AGENDA
PERFORMANCE AND ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, October 19, 2022
5:00 p.m.
VIDEO/WEB CONFERENCE
Denver, CO

1. Call to Order

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Move to Adopt the Consent Agenda
   • July 20, 2022 meeting summary
     (Attachment A)

ACTION ITEMS

3. Select a representative to the Nominating Committee
   (Attachment B) Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director

INFORMATIONAL BRIEFING

4. 2022 DRCOG Board Director Collaboration Assessment Survey Results
   (Attachment C) Randy Arnold, Director, Human Resources

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

5. Report of the Chair
6. Report of the Executive Director
7. Other Matters by Members
8. Next Meeting – November 16, 2022
9. 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.
Members Present:

Wynne Shaw, Chair Lone Tree
Steve O’Dorisio Adams County
George Teal Douglas County
Nicole Speer Boulder
William Lindstedt Broomfield
Steve Conklin Edgewater
Jeslin Shahrezaei Lakewood
Joan Peck Longmont
Ashley Stolzmann Louisville
John Diak Parker
Bud Starker Wheat Ridge

Others present: Doug Rex, Executive Director; and DRCOG staff.

Chair Shaw called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. with a quorum present.

Move to adopt the consent agenda

Director Teal moved to adopt the consent agenda. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Items on the consent agenda included:

- Summary of the June 15, 2022 Performance and Engagement Committee meeting.

Preparation of the 2022 DRCOG Board Director Collaboration Assessment

Executive Director Doug Rex provided a brief overview of the assessment to the directors. This assessment has been utilized as a feedback mechanism allowing directors to voice their opinions about their experience at DRCOG regarding collaborative work and the achievement of desired results. Once complete, a report is provided to this committee for initial review and discussion prior to it being delivered to the Board. Within the last year, committee members have discussed how they can reduce the length of the survey. ED Rex proposed suggested edits/deletions to the committee and members agreed to these modifications.

DRCOG’s executive director 2021-2022 annual performance evaluation process

Randy Arnold provided a brief overview of the process to the committee. The executive director’s employment evaluation typically occurs annually in October. In preparation for this year’s executive director performance evaluation at the October P&E meeting, staff provided the committee with multiple documents for review:

- 2021-2022 executive director performance objectives. These performance objectives are the basis for the executive director’s scorecard report.
• Evaluation survey to be completed by the Board of Directors. Director Arnold proposed sending the performance evaluation to Board Directors in September.
• Evaluation survey for direct reports of the executive director.
• Evaluation survey for peer partners. The survey has been sent in the past to the directors of other MPOs along the front range, CDOT, RTD and E-470.

Report of the Chair
There was no report.

Report of the Executive Director
There was no report.

Other Matters by Members
There were no other matters.

Next Meeting – August 17, 2022

The meeting adjourned at 5:21 p.m.
To: Chair and Members of the Performance & Engagement Committee

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

Meeting Date | Agenda Category | Agenda Item #
---|---|---
October 19, 2022 | Action | 3

SUBJECT
This action is related to selection of one member of the Performance and Engagement Committee to serve on the Nominating Committee

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
Staff recommends the Performance and Engagement Committee select one (1) member to serve on the Nominating Committee in accordance with the Articles of Association.

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
The Articles of Association state that “The Nominating Committee shall be appointed in November of each year and consist of member representatives herein designated: The Immediate Past Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair if there is no Immediate Past Chair); one Board member representing the City and County of Denver; one member selected by the Performance & Engagement Committee …; one member selected by the Finance & Budget Committee …; one member selected by the Board; and one member selected by the Board Chair.” If more than one member expresses interest in serving, a ballot vote will be taken to select the Nominating Committee member.

At the January meeting each year, the Nominating Committee shall present to the Board nominations for Executive Committee members to be elected at the February meeting.

The Board has established the following guidelines to assist in selection of members of the Nominating Committee:

- Members of the Nominating Committee are not eligible to be nominated for a position on the Executive Committee (Board Officer) by the committee or from the floor.
- Members of the Nominating Committee shall have served not less than one year on the Board before being eligible to serve on the Nominating Committee.
- A designated alternate may not serve on the Nominating Committee.
- In the appointment of the Nominating Committee, consideration shall be given to providing representation of a broad cross-section of the Board, taking into account community size, geographic location, the rate of growth, county and municipality, rural and suburban and other factors.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A
Move to select one member of the Performance and Engagement Committee to the Nominating Committee

List of Eligible P&E Members (Will have served on the Board at least one year as of November 2022)

If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Melinda Stevens, Board Coordinator, at 303-480-6744 or mstevens@drcog.org.
Eligible P&E Members
(Members who will have served on the Board at least one year as of November 2022)

Steve O’Dorisio
Commissioner
Adams County

Bud Straker
Mayor
City of Wheat Ridge

William Lindstedt
Council Member
City of Broomfield

Joan Peck
Council Member
City of Longmont

Kevin Flynn
Council Member
City and County of Denver

George Teal
County Commissioner
Douglas County

Steve Conklin
Council Member
City of Edgewater

John Diak
Council Member
Town of Parker

Sarah Nurmela
Council Member
City of Westminster

Ashley Stolzmann
Mayor
City of Louisville

Wynne Shaw*
Council Member
City of Lone Tree

Stephanie Walton
Council Member
City of Lafayette

*Committee chair 2022-2023
To: Chair and Members of the Performance & Engagement Committee

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 19, 2022</td>
<td>Informational Briefing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
This item relates to the 2022 DRCOG Board Director Collaboration Assessment Survey Results

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
Since 2015, the DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment has been utilized as a feedback mechanism allowing directors to voice their opinions about their experience at DRCOG as it relates to collaborative work and the achievement of desired results.

The 2022 survey concluded on August 29. At the October meeting, staff will provide a summary of the results and initiate a conversation with the committee about possible areas for improvement.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
July 20, 2022 - P&E Committee meeting

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
2022 DRCOG Board Director Collaboration Assessment Results

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you have questions about the assessment, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org; or Randy Arnold, Director, Human Resources, at 303-480-6709 or rarnold@drcog.org.
Structural Integrity

Structural Integrity refers to how Board Directors perceive the fairness of the collaborative process. A process that has high structural integrity applies criteria for making decisions and allocating resources in a fair and consistent manner, treats all members equitably, and allows sufficient opportunity for members to challenge and revise decisions.

1 = False, 2 = More false than true, 3 = More true than false, 4 = True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions are based on accurate information.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The criteria for allocations are fairly applied.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decisions made in the process are based on accurate information.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is free of favoritism.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process responds fairly to the needs of all participants.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, everyone has an equal voice.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made in the process are based on accurate information.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, there is sufficient opportunity to challenge and revise.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of resources is decided fairly.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people involved in the process usually feel satisfied.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Avg 2022</th>
<th>Avg 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisions are based on accurate information.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The criteria for allocations are fairly applied.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decisions made in the process are consistent.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is free of favoritism.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process responds fairly to the needs of its members.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, everyone has an equal opportunity to influence decisions.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made in the process are based on fair criteria.</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, there is sufficient opportunity to challenge decisions.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of resources is decided fairly.</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people involved in the process usually are focused on broader goals (outcomes) of the region, rather than individual agendas.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- True more than false but a preference goes to Denver and it’s immediate suburbs.
- Decision makers approach their tasks with fairness as a guiding principal and the process supports this approach.
- I appreciate, even in Zoom times, there is opportunity to hear from all members who wish to speak. I think the real story on this set of questions is the response from members who have only joined since we’ve been remote. I have concern some might not feel as comfortable to speak up?
- As a newer member, the process and criteria are not fully understood.
- Truly regional projects can’t receive sufficient funding without subregional supplemental funding.
I think there is a fair process for discussion.
DRCOG’s structural integrity is based on a solid foundation. Everyone has an equal opportunity to participate in discussions and get their points made. Current and past Chairs have always encouraged participation in the decision making process and by voting.
I think I need a training session for this position. It is overwhelming to attend these meetings.
Authenticity

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

1 = True, 2 = More true than false, 3 = More false than true, 4 = False
## DRCOG Board Collaboration Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Avg 2022</th>
<th>Avg 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the process, some people’s opinions are accepted while other people are asked to justify themselves.</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In discussions about decisions or procedures, some people are discounted because of the organizations/jurisdictions that they represent.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the process, strings are being pulled from outside Board discussions which influence important decisions.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process gives some people more than they deserve, while shortchanging others.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- Outside influences are always a reality.
- Decision makers are generally effective in isolating outside influences in order to focus on issues at hand while supported in open discussion of emerging community issues.
- I feel it is a fair and balanced process. I don't have the impression there are outside influences, but there must be if these questions are being asked.
- None
- I haven't felt that others are discounted because of where they represent. I would say the converse might me more apt, there is not a shortage of confidence in sharing opinion from some folks with longer history on the board.
- Different jurisdictions (towns, cities, counties) may have different rules or guidelines. Some directors have autonomous authority from their governance and others must seek direction from their board or council, chair or mayor. DRCOG’s process allows for that difference.
- I would not be surprised if many of these statements are true but I have no evidence.
Strong Leadership

Strong Leadership reflects the perception the Board has an effective organizing/coordinating body and, is led by committed and effective leaders. The role of the organizing/coordinating body is to provide a convening location, collaborative environment and relevant information for Board Director deliberation and decision-making.

1 = False, 2 = More false than true, 3 = More true than false, 4 = True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Leadership</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Avg 2022</th>
<th>Avg 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our collaborative is led by individuals who are strongly dedicated to the Mission and Vision of DRCOG.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our collaborative has an effective organizer/coordinator.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

- I like our leadership
- The leadership team within the Board is supported effectively by staff and structure in its decision-making role.
- Love the staff. Pros all around! Knowledgeable and responsive.
- None
- I am always impressed by the DRCOG staff. They are informed and willing to share and discuss.
- Both DRCOG staff and the Directors have strong leadership/collaboration. The Executive Committee is made of Directors selected by the Board.
Members

Members refers to how Board Directors perceive other Director’s capacity to collaborate: Are they willing to devote their efforts to furthering the goals of the collaborative rather than simply garner additional resources for their individual programs? Will they support the ideas that have the most merit even at the expense of their own interests? And, do they think there is sufficient trust among members to honestly share information and feedback?

1 = False, 2 = More false than true, 3 = More true than false, 4 = True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...are willing to let go of an idea for one that appears to have more merit.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are willing to devote the effort necessary to achieve Metro Vision Outcomes.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are effective liaisons between their home organizations and our group.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...trust each other sufficiently to honestly and accurately share information, perceptions, and feedback.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...trust each other sufficiently to honestly and accurately share information, perceptions, and feedback.</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are effective liaisons between their home organizations and our group.</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are willing to devote the effort necessary to achieve Metro Vision Outcomes.</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are willing to let go of an idea for one that appears to have more merit.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Usually it’s a fair and collaborative effort
- Members use