AGENDA
DRCOG Board Work Session
Wednesday, October 3, 2018
4 p.m.
1001 17th Street
Aspen/Birch Conference Room

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Summary of September 5, 2018 Board Work Session
   (Attachment A)
4. Public Comment
   The chair requests that there be no public comment on issues for which a prior public hearing has been held before the Board of Directors.
5. Discussion of Active Transportation Plan
   (Attachment B) Emily Lindsey, Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning & Operations
6. Discussion of Community Assessment Survey of Older Adults (CASOA)
   (Attachment C) Jayla Sanchez-Warren, Director, Area Agency on Aging
7. Discussion of FTA 5310 Designated Recipient
   (Attachment D) Jacob Riger, Long-Range Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning & Operations
8. Adjourn

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.
Directors present:
Bob Fifer, Vice Chair  Arvada
Eva Henry  Adams County
David Beacom  City and County of Broomfield
Nicholas Williams  City and County of Denver
Kevin Flynn  City and County of Denver
Bob Roth  Aurora
Larry Vittum  Bennett
Tammy Maurer  Centennial
Laura Christman  Cherry Hills Village
Rick Teter  Commerce City
Steve Conklin  Edgewater
Daniel Dick  Federal Heights
Jim Dale  Golden
Ron Rakowsky  Greenwood Village
Karina Elrod  Littleton
Wynne Shaw  Lone Tree
Ashley Stolzmann  Louisville
John Diak  Parker
Debra Perkins-Smith  Colorado Department of Transportation

Participating via Webex:
Aaron Brockett  Boulder
Lynette Kelsey  Georgetown
Stephanie Walton  Lafayette
Jessica Sandgren  Thornton

Others present: Doug Rex, Executive Director; Jeanne Shreve, Adams County; Mac Callison, Aurora; Brad Boland, Castle Rock; Janice Finch, Denver; Jamie Hartig, Douglas County; Carolyn Scharf, Federal Heights; Kent Moorman, Thornton; Mike Lewis, Herman Stockinger, CDOT; and DRCOG staff.

Board Vice Chair Bob Fifer facilitated the work session. The session began at 4:00 p.m.

Summary of April 4, 2018 Board Work Session
The summary was provided for review. No revisions to the summary were requested.

Public Comment
No public comment was received.

Discussion of transportation ballot initiatives
Representatives from Propositions 109 and 110 were invited to present at the work session. The Proposition 109 campaign declined the invite citing a scheduling conflict. Arvada Mayor Marc Williams provided an overview of Proposition 110, on behalf of Let’s
Go Colorado. Ron Papsdorf, DRCOG Transportation Planning & Operations Director, provided background information on Proposition 109. Members discussed the two initiatives. Consensus of the group is for the two initiatives to move forward to the full Board for discussion.

Discussion of non-transportation ballot initiatives
Rich Mauro, Senior Policy and Legislative Analyst, provided information on the non-transportation ballot initiatives. Members discussed the various initiatives. Consensus of the group is for Amendments 73 and 74 to move forward to the full Board for discussion.

The work session ended at 5:31 p.m.
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors
From: Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director
303 480-6701 or drex@drcog.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 3, 2018</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT**
Discussion of the DRCOG Active Transportation Plan

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**
N/A

**ACTION BY OTHERS**
N/A

**SUMMARY**
DRCOG and its partners have developed a draft regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP). Alongside the Active Transportation Stakeholder Committee (ATSC), the project team kicked off the planning process at the end of 2017 and conducted stakeholder and public outreach in spring and summer 2018.

In June, the project team held five workshops across the region with local government staff, conducted outreach on Bike to Work Day at ten stations regionwide and analyzed survey results to learn more about barriers to walking and bicycling. In August, the project team received comments from the ATSC regarding the planning framework, tools for local implementation, and draft regional active transportation corridors.

Staff anticipates releasing the draft ATP for public and stakeholder comment in October. The 30-day public comment period will include public outreach and stakeholder engagement. The project team will revise the document based on feedback and present the final draft to DRCOG’s Transportation Advisory Committee, Regional Transportation Committee and Board of Directors.

