (for example, revised socioeconomic forecasts incorporating the effects of the Great Recession) and ultimately whether such forecasts are realized. However, again, DRCOG does not currently maintain supporting documentation to describe how the land-use model or transportation forecasting model is calibrated or validated, or depicting the results of the calibration and validation effort.

**Recommendation:** DRCOG needs to work with their regional transportation partners, RTD and CDOT, to further develop and document a standardized process for the calibration and validation of the land-use and transportation forecasting models, including documenting the results of the model calibration and validation process.
Resolution: This activity should be completed concurrent with the UPWP activity under land-use modeling and forecasting and transportation modeling and forecasting, and no later than the delivery of the 2045 MVRTP.

Proposed FHWA/FTA Technical Assistance: The FHWA/FTA will assist in any technical needs of the regional transportation agencies, including delivery of notable examples of documented validation processes and results from throughout the Nation.
October 18, 2016

Ms. Elise Jones, DRCOG Board of Directors Chair
Denver Regional Council of Governments
1290 Broadway, Suite 100
Denver, CO 80203-5606

Subject: 2016 Federal Planning Certification of Denver-Aurora TMA Planning Process

Dear Ms. Jones:

Pursuant to 23 United States Code (USC) 134 (k)(5) and 49 USC 5303 (k)(5), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) must jointly certify the transportation planning process in Transportation Management Areas (TMA) at least every four years.

The recent certification review of the transportation planning process in the Denver-Aurora area included a desk review, a site visit on February 8, 2016, and a public meeting to receive comments on March 28, 2016. Significant time was spent with staff from DRCOG, the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), and the Regional Transportation District (RTD) to discuss the transportation planning process in the region.

The planning certification review is one of several methods employed by FHWA and FTA to monitor and assess the outcomes of the transportation planning process in the Denver-Aurora region. Other methods include the review and approval of the DRCOG Unified Planning Work Program, review of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), issuance of air quality conformity determinations for the RTP and TIP, and attendance at meetings.

The 2016 Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) Planning Certification Report is currently being finalized and will be sent out immediately after completion. The report provides an overview of the certification process, summarizes discussions from the recent site visit, provides a series of review findings with recommendations for improvement, and issues the FHWA/FTA certification action.

The FHWA/FTA review team found the metropolitan planning process satisfies the provisions of 23 USC 134, 49 USC 5303-5306, 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 450.300 and other associated federal requirements. Noteworthy practices and strengths are recognized in the report.

Based on overall findings, FHWA and FTA hereby certify the Denver-Aurora TMA’s planning process. Upon request, representatives from FHWA and FTA can be scheduled to formally present the review findings and the FHWA/FTA certification action at an upcoming DRCOG meeting.

If any questions arise, please contact Aaron Bustow (FHWA) at 720-963-3022, Aaron.Bustow@dot.gov, or Larry Squires (FTA) at 303-362-2394, Larry.Squires@dot.gov.
Sincerely,

JOHN M CATER
Division Administrator
FHWA Colorado Division

DAVID L BECKHOUSE
Deputy Regional Administrator
FTA Region 8

Cc: Ms. Jennifer Schaufele, DRCOG
    Mr. Doug Rex, DRCOG
    Mr. Jacob Riger, DRCOG
    Ms. Debra Perkins-Smith, CDOT DTD
    Mr. Jeff Sudmeier, CDOT DTD
    Mr. Tim Kirby, CDOT DTD
    Mr. Chuck Attardo, CDOT Region 1 Planning
    Mr. Danny Hermann, CDOT Region 1 Planning
Appendix 1: Recommendations

Recommendations identify activities that substantially met the requirements of the transportation planning laws and regulations, but have the potential for enhancement. These elements could benefit by adopting proven best practices or other improvements that would noticeably enrich the planning process. In this category, outdated concepts or older procedures that haven’t been recently updated are brought into the spotlight as methods and techniques to handle such have progressed.

Agency Retention of Institutional Knowledge and Procedure

Transportation agencies experience constant change, either through retirement or staff turnover, which results in lost industrial knowledge or a lack of proper training for new employees required to successfully administer the federal planning process. The FHWA and FTA suggest that the DRCOG work with their regional planning partners to develop documented standard operating procedures for mission critical tasks. This will ensure that any fluctuations in the DRCOG staff will not produce disruptions to required processes and planning schedules while quickly acclimating individuals to what has occurred and what is on the horizon. Positioning a new employee this way can prevent any lapses in federal approvals.

Intelligent Transportation Systems

The Regional ITS Architecture needs to be updated and a process should be identified including a schedule of actions and future update cycles. The ITS Strategic Plan would benefit the transportation planning process by being included within the MVRTP as a chapter or component as opposed to being a standalone document. With the continuing importance of ITS applications and vehicular technology advancement, greater importance is placed on integrating a systems-level understanding in the development of regional transportation planning activities.

Systems Engineering Analysis

The DRCOG should encourage and foster an understanding and application of systems engineering analysis procedures consistently among local agencies. Possible ways to engage stakeholders on this topic include workshops and in DRCOG’s documents such as the Prospectus.

Unified Planning Work Program

Currently, the FY2016-2017 UPWP describes the out-of-state travel budget as a sub-note to the Anticipated Expenditures (Table 2). There is no connection or explanation of travel activities and the relationship with tasks identified to fulfill the federal and regional planning activities. For purposes of transparency and accountability, reporting of DRCOG staff travel in the End of Year Report documents the alignment with tasks and purpose of trips taken with metro planning funds. Dollar amounts and specifics of events are not necessary; the goal is to link travel with task accomplishment.
Environmental Mitigation

The 2040 MVRTP handles environmental mitigation by directing readers to project level analysis. This approach does not fully capture the intent of 23 CFR 450.324 (f) (10). The intention of this regulation is to present types of potential environmental mitigation activities that have the greatest ability to restore and maintain healthy environmental functions. This doesn’t mandate that an MPO list and discuss each potential mitigation technique one-by-one that could be used at a project level.

In the 2035 Metro Vision RTP, a category for environmental mitigation is contained in chapter 6. It states that appendix 1 contains a broad overview of selected environmental resources that could be impacts by any proposed transportation improvement, but provides no further details. The stated Policy and Action Strategies #14, Environmental Quality, frames three policy statements concerning specific topics in which environmental consideration is a priority. What might benefit the regional picture is to provide a summary of the projects contained in Appendix 1 that highlight’s significant or repetitively affected environmental features of the implemented projects and the corresponding mitigation activities undertaken to counteract any negative side effects. A simple description could better educate those reading as to what types of environmental mitigation activities are happening or of concern and provide them a place to go for further information.

The FHWA encourages the DRCOG to continue exploring successful practices that produce effective and beneficial environmental coordination and consultation among regional resources agencies. The outcomes of these efforts should be documented in the Plan with a discussion on how these concepts are handled in the transportation planning process, along with how outcomes contributed to the RTP and TIP processes or mitigation activities.

Public Outreach and Public Involvement

The DRCOG should consider the provision of materials and documents in a vernacular the public can easily understand. It should contain commonly used words, avoidance of transportation jargon, and use graphs, charts, and pictures to convey themes and topics. A starter’s guide to transportation could introduce the public in a friendly manner to the documents available and the intention of each one. This would be a simpler and straight forward presentation that could be included in the Public Participation Plan, but would make sense to have right on the home page of DRCOG’s website.

Scenario Planning for the 2045 MVRTP

The development of scenario planning at DRCOG will provide flexibility to explore plausible new funding sources and mechanisms and the effects on transportation, the analysis of alternative scenarios that can focus on CMP consistent strategies and regional objectives, and combinations of modal improvements that address the identified performance targets of the region. If it is decided upon to develop a scenario planning process, the DRCOG should consult with 23 CFR 450.324 (i) (i) to incorporate the preferred conditions of alternatives encouraged by the FAST Act. These conditions
include future investment strategies, revenue and cost estimates, population and employment distributions, and performance target impacts.

**Integrating Freight in the Transportation Planning Process**

The DRCOG should consider using the structure of the State Freight Plan regulations (49 U.S.C. 70202) as a guide to further develop their RTP Freight Component. The FAST Act regulations provide a solid framework for what should be included and analyzed when considering freight elements. Another benefit is the alignment of the DRCOG regional freight plan with the CDOT State Highway Freight Plan and Multimodal Freight Plan, which will conform to the regulatory requirements. By coordinating the regional and state freight plans, opportunities for data sharing, consistency of objectives, and project identification can leverage efforts and create a more dynamic product.

**Transportation Improvement Program**

The FAST Act introduced new management tools to monitor TIP progress and for agencies to show that implemented projects are aligned with the performance targets of the region. The citation 23 CFR 450.326 (c) and (d) directs the MPO to design the TIP to achieve progress towards performance targets and to provide a mechanism to evaluate the anticipated effect of the TIP towards matching the goals, objectives, and targets identified in the RTP, specifically by linking the investment decisions with the performance targets. The DRCOG has until May 2018 to comply, but should start looking ahead and having conversations with regional and state transportation planning partners on accommodating these new elements cooperatively. The FHWA/FTA anticipates providing further guidance on these requirements.

23 CFR 450.326 (n) (1) identifies a requirement that the TIP identify the criteria and process for prioritizing implementation of transportation plan elements for inclusion in the TIP and any changes in priorities from previous TIPs. The DRCOG provides an extensive TIP Policy that highlights the current policies for project scoring criteria and procedures. What is lacking in the TIP Policy is a description of what has changed since the last development cycle; both in TIP develop procedures and RTP elements, along with an explanation as to why. This is an important requirement to monitor when a new RTP has been created and provides new goals, objectives, and criteria with which the TIP must align.
Appendix 2: Certification Review Team Members

**Federal Review Team Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Bustow</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Haas</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Program Development Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darin Allan</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Planning and Program Development Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Squires</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Kenyon</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Goodman</td>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Office of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Stark</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Office of Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Public Comments

Written comment 1:

Aaron;


Having been a community provider for years, while I see CDOT and DRCOG working hand in hand, RTD remains aloof. It appears they (RTD) makes their decisions and “dictates” to DRCOG what is going to happen. I.e. service changes, discount fares, BRT on Colfax are a few examples. Seems this process is backwards. Though they fit things into the Metro Vision plan, I think DRCOG should direct RTD not the other way around.

Hank Braaksma
Director of Transportation Services
Seniors’ Resource Center
3227 Chase Street
Denver, CO 80212
c- 303.917.6692
o- 303.235.6970

FHWA/FTA Response

In response to Hank Braaksma’s comment about the relationship between RTD and DRCOG in terms of RTD administrative and pricing actions, reference these identified recommendations:

Required Recommendations- Financial Plan for the 2045 MVRTP and Planning Agreements

These required recommendations aim to enhance the sharing of financial data for the purposes of providing realistic revenue and cost estimates and institutionalizing the responsibilities of the regional transportation agencies sharing financial data including future revenue decisions and potential funding options.

Written Comment 2:

Mile High Connects, Executive Director Dane West

These comments were included in a six page letter. Six major comments were issued and a response to each one will include either its reflection in the current Certification Review Report or a clarification of how the comment can be addressed. This letter is on file with the FHWA Colorado Division and the FTA Region 8 offices, please contact us for a copy if desired.
Organization and management of the transportation planning process: create a more inclusive and representative metropolitan transportation planning process

The Public Outreach Strategies and Public Participation Plan Required Recommendations focus on increasing both the effectiveness of the public participation program and involvement from traditionally underserved communities. Identified activities are the inclusion of traditionally underserved community representatives on Committees or working groups and explicit engagement of the community through outreach.

The structure and organization of Policy Boards at the DRCOG is codified in 23 CFR 450.310 (d) (i) – (iii). This regulation states that the MPO (Policy Board) shall consist of local elected officials, officials of public agencies that administer major modes of transportation including public transportation, and appropriate State officials. The CDOT Transportation Commission and STAC are setup by the Colorado Revised Statutes.

Interagency Cooperation: Empower CDOT, DRCOG, and RTD to use all the appropriate tools at their disposal to develop and effective, sustainable, and equitable transportation network

A recommendation addressing scenario planning encourages the DRCOG and its regional planning partners to undertake the exercise and explore alternatives while adhering to the baseline conditions identified in the Code of Federal Regulations. These conditions include assumptions of population and employment, performance targets, and financial estimates of revenue and costs.

The scenario planning work would be funded using federal metro planning dollars; those funds can only be used for planning related activities to accomplish the federal planning requirements. Any cost savings would not be eligible to be used for construction projects, but could be utilized for other planning activities.

Federal Planning Factors: Amend transit-funding calculations to rely less on parking as a proxy for ridership

This is a requirement of FTA that is capture in federal regulations.

Project Prioritization and Selection: Increase accountability in the federal transportation program by linking spending decision to performance measures and ensure that those measure promote sustainable and equitable development

The FAST Act introduced national performance targets that need to be achieved by CDOT, DRCOG, and RTD. These performance targets are currently going through a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking process that includes public comment and education. When the notice is made final, the CDOT and DRCOG will cooperatively work together to incorporate the performance targets into the transportation planning process including the regional transportation plan and the transportation improvement program. There are specific performance categories dealing with system performance (congestion), freight performance, and air quality measures (CMAQ). Those planning oriented categories are joined by Safety, Pavement, and Bridge performance targets. The incorporation of these are tied to a schedule when the Final Rules (23 CFR 490) are released. A recommendation has been made to monitor the situation as full action cannot be taken until Final Rules are complete.

Other performance management requirements include the Congestion Management Process and linking the RTP goals and objectives with the TIP implementation. These are both codified in the
Public Participation: Encourage participation from low-income citizens

The Public Outreach Strategies and Public Participation Plan Required Recommendations focus on increasing both the effectiveness of the public participation program and involvement from traditionally underserved communities. Identified activities are the inclusion of traditionally underserved community representatives on Committees or working groups and explicit engagement of the community through outreach.

Public Meeting Discussion and Comments


March 28, 2016 TAC Agenda: https://drcog.org/sites/drcog/files/event-materials/03-28-16%20TAC%20Full%20Agenda.pdf

Soundcloud audio links:

Notice of Public Meeting

Federal Transportation Planning Certification Review of the Denver-Aurora Metro Area

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will hold a public meeting in conjunction with their quadrennial review of the transportation planning process in the Denver-Aurora Metro area as administered by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG).

Date: March 28th, 2016
Time: 5:00PM – 7:00PM
Location: Denver Regional Council of Governments
1290 Broadway
Denver, CO 80203
Independence Pass Conference Room, 1st Floor

The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015 requires the FHWA and the FTA to review and certify the transportation planning process in metropolitan areas with populations of 200,000 or more every four years. The FHWA and the FTA conduct this review in accordance with the joint planning regulations contained in 23 CFR Part 450 subpart C – Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming. This public meeting is held to provide interested parties an opportunity to express comments on the transportation planning process and how it is addressing the transportation needs of the Denver-Aurora metropolitan area.

Major elements of the review include, but are not limited to, the organization and management of the transportation planning process, cooperation between the Colorado Department of Transportation, the DRCOG, the Regional Transit District, and other partners, federal planning factors, public participation, congestion management process, plan development, project prioritization and selection, programming, monitoring and evaluation, financial planning and accountability, civil rights, freight planning, air quality, safety, travel demand modeling and forecasting, intelligent transportation systems, and the management and operations of the transportation network.

You may also submit your comments can in writing or voiced directly to either Federal Review Team member by April 4, 2016:

Aaron Bustow
Federal Highway Administration
12300 West Dakota Ave., Suite 180
Lakewood, CO 80228-2583
aaron.bustow@dot.gov
(720) 963-3022

Kristin Kenyon
Federal Transit Administration
1961 Stout Street, Suite 13301
Denver, CO 80204-3007
kristin.kenyon@dot.gov
(303) 362-2391

Individuals in need of auxiliary aids or services, such as interpretation services or assisted listening devices, are asked to contact the DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of this meeting by calling (303) 480-6744 or emailing drcog@drcog.org.
Ms. Elise Jones  
DRCOG Board of Directors Chair  
Denver Regional Council of Governments  
1290 Broadway, Suite 100  
Denver, CO 80203-5606

Subject: 2016 Federal Planning Certification Report for the Denver-Aurora Transportation Management Area

Dear Ms. Jones:

The recent planning certification review of the transportation planning process for the Denver-Aurora region took place in the Spring of 2016. The FHWA/FTA review team found that the metropolitan planning process satisfies the provisions of 23 USC 134, 49 USC 5303-5306, 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 450.300 and other associated federal requirements. The metropolitan planning process for the Denver-Aurora Transportation Management Area (TMA) was found to be compliant with the federal planning regulations and certified on October 18, 2016.

The 2016 Federal Planning Certification Report for the Denver-Aurora TMA is complete. The attached report provides an overview of the certification process, summarizes activities from the recent review, and provides a series of review findings. We are available to describe the details of the report with you and other DRCOG members.

If any questions arise, please contact Aaron Bustow (FHWA) at 720-963-3022, Aaron.Bustow@dot.gov, or Larry Squires (FTA) at 303-362-2394, Larry.Squires@dot.gov.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
John M. Cater, P.E.  
Division Administrator

By: William Haas  
Program Development Team Leader


Cc:  
Ms. Jennifer Schaufele, DRCOG  
Mr. Doug Rex, DRCOG  
Ms. Debra Perkins-Smith, CDOT DTD  
Mr. Jeff Sudmeier, CDOT DTD  
Mr. Tim Kirby, CDOT DTD  
Mr. Chuck Attardo, CDOT Region 1 Planning  
Mr. Bill Van Meter, RTD  
Mr. Larry Squires, FTA Region 8  
Mr. Darin Allan, FTA Region 8
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>March 15, 2017</td>
<td>Informational Briefing</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT**
Anticipated schedule and topics for the development of the 2020-2023 TIP Policy document.

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

**ACTION BY OTHERS**
N/A

**SUMMARY**
At the February 2017 Board Work Session, it was requested that staff provide a schedule for when topics related to the development of the 2020-2023 TIP Policy document would be presented to the Board for discussion/action.

Attachment 1 provides the 2020-2023 TIP Policy document development schedule and highlights when topics will be discussed by the TIP Policy Work Group. It also highlights opportunities for input at Board work sessions and subsequent Board action on specific topics. Attachment 2 provides an explanation of the topics within the anticipated schedule.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**
N/A

**PROPOSED MOTION**
N/A

**ATTACHMENTS**
1. 2020-2023 TIP Policy Document Development Schedule and Topics
2. TIP Policy Work Group Explanation of Topics

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations at 303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org.
2020-2023 TIP Policy Document

**Anticipated Schedule and Topics**

March 15, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP Policy Work Group Activity</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Policy Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP Focus Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set-Asides</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifying Benefits</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update on Revenue Estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and Subregional Funding Targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP Amendment Rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP Policy Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Share Policy Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Definition/Project Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Project/Program Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Project/Program Submittal Limit; Funding Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Funding Type Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subregional Share Policy Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Distribution Formula/Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Project/Program Criteria; Project Type Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRCOG's Role in Subregional Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Project/Program Submittal Limit; Funding Min.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Funding Type Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Work Session Discussion = X

Board Action/Direction = O

TIP Policy Work Group Discussion = 
TIP Policy Work Group Explanation of Topics

General Policy Topics

- **TIP Focus Area(s)**: Establishment of priority or focus areas, consistent with Metro Vision and the Regional Transportation Plan for what the Board hopes to accomplish in the 2020-2023 TIP call for projects. It is anticipated that the TIP Policy Work Group will work with the Board at its work sessions to develop concepts for discussion at this summer’s Board Workshop.

- **Project Delays**: Review the existing TIP policy on project delays to ensure it reflects an effective methodology for DRCOG to address delays in the implementation of projects with DRCOG-allocated funding.

- **Set-Asides**: The TIP Policy Work Group will undertake a thorough review of all DRCOG set-aside programs to ensure they effectively contribute towards meeting the associated Metro Vision and Regional Transportation Plan goals.

- **Quantifying Benefits**: Establish a project/program selection process that includes quantifiable performance metrics directly linked to Metro Vision and Regional Transportation Plan. In other words, create a selection process that implements project/programs providing the most benefit to meet today’s needs and advance the region’s multimodal transportation system.

- **Update on Revenue Estimates**: DRCOG staff will provide the latest estimated revenue amounts to be available during FY2020-2023 for the Surface Transportation Program-Metro (STP-Metro), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and Transportation Alternatives (TA) funding programs.

- **Regional and Subregional Funding Targets**: Discuss the necessity of establishing a subregional share funding minimum from the overall federal funding amount available to DRCOG.

- **TIP Amendment Rules**: Review the existing policy on TIP amendments, which outlines the amendment type (i.e., administrative modification or amendment) required based on the magnitude of change to the TIP project.

- **Application Format**: Discuss how to simplify the application process, including modifications to the application form.

- **Training Requirements**: Review the existing TIP policy on project implementation training, which requires that applicants must attend a training/information session led by DRCOG, CDOT, and RTD.

- **Initial Draft; Final Draft; and TIP Policy Action**: A review of the draft TIP Policy document, leading to Board action to adopt the 2020-2023 TIP Policy document.
Regional Share Policy Topics

- **Regional Definition/Project Eligibility:** Define what a regional project is and what types of projects are eligible.

- **Regional Project/Program Evaluation Criteria:** Establish criteria for how regional projects/programs will be evaluated and scored. Criteria must include quantified benefits. Once the Board approves TIP Focus Area(s), the draft evaluation criteria may be adjusted, if needed to ensure the selection process adheres to those focus areas.

- **Regional Project/Program Submittal Limit; Funding Minimum:** Discuss whether an eligible sponsor will be limited to a certain number of applications and what the minimum federal funding request and local match percentage will be.

- **Regional Funding Type Distribution:** DRCOG staff currently assigns a funding type (STP-Metro, CMAQ, or TA) to a project after it has been selected for funding, but before the TIP is adopted. This item will discuss if pre-determined amounts of each funding type will be identified before projects are selected.

Subregional Share Policy Topics

- **Subregional Distribution Formula/Geography:** Define the geographic unit for the subregional forums and how the subregional funds will be targeted to each subregion.

- **Subregional Project/Program Criteria; Project Type Eligibility:** Define the minimum required evaluation criteria for how those projects will be scored or reviewed. Criteria must include quantified benefits. In addition, establish (if necessary) which project types will be eligible.

- **DRCOG’s Role in Subregional Process:** Identify the level of interaction (roles, responsibilities, and assistance) DRCOG staff will undertake in the subregional forums.

- **Subregional Project/Program Submittal Limit; Funding Minimum:** Discuss whether an eligible sponsor will be limited to a certain number of applications and what the minimum federal funding request and local match percentage will be.

- **Subregional Funding Type Distribution:** DRCOG staff currently assigns a funding program type (STP-Metro, CMAQ, or TA) to a project after it has been selected for funding before the TIP is adopted. This item will discuss if pre-determined amounts of each funding type will be identified to each subregional forum before projects are selected.
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

From: Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and 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>March 15, 2017</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
March administrative modifications to the 2016-2021 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 2016-2021 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 2016-2021 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 March 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
March 2017: 2016-2021 TIP Administrative Modifications

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information Douglas W. Rex, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations at 303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org; or Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner at 303 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.
SUMMARY

- Per the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation*, administrative modifications are reviewed and processed by staff. They are emailed to the TIP Notification List, and posted on the [DRCOG 2016-2021 TIP web page](http://www.drcog.org).

- The TIP Notification List includes the members of the Denver Regional Council of Governments (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 2016-2021 TIP. If you wish to be removed from the TIP Notification List, please contact Mark Northrop at (303) 480-6771 or via email 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. For more information on the TIP modification policy, visit the [DRCOG 2016-2021 TIP web page](http://www.drcog.org).

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

PROJECTS TO BE MODIFIED

- **2012-080**: North Metro Rail 72nd Ave and Colorado Blvd Station Sidewalks
  Adjust scope

- **2012-082**: North Metro Rail Stock Show Station Bicycle/Pedestrian Trails
  Adjust years of funding

- **2016-013**: Superior Call-n-Ride
  Adjust scope
2012-080: Adjust scope and project map to reflect southern limits of project at E. 70th Ave. This Second Commitment in Principle project scope change was agreed to by all North Metro Corridor partners.

**Existing**

**Title:** North Metro Rail 72nd Ave and Colorado Blvd Station Sidewalks  
**TIP-ID:** 2012-080  
**Project Type:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects (New)  
**Sponsor:** Commerce City

**Project Scope**

Project constructs the following facilities on Colorado Blvd from East 68th Ave to East 72nd Ave:

1. Curb, gutter, and a 5-foot wide (minimum) sidewalk along both sides of the street.
2. Drainage improvements, including inlets, manholes and RCP piping.
3. Street lighting spaced at 300 foot intervals on both sides of the street.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Initiate Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Initiate Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Initiate ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Initiate Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$1,357</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$46</td>
<td>$339</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$231</td>
<td>$1,696</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised Project Scope**

**Title:** North Metro Rail 72nd Ave and Colorado Blvd Station Sidewalks  
**TIP-ID:** 2012-080  
**Project Type:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects (New)  
**Sponsor:** Commerce City

**Project Scope**

Project constructs the following facilities on Colorado Blvd from **East 70th Ave** to East 72nd Ave:

1. Curb, gutter, and a 5-foot wide (minimum) sidewalk along both sides of the street.
2. Drainage improvements, including inlets, manholes and RCP piping.
3. Street lighting spaced at 300 foot intervals on both sides of the street.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Initiate Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Initiate Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Initiate ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Initiate Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016-080: Move project from the 2012-2017 TIP into the 2016-2021 TIP, and shift FY2014 and FY2015 funding into FY2017, per FTA’s request.

**Existing (from 2012-2017 TIP)**

**Title:** North Metro Rail Stock Show Station Bicycle/Pedestrian Trails  
**TIP-ID:** 2012-082  
**Project Scope:** Constructs a new detached five foot sidewalk and adjacent tree lawn on the south side of E 48th Ave from Brighton Blvd to York St and on the west side of Brighton Blvd from E 48th Ave. north approx. 150 feet to the sidewalks being built by RTD adjacent to the Stock Show Station. The proposed improvements include: street lighting, sidewalk, curb and gutter and the necessary street modifications to accommodate drainage, grade transitions and to meet City and Federal requirements, including ADA requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Municipality(ies)</th>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
<th>Project Phases</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Initiate Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Initiate Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Initiate Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY15-17</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>$1,442</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$361</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td>$1,803</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised Funding Table (2016-2021 TIP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,639</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>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,049</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016-013: Add the purchase of 2 buses to the project scope. This element was part of the original application but inadvertently left out.

Existing

Title: Superior Call-n-Ride
TIP-ID: 2016-013
STIP-ID:
Open to Public: 2016
Sponsor: Superior

Project Scope
This project adds a new Call-n-Ride servicing an area generally from McCaslin Blvd to 96th St, and US 36 to south of Interlocken Loop. Service hours will be approximately 5:30am to 7pm Monday through Friday.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Municipality(ies)</th>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
<th>Project Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Initiate Bus Service - Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Initiate Bus Service - Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Initiate Bus Service - Year 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$106</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>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$269</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised Project Scope

Title: Superior Call-n-Ride
TIP-ID: 2016-013
STIP-ID:
Open to Public: 2016
Sponsor: Superior

Project Scope
This project adds a new Call-n-Ride servicing an area generally from McCaslin Blvd to 96th St, and US 36 to south of Interlocken Loop. Service hours will be approximately 5:30am to 7pm Monday through Friday. The project includes the purchase of two additional buses.
Council Member Bob Roth Elected as DRCOG Chair

Aurora City Council member Bob Roth was elected chair of the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) board of directors at its Feb. 15 meeting.

Joining Roth on the board’s executive committee are City of Westminster mayor Herb Atchison as vice chair, City of Arvada mayor pro tem Bob Fifer as secretary and Town of Parker council member John Diak as secretary. Boulder County commissioner Elise Jones will serve as immediate past chair for the coming year.

“I want to thank our outgoing chair, Elise Jones, for providing excellent leadership this past year,” said Bob Roth, board chair. “It’s an honor to follow in her footsteps in guiding this esteemed organization. Regionalism is alive and well in the metro area and with the support of DRCOG staff, the executive officers and the entire board, I’m looking forward to the continuing and important work of enhancing and protecting our quality of life.”

For more information on DRCOG or its board of directors, visit drcog.org or call 303-455-1000.
Denver Regional Council of Governments elects 2017-2018 Officers

The Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) has elected its officers, who serve a one-year term effective immediately.

Denver, CO (PRWEB) February 24, 2017

The Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) has elected its officers, who serve a one-year term effective immediately. Elected Feb. 15 to lead the board of directors are:

Chair – Bob Roth, council member, City of Aurora
Vice Chair – Herb Atchison, mayor, City of Westminster
Secretary – Bob Fifer, mayor pro tem, City of Arvada
Treasurer – John Diak, council member, Town of Parker

Boulder County commissioner Elise Jones will serve as immediate past chair.

"I want to thank our outgoing chair, Elise Jones, for providing excellent leadership this past year," said Bob Roth, board chair. "It's an honor to follow in her footsteps in guiding this esteemed organization. Regionalism is alive and well in the metro area and with the support of DRCOG staff, the executive officers and the entire board, I'm looking forward to the continuing and important work of enhancing and protecting our quality of life."

For more information on DRCOG or its board of directors, visit drcog.org or call 303-455-1000.

# # #

The Denver Regional Council of Governments is a planning organization where local governments collaborate to establish guidelines, set policy and allocate funding in the areas of transportation and personal mobility; growth and development; and aging and disability resources.
DRCOG executive director Jennifer Schaufele resigns

Transportation planning director Doug Rex will lead group in the interim

By MONTE WHALEY  |  mwhaley@denverpost.com  |  The Denver Post

February 24, 2017 at 11:43 am

Jennifer Schaufele has resigned her position as executive director of the Denver Regional Council of Governments. Her departure was effective Feb. 17.

“Jennifer served this organization and our region for nearly 13 years, and her accomplishments are both numerous and significant,” said Bob Roth, chair of the organization.

The Denver Regional Council of Government — or DRCOG — is a planning organization where local governments collaborate to establish guidelines, set policy and allocate funding in the areas of transportation and personal mobility; growth and development; and aging and disability resources.

During her tenure with DRCOG, Schaufele helped lead several regional efforts, including the redevelopment of Denver’s Union Station and the lobbying for significant improvements to the Older Americans Act, which funds services for and protects the rights of older adults. She also galvanized peers across the nation to advocate for improvements in federal transportation funding.

Schaufele said she was proud of her work with DRCOG and wishes the organization well.

“I strongly believe in and support DRCOG’s mission and vision and I’m proud to have been proud of its accomplishments over the past 12 years,” she said. “While it’s time for me to pursue other challenges and interests, I will always be a champion for DRCOG and I look forward to watching the organization continue to work from a new vantage point.”

In the coming weeks, the board’s Performance and Engagement committee will begin the process of hiring a new executive director for DRCOG. Doug Rex, director of transportation planning and operations, will fulfill the duties of executive director until a new person is named to the position.
Denver Is No Longer the Very Best Place to Live in the U.S

We dropped a slot in *U.S. News and World Report*'s annual list of America's most desirable cities. To that we say: thank you.

**BY: ALI LONGWELL**

**FEBRUARY 8 2017, 10:06 AM**

*U.S. News & World Report*'s annual list the 100 Best Places to Live in the USA was released this week, and Denver should be celebrating the results. This year, the Mile High City dropped from the top spot to number two, falling below Austin, Texas, but ranking above San Jose, California; Washington D.C.; and Fayetteville, Arkansas.

Why should Denverites celebrate being taken down a peg? We don’t often put much stock in these types of lists—after all, we already know that Denver is a great place to live—but perhaps a drop in ranking is good news for a city that’s been squeezed by growing pains. Or maybe that’s just wishful thinking.

The annual list ranks cities based on quality of life, job market, value, and people’s desire to live there. As to the last point, just look at Denver’s (and Colorado's) massive growth to see that our fair city is a sought-after home base. The Mile High City is consistently named among the fastest-growing metros in the nation, with a population of more than 2.7 million. And according to a U.S. Census Bureau report, Colorado ranks seventh among the states for population growth from 2015 to 2016.

*U.S. News & World Report* gave Denver an overall score of 7.5 out of 10 on this year’s report. We received high marks on desirability (naturally) at 8.4, net migration at 8.1, and job market at 8.0. For value, we got a score of 7.2, and quality of life (which includes crime rates, quality and availability of health care, quality of education, well-being, and the commuter index) came in at 6.8—somewhat surprising considering that Coloradans are often touted as some of the healthiest and happiest citizens in the U.S.

According the report, Denver has a median age of 36.1, a 3.2 percent unemployment rate, and a median home price of $314,021. And to those complaining about your morning commute, the average transit time actually comes in a mere 1.3 minutes higher than the national average, at 27.2 minutes.

In a state known for its sunshine, mountains, Wild West history, and of course, legal marijuana, it makes sense that people love to visit. But why stay? 5280 provides readers with a plethora of reasons, but it’s likely the 5,000 acres of parks, burgeoning arts scene, young population, the nearly 100 breweries, mild climate, the high volume of tech jobs, and any of the others perks that this report lists.

In upcoming years, Denver’s population growth is not necessarily going to halt, but the city and its citizens can continue to find solutions to its pitfalls. The Denver Regional Council of Governments has already started developing plans to create a growth boundary, as well as guidelines for mixed-use development and land usage in their Metro Vision plan, which outlines goals for growth and development to the year 2040.

Until then, I’ll raise my glass—filled with one of Denver’s finest craft brews—to the city we all know and love.
**Tonsing leaves light rail as major part of legacy**

Former Littleton City Council member made big imprint in work with RTD

Posted Sunday, February 5, 2017 12:57 pm

Robert “Bob” Tonsing served for a decade on Littleton City Council and was named “Father of Light Rail” by the Regional Transportation District when he retired from its board in 2004.

Friends and colleagues will gather Feb. 10 at Fort Logan National Cemetery to bid farewell to Tonsing, who died in Littleton on Jan. 24 at age 86.

Born Jan. 8, 1931 in Wichita, Kansas, Tonsing thought of himself as a journalist to the end, and was a working reporter until 1960. That's when a growing family required a fatter paycheck, and he became director of public relations for Martin Marietta, according to his son, Robert, who said Tonsing was a fourth-generation journalist. Tonsing's father was editor of the Wichita Eagle and his grandfather, newspaperman John A. Martin, was governor of Kansas.

Tonsing wore a number of hats, often simultaneously, after graduating from Wichita State University. While in the Army, he was a staff member of Pacific Stars and Stripes newspaper, based in Okinawa. Following discharge, he went to work as an investigative reporter for the Denver Post and uncovered corruption in the Denver Police Department, as well as Mafia activities in the metro area.

He was executive director of the Colorado Republican Party; a Littleton city councilman (1983-1993): chairman of the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG); director of the Metropolitan Denver Water Authority; member, and for a time, chairman of the Regional Transportation District Board of Directors (1992-2004).

A plaque he received from the RTD board said: “Bob Tonsing has been the key political strategist for building a light rail system in the Denver Metro Region. After all is said and done, Bob Tonsing is the person most responsible for the region's fixed guideway transportation system.”

The heading on it called the District H director “Father of Light Rail in the Denver Metro Region.”

Son Robert has happy memories of family dinner visits to the “cherished” Denver Press Club, where a reception will be held following the Fort Logan ceremony. All attending are invited.

He is survived by sons Robert (Ann Imse, Robert's wife), of Morrison; Martin, of Denver; and Anthony, of Aurora.

Several Littleton colleagues recalled working with Tonsing. During an interview with Colorado Community Media, former Littleton Community Development Director Charlie Blosten and former City Manager Jim Woods were together, reminiscing about Tonsing, and they agreed that “Bob knew light rail better than anybody.”

Without his and the city council's long and bitter fight against some RTD board members and people who opposed public transportation, light rail would never have been built, Blosten said. He spoke of numerous trips to Washington by Tonsing, Littleton Mayor Dennis Reynolds and others to lobby Colorado Congressman Dan Schaefer — in addition to years of state maneuvering.
“He was also a good councilmember,” Blosten recalls, “and worked well with staff.”

Littleton’s director of communications, Kelli Narde, agreed about Tonsing’s role in bringing light rail to Littleton: “I don’t believe we’d have the Southwest Corridor light rail, if it weren’t for him.” She added that she and Tonsing became friends, and he also worked on city public relations matters through his Public Information Corp. His company conducted polls of Littleton citizens on various topics, such as why they voted against a tax for building a new police station in 2005.

Blosten and Woods talked about the city’s involvement in light rail, working on complexities of right of way along the railroad tracks, moving tracks at times — when they were uncertain what the future technology would be — with Tonsing in the picture.

Former state highway department employee Harvey Atchison of Littleton was involved in the project “from the beginning,” he said, including environmental studies. He remembers the state Legislature as the biggest obstacle: “They fought tooth and nail because the highways needed the funds.”

Probably many stories about Tonsing will surface as people gather to remember a man prominent in recent local and regional history. The Fort Logan National Cemetery service is at 10:15 a.m. Feb.10 — open to all (guides at the entrance, which is on Sheridan Boulevard two blocks south of Hampden Avenue/U.S. 285, will assist with directions to the site). And all attending are invited to a reception at the Denver Press Club afterward, 1330 Glenarm Place, Denver.
DRCOG Elder Refugee Program supports socialization, overall wellness for community

More funding to launch English, health classes this spring

By MEGAN MITCHELL | mmitchell@denverpost.com | The Denver Post

PUBLISHED: February 21, 2017 at 7:59 pm | UPDATED: February 23, 2017 at 12:04 pm

When Dessalegn Jenber retired last September at 63, he got bored.

“And my weight started to increase because I have all this free time and nothing to do,” Jenber said. “I have a neighbor who comes (to the Aurora Center for Active Adults) and uses the gym for exercise. Through him, I heard about the gym for elders.”

What he heard about was the Elder Refugee program, a state-funded, social integration and wellness program designed specifically for refugees in 2012. It is headed up by the Denver Council of Regional Governments and the Colorado African Organization and is based out of the Aurora Center for Active Adults in Del Mar Circle.

Jenber, a former language and history teacher in his native Ethiopia, says that every day has been a new learning experience for him since he came to the United States in 2011 to be with his grown daughters. And when he started coming to the Elder Refugee program three months ago, he began a new learning process by taking orientation classes for several weeks on how to use the workout equipment.

“A lot of the people who come in have never done regimented exercise before,” said Tony Yang, recreation supervisor of fitness for the Aurora Parks, Recreation and Open Space Department. “They come from places where work was hard labor for their entire lives ... When they come in for the first time they usually have no idea how these machines work. So we set them up with them, give them orientations for about six to eight weeks with our trainers. Then they do by themselves, whenever they want.”

But exercise turned out to only be half of Jenber’s motivation for joining the program.

“I wanted to control my weight, yes, I wanted to be healthy, yes, but I want to have friends here,” Jenber said. “I live alone now, and sports activities like this are for friendship and that’s why I come here. I have made so many new friends — Ethiopian friends, Nepalese, Americans and so on. I love it, it’s meaningful.”

And that integration is the true central mission of the Elder Refugee program.

“Instead of staying at home, they are coming here and meeting friends and talking to people,” said Lydia Dumam, co-manager of the Colorado African Organization’s navigation program. “For example, we have people from Ethiopia and Burma and Eritrea, and they all speak different languages, so they have to learn how to communicate in English when they come here. They are trying their best, and that feels so good.”

The program encourages refugees who are older than 60 to come to the center as often as they like to learn things like Zumba and shooting pool and how to dance the jitterbug. About 40 people are currently involved in the program.
“There’s a lot of differences when people come from the Third World to the First World,” added Mohammed Juma, community navigator for the Colorado African Organization. “These elders want to see what people are doing and how they’re acting and learn from that. They imitate Americans, they learn from them and that’s very beneficial to their integration and overall wellness.”

The Colorado Refugee Service Program and the Older Americans Act, along with other funding sources, help to pay all membership fees to the Aurora Center for Active Adults as well as program staffing, community navigation services, English and health education classes, and bus tickets for transportation. The Colorado Refugee Service Program is a division of the Colorado Department of Human Services, and is itself funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ Office of Refugee Resettlement.

“A few years ago, (the Colorado Refugee Service Program) saw a need with elders in the community,” said Sara Beth Ford, Refugee Program Coordinator for DRCOG. “A lot of them were contributing to their families stabilization by doing things like staying home and cooking, cleaning and making sure the kids were taken care of, but they weren’t necessarily able to get out of the house and socialize and learn English and get all the benefits of getting out, even though they were really helping their families at home.”

And so the state organization reached out to DRCOG to develop a partnership that could enrich the elder refugee community through DRCOG’s Area Agency on Aging.

“It seemed like a perfect partnership because we have all the connections to the elder resources, and CAO has excellent connections to the refugee community,” Ford said. “Having it in Aurora was a natural fit because it’s in close proximity to the greater refugee community here.”

This year, the program was able to get a little more funding and so new classes on nutrition and English are being planned for the spring.

“Most of the new activities that we designed are based on things that the elders said that they wanted to see,” Ford said. “We know they care a lot about wellness and health and taking care of themselves, and that’s absolutely what we want to encourage.”
16 travel options for skiers who don’t want to drive to Colorado’s slopes

Options include trains, buses, ride-share services and shuttles from Denver International Airport

Cyrus McCrimmon, The Denver Post

Ski traffic sits backed up on the onramp to Interstate 70 eastbound at U.S. Highway 40 in Empire on Feb. 17, 2014.

By TOM MCGHEE | tmcghee@denverpost.com | The Denver Post

PUBLISHED: February 7, 2017 at 3:26 pm | UPDATED: February 8, 2017 at 5:50 pm

Want to leave the car at home for your next Colorado ski trip?

A growing list of transportation options — 16 in fact — is available to reach ski resorts.

A new guide, put together by the CoPIRG Foundation and Snowriders International, was announced Tuesday and includes information about trains, buses, ride-share options and shuttles from Denver International Airport.

“Given there’s only a couple of routes, and thousands of us are going to just a handful of places, all of us driving our own cars is completely inefficient,” said Danny Kats, director of CoPIRG, a public interest research group. “However, we’ve seen a dramatic increase in the number of options people have to get to their favorite mountains without driving.”

The guide’s options include:

1. Amtrak Winter Park Express ski train

Daniel Brenner, Special to The Denver Post

Boulder residents Jane Weakley, 9, left, and her brother Miles, 7, right, play in the snow after departing the Winter Park Express Saturday, Jan. 7, 2017 at Winter Park. The Winter Park Express is now operational on Saturday, Sundays, and some holidays until March 26. The historic train service began in 1912. The trip is about two hours and travels through 28 tunnels.

The Winter Park Express runs from Union Station to Winter Park and back on Saturdays and Sundays.

2. Amtrak California Zephyr

Andy Cross, The Denver Post

Keith Dameron washes off the windows of the Amtrak California Zephyr train during a brief stop at Union Station on Tuesday, May 7, 2007. The train came from Chicago and then headed to California.

The California Zephyr train from Amtrak runs from Union Station in Denver to Fraser, Granby and Glenwood Springs.

Cost: $35-$168

Departs: 8:15 a.m. from Union Station in Denver.
3. Front Range Ski Bus

This privately-operated bus runs Wednesday through Sunday from Union Station to Loveland and Copper.

4. Bustang

RJ Sangosti, The Denver Post

Passengers arrive at Union Station in Denver from Fort Collins on the Bustang, a statewide bus service, that started in July, Sept. 2, 2015.

The Bustang, a state-funded bus service from Union Station and Denver Federal Center, travels to Frisco, Vail and other destinations daily. The stop in Frisco allows riders to get to Arapahoe Basin, Breckenridge, Copper and Keystone. From Vail, riders can get to Vail Mountain and Beaver Creek via the ECO Transit Bus. From Glenwood Springs, riders gain access to Aspen’s mountains.

Departures: The bus departs at 3:10 p.m. from Union Station in Denver and 3:40 p.m. from Denver Federal Center via Route 730 daily. Route 700 departs at 5:40 p.m. from Union Station and 6:10 p.m. from Denver Federal Center.

Returns: From Vail, the bus departs at 7:05 a.m. from Vail Transportation Center (Route 731). From Frisco, the bus departs at 7:40 a.m. On Route 701, the bus departs at 8:40 a.m. from Vail Transportation Center and 9:15 a.m. from Frisco Transportation Center.

Cost: $12-28 one-way.

5. RTD ski-n-ride

Route N offers service to Eldora Mountain Resort from Boulder or with a single transfer from Broomfield, downtown Denver, Lafayette, Longmont or Louisville. The service offers luggage bays for ski and snowboarding equipment, which must be placed in a ski bag when boarding any bus. Ski bags are not mandatory on regional buses when skis are placed in lower baggage bins, RTD says.

Cost: Regional $4.50; $250 for discount, which includes seniors 65+ and people with disabilities.

Departures and returns: Service is frequent for those looking for full- or half-day skiing. The bus departs multiple times daily in the winter (check the RTD schedule to be sure).

6. Greyhound Bus

Greyhound runs service from Denver station to Frisco, Vail and Glenwood Springs, with access to resorts, departs multiple times daily.

7. University of Colorado Boulder Ski Bus program

This program offers service on alternating schedule to Keystone, A-Basin, Breckenridge, Beaver Creek and Vail.

8. Shuttle service from Denver International Airport
Service is offered by Colorado Mountain Express, Fresh Tracks Transportation, Peak 1 Express, Powderhound Transportation and Summit Express.

9. Create a car pool or van pool

You can do this via SkiCarpool, CarPoolWorld and WaytoGo or check out Craigslist Rideshare options.

The guide also provides timetables, costs, route information and ticketing information.

The Colorado Department of Transportation’s SnowStang bus service, a pilot program that is expected to launch next winter, will offer test runs to determine if it is viable on Feb. 11 and Feb. 25, said Mike Timlin, bus operations manager for CDOT.

SnowStang will offer round-trip service to Arapahoe Basin, Beaver Creek, Breckenridge, Keystone, Vail and Winter Park. Trips will begin and end at the Regional Transportation District’s park-n-Ride lot at the Federal Center in Lakewood. Tickets are $45 for Keystone, Winter Park and A-Basin; $50 for Breckenridge and $60 for Vail and Beaver Creek.

SnowStang, will build on the success of CDOT-operated Bustang, which provides service along Interstate 25 north to Fort Collins and south to Colorado Springs, and along the Interstate 70 corridor to Glenwood Springs.

Since its launch in June 2015, Bustang’s ridership has increased and it now carries 12,000 people per month.
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City to host Feb. 23 open house about Railroad Quiet Zones

On Thursday, Feb. 23, the City of Boulder will host its second Railroad Quiet Zones open house to share information about railroad quiet zones and to present information regarding the results of the initial evaluation process. The open house will take place from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at the Boulder Chamber of Commerce at 2440 Pearl St.

In response to concerns expressed by community members regarding the impacts of train horn noise, city staff is working with agency partners to develop a prioritization and phasing plan for the implementation of quiet zones for railroad crossings impacting Boulder. Quiet zones are at-grade railroad crossings that include physical infrastructure and warning systems so that train engineers are not required to sound the train horn at the crossing.

The city has been awarded approximately $1 million in grant funding from the Denver Regional Council of Governments to advance quiet zones for the Boulder community. Staff is currently updating the railroad quiet zone technical requirements, cost estimates, and continuing the community engagement process.

The city is seeking community input to identify and prioritize potential quiet zone crossing improvements. The options for prioritizing railroad quiet zone crossing improvements will be based on factors including the number of people living and working within half a mile of the railroad crossings, type and proximity of adjacent land uses (existing and/or planned), as well as street characteristics, costs for installation, potential on-going maintenance responsibilities, opportunities for multi-agency and public/private partnerships, and above all, safety.

For more information regarding City of Boulder railroad quiet zones, including copies of the quiet zone study reports and how to stay up-to-date on the project, please visit: https://bouldercolorado.gov/Transportation/RRQZ.