A [link](#) to the draft ATP is available for your review. Please note that only Appendix A is included in the document. Appendices B-F will be added to the Plan at a later time.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**
July 18, 2018 – Board of Directors meeting

**PROPOSED MOTION**
N/A

**ATTACHMENT**
1. Staff presentation
2. [Draft ATP](#)

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
If you need additional information please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at (303) 480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Emily Lindsey, Transportation Planner, at (303) 480-5628 or elindsey@drcog.org.
DRCOG Active Transportation Plan

Schedule

Winter / Spring 2017-2018
- Project Kickoff
- Information gathering & data analysis

June 2018
- Local Government Outreach
- Public Outreach

July 2018
- Draft Network Development

Late summer/early fall
- Additional Stakeholder Outreach
- Plan Development and Network Refinement

Fall
- Stakeholder and Public Outreach
- Plan Review/Approval Process
Outreach Highlights (to date)

55 participants from 31 stakeholder agencies at 5 meetings across the region in June

412 responses to an online survey from members of the public

10 stations on Bike to Work Day and 233 responses to engagement activity

Resident Survey

At least once during a typical month:

- For fun or exercise

  - 49%

  - 79%

- To get somewhere other than work

  - 30%

  - 55%

- To get to work

  - 17%

  - 15%
% who said they would feel very or somewhat comfortable:

- No bicycle facility on a four-lane roadway: 12%
- Bicycle lane on a two-lane roadway: 65%
- Bicycle lane on a four-lane roadway: 62%
- Buffered bicycle lane on a four-lane roadway: 82%

< only 2 in 10 respondents would feel very comfortable on a two- or four-lane roadway w/ a bicycle lane.

< only 4 in 10 respondents would feel very comfortable on a buffered bicycle lane on a four-lane roadway.

% who said they would feel very or somewhat comfortable:

- Sidewalk adjacent to a four-lane roadway: 91%
- Biking and Walking Trail: 92%
- Bi-directional separated bike lane on a four-lane roadway: 91%
- Separated bike lane on a four-lane roadway: 93%
If there were more shared use paths....

Who are we planning for?

- 4% of people are highly confident
- 12% of people are somewhat confident
- 59% of people are interested but concerned

DRCOG Survey of Residents About Active Transportation (2018)
Planning Framework Themes

- Crashes and safety
- Comfort and usability
- Connectivity of local and regional active transportation networks
- Access to/from transit
- Equitable access to active transportation options

Plan Structure

Introduction + Objectives
Regional Active Transportation Network
Tools for Local Implementation
Taking Action – Strategic Initiatives
Appendices
  - County profiles
  - Engagement summary
  - Survey results
  - Crash report
  - Local plan inventory
Introductory Components

- Outlines objectives and performance measures.
- Highlights local examples throughout the DRCOG region.
- Describes connection to Metro Vision.
- Introduces the regional active transportation network concept.

Regional Active Transportation Network Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>What does it mean for the ATP?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian focus area</td>
<td>Areas with a high concentration of existing or potential pedestrian activity.</td>
<td>Efforts to improve pedestrian safety and convenience in these areas will help the region achieve Metro Vision goals related to livable communities, safety, health, and transit integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-trip opportunity zones</td>
<td>Areas with a high concentration of short trips (2 miles or less).</td>
<td>The average bicycle trip distance in the Denver region is 1.8 miles. Areas with a large number of trips 2 miles or less hold potential for converting car trips to bicycle trips, which will help fulfill a key Metro Vision goal (reduce SOV mode share).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional active transportation corridors</td>
<td>Vision for high-comfort routes that connect significant regional destinations and may serve longer distance bike trips, as well as local walking and biking trips.</td>
<td>These corridors are intended to allow safe and comfortable access to regional destinations for everyone, supporting Metro Vision’s goals related to creating a connected multimodal region and vibrant regional economy. The regional network should facilitate cross-jurisdictional collaboration toward a common vision for a regional active transportation network. Local facilities that feed into the regional network are critical to connect residents to the regional network and will be recognized in the ATP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Active Transportation Network Components

Highlights from Tools for Local Implementation

Identified planning and design approaches for:
bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian infrastructure, 
and supporting elements for active transportation.

New and Emerging – covers topics like e-bikes, dockless mobility, etc.

Traditional – covers topics like accessibility, complete streets, etc.
Local and Regional Strategic Initiatives

In line with **Metro Vision planning framework**, identified:

- Options for **Regional Organizations**
  - Collaboration
  - Education and Assistance
  - Investments
- Options for **Local Organizations**
  - Collaboration
  - Policies, Plans & Regulations
  - Investments

Highlighted relevant **case studies** too!

County Profiles

As part of existing conditions assessment, looked at each County-level geography to:

- Understand **planning context**
- Highlight and incorporate **local plans and policies**
- Examine **existing facilities** and **walking and bicycling activity**.
- Report on active transportation **crashes**.
Bicycle and Pedestrian Crash Report – Coming soon!

QUESTIONS?
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 3, 2018</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT**
This item reports the regional results of the Community Assessment Survey of Older Adults (CASOA)

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**
No action requested.

**ACTION BY OTHERS**
N/A

**SUMMARY**
The Area Agency on Aging is required to complete an Area Plan on Aging for 2020-2024. The Area Plan requires a survey of older adults in the region. DRCOG contracted with The National Research Center (NRC) to conduct a region-wide survey of older adults. The objective of the survey is to identify community strengths, articulate specific needs of older adults, estimate the contribution of older adults and determine the connection of older adults to the community.

At the October meeting, staff will present the regional analysis of the survey. Links to CASOA county reports can be found at: [https://drcog.org/programs/area-agency-aging/data-and-surveys](https://drcog.org/programs/area-agency-aging/data-and-surveys) on the lower portion of the page.

**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**
N/A

**PROPOSED MOTION**
N/A

**ATTACHMENT**
Staff presentation

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
Should you have any questions regarding the presentation, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Jayla Sanchez-Warren, Area Agency on Aging Director, at 303-480-6735 or jswarren@drcog.org.
CASOA™ Methods and Goals

Assessment Objectives
- Identify community strengths and weaknesses
- Articulate the specific needs of older adults in the community
- Develop estimates and projections of resident need in the future

Assessment Methods
- Multi-contact mailed survey
- Representative sample of 10,400 households of residents age 60+
- 1,246 surveys returned; 3% margin of error
- 12% response rate
- Data statistically weighted to reflect population

Assessment Goals
- Immediate
  - Useful information for:
    - Planning
    - Resource allocation and development
    - Advocacy
    - Engagement

- Intermediate
  - Improved program mix
  - Better quality programs
  - More effective policies

- In time, a community of elders that is
  - More engaged
  - More supportive
  - More empowered
  - More independent
  - More vibrant
Community Dimensions Assessed

Overall Community Quality
- Community as a place to live and retire
- Recommend community to others
- Residential stability

Community and Belonging
- Sense of community
- Overall safety
- Valuing older residents in community
- Crime victimization and abuse

Community Information
- Availability of information about older adult resources
- Financial or legal services

Productive Activities
- Civic engagement
- Social engagement
- Recreation
- Caregiving
- Economic contribution

Health and Wellness
- Physical health
- Mental health
- Health care
- Independent living

Community Design and Land Use
- Housing variety and availability
- Ease of travel by car, foot and bus
- Access to daily needs
- Overall quality of life

Overall Community Quality

National Research Center, Inc.
Community as a Place for Older Residents

- **Community as a place to live**
  - 2010: 85%
  - 2015: 86%
  - 2018: 87%

- **Community as a place to retire**
  - 2010: 62%
  - 2015: 70%
  - 2018: 74%

- **Overall quality of services provided to adults age 60 and older**
  - 2010: 53%
  - 2015: 57%
  - 2018: 61%

National Research Center, Inc.

---

Recommending Community

**How likely are you to recommend living in the community to older adults?**

- 2018: 66%
- 2015: 77%
- 2010: 78%

National Research Center, Inc.
### Community and Belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness and acceptance of the community towards residents age 60 and older</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall feeling of safety in community</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing residents age 60 and older in community</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborliness of community</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent "excellent" or "good"
## Community and Belonging Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being the victim of a crime</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being the victim of a fraud or scam</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being physically or emotionally abused</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent at least a “minor” problem

National Research Center, Inc.

---

## Community Information
In general, how informed or uninformed do you feel about services and activities available to older adults?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Somewhat or Very Informed</th>
<th>Excellent or Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Availability of information about resources for adults age 60 and older

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Somewhat or Very Informed</th>
<th>Excellent or Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not knowing what services are available to older adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feeling like your voice is heard in the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding meaningful volunteer work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding productive or meaningful activities to do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Productive Activities

National Research Center, Inc.

2018
2015
2010

Volunteer opportunities

Participate in local government or community matters

Attend social events or activities

Attend religious or spiritual activities

Skill-building or personal enrichment classes

Recreation opportunities

Employment opportunities

Percent “excellent” or “good”
### Participation in Productive Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended a meeting of local elected officials or other local public meeting</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered time to some group/activity in your community</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a senior center in your community</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited a neighborhood park</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides care to a child, adult or other older adults</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent at least once or at least one hour

---

### Productive Activities Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having interesting social events or activities to attend</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having interesting cultural or recreational activities to attend</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling emotionally burdened by providing care for another person</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent at least a “minor” problem
Economic Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Unpaid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$6,676,949,573</td>
<td>$3,943,577,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$5,179,333,738</td>
<td>$3,796,865,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$3,173,604,200</td>
<td>$3,629,789,041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Paid**
  - Working part-time
  - Working full-time
- **Unpaid**
  - Providing care to older adults
  - Providing care to adults
  - Providing care to children
  - Providing help to family and friends
  - Volunteering

---

Health and Wellness
Health and Wellness

- Availability of preventive health services (e.g., health screenings, flu shots, educational workshops): 55% (2018), 67% (2015), 67% (2010)

Participation in Health and Wellness Activities

- Overall physical health: 74% (2018), 78% (2015), 74% (2010)
- Ate at least 5 portions of fruits and vegetables a day: 35% (2018), 40% (2015), NA (2010)
- Participated in moderate or vigorous physical activity: 51% (2018), 46% (2015), NA (2010)
### Health and Wellness Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Need</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your physical health</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling bored</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having adequate information or dealing with Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing regular activities, including walking, eating and preparing meals</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent at least a “minor” problem

---

### Community Design and Land Use

---

---
### Community Design and Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percent &quot;excellent&quot; or &quot;good&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of life</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of affordable quality housing</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of affordable quality food</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of travel by car</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of walking</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living in community</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent “excellent” or “good”

National Research Center, Inc.

### Use of Public Transportation

In the last 12 months, about how many times, if ever, used bus, rail or other public transportation instead of driving?

- 2018: 29%
- 2015: 32%
- 2010: 37%

National Research Center, Inc.
Community Design and Land Use Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having safe and affordable transportation available</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having housing to suit your needs</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having enough to eat</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent at least a “minor” problem

Community Readiness
Special Topics

Frequency of Internet Use

Most often
- Use email, texting or video to communicate
- Get the news or weather
- Research or study a topic of interest

Least often
- Sell goods and services online, advertise
- Attend an online class or training
- Communicate with government (seek services, get a license, discuss a problem)
Comfort with Using the Internet

- Using email: 93%
- Accessing the Internet: 91%
- Using a computer/laptop/desktop: 91%
- Locating information online (bus schedules, weather, news, etc.): 89%
- Using smartphone or tablet computer: 87%
- Using social networking sites (Facebook, Twitter, etc.): 72%

Percent very or somewhat comfortable

Recommendations
**Recommendations**

**Community and Belonging**
- Encourage neighborliness
- Promote intergenerational programs
- Create social resources for high-risk populations
- Consider community design and land use policy to “build community”

**Community Information**
- Increase public awareness of programs and services
- Develop a clearinghouse for all services offered to seniors in community
- Offer information and planning activities on a large scale

**Productive Activities**
- Actively promote senior volunteerism
- Consider the social and leisure interests of Baby Boomers
- Increase participation of older residents in local governing and community decision-making

**Health and Wellness**
- Pursue policies encouraging universal design and senior housing options that require less maintenance burden
- Provide attractive fitness opportunities for older residents
- Support home modification and repair services
Recommendations

Community Design and Land Use

- Consider zoning regulations that encourage affordable housing options
- Develop programs that reduce housing costs
- Develop “time bank” or other volunteer programs to support senior transportation

Thank You!
To: Chair and Members of the Board of Directors

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

Meeting Date | Agenda Category | Agenda Item #
-------------|----------------|-------------
October 3, 2018 | Discussion | 7

SUBJECT
Discussion on DRCOG becoming the designated recipient for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 (Enhanced Mobility of Seniors & Individuals with Disabilities) Program funding.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
The FTA 5310 program funds projects to increase the mobility of older adults and individuals with disabilities. Eligible projects include both capital investment and operating assistance for service that goes beyond minimum Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit service requirements. There is an annual allocation of just under $2 million for the Denver region. CDOT has been the designated recipient since 2013.

DRCOG previously selected projects for this program and its predecessor program for several cycles for RTD. The DRCOG Area Agency on Aging (AAA) also administers transportation projects funded through the Older Americans Act (OAA). The coordination of both funding sources could significantly increase service efficiency, reduce duplication, and increase the number of trips provided. Also, the FTA allows funding expended for OAA transportation projects to count towards the local match requirement for FTA 5310. For those reasons, combining both programs is a key recommendation of the 2016-2019 DRCOG Area Plan on Aging. It is also the primary recommendation of the 2013 Transportation Coordination Systems Study, a joint effort of DRCOG, the Denver Regional Mobility Access Council (DRMAC), and other stakeholders. In fact, this study recommended as a best practice the integration and leveraging of multiple funding sources to best serve transportation needs for vulnerable populations.

In addition, the new 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program Human Service Transportation set-aside could also be combined with the other two funding sources, and potentially others, to make an even more robust coordinated program.

Becoming the designated recipient would be a new responsibility for DRCOG. It would mean working more directly with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). It would also mean overseeing federal projects undertaken by subrecipients and compensating them for their work before getting reimbursed from FTA. These responsibilities are not dissimilar to ones that the DRCOG AAA has had for decades in their role as a recipient of Older Americans Act funds. FTA 5310 designated recipients can use up to 10% of the annual allocation to cover administrative costs associated with administering the program with no local match requirement.
DRCOG staff have met with CDOT, FTA, RTD, and stakeholders to obtain input and support. CDOT, FTA, and RTD have indicated support, and stakeholders have provided useful feedback. DRCOG staff are currently engaged with stakeholders to address their questions and concerns.

If DRCOG becomes the FTA 5310 designated recipient, staff would work with CDOT to transition the program to DRCOG effective with the 2020 funding cycle. The first call for projects would take place in the Summer/Fall of 2019 and the first projects would commence in January 2020.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTACHMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you need additional information please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or <a href="mailto:drex@drcog.org">drex@drcog.org</a>; or Jacob Riger, Long Range Transportation Planning Manager, at 303-480-6751 or <a href="mailto:iriger@drcog.org">iriger@drcog.org</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion on DRCOG Becoming a Direct Recipient for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 Funding

FTA 5310 Program History

- DRCOG previously selected projects for FTA 5310 and its predecessors
- RTD managed the program until 2013 when it transitioned to CDOT
- Federal statute requires DRCOG (as MPO) to recommend the FTA 5310 Program designated recipient to the Governor
5310 Background

- Funds projects to increase mobility of older adults and individuals with disabilities (just under $2 million annually in Denver region)
  - Operating Expenses
  - Mobility Management
  - Capital Investment
    - Vehicles
    - Small Infrastructure

Eligible Activities

- Meet specific needs of targeted populations when existing transit is insufficient, inappropriate, or unavailable
- Exceed Americans with Disabilities Act requirements
- Improve fixed route access & decrease paratransit reliance
- Offer alternatives to public transit
Desired Outcomes

- Ensure more/better service is provided to vulnerable populations
- Reduce administrative and service duplication
- Break down silos between different funding sources, providers, jurisdictions, trip purposes, etc.
- Efficiently use taxpayer dollars to provide life-sustaining mobility
Benefits of DRCOG Administering FTA 5310

- Coordinate planning
  - DRCOG MPO function
  - Coordinated Transit Plan

- Coordinate and integrate multiple funding sources:
  - FTA 5310
  - Older Americans Act/Older Coloradans Act
  - 2020-2023 TIP Human Services Transportation Set-Aside

- Blend/leverage funding sources to reduce match requirements
  - OAA can be used as match for 5310

- Integrate coordinated funding with service technology tools (VTCLI project)

- Combine application, contract & auditing process among 3 funding sources

Coordinated Transportation Model (Administration)

HHS & U.S. DOT

- (a) Older Americans Act
- (b) FTA 5310
- (c) Transportation Improvement Program
  Through DRCOG

SRC
SRC Subgrantees

Douglas County
Douglas County Subgrantees

Via
Via Subgrantees

DRMAC

Other Transportation Providers
Coordinated Transportation Model (Funding)

FTA 5310 → Older Americans Act → TIP Set-aside → Coordinated Human Service Transportation

Capital, Operating, & Mobility Management Projects

QUESTIONS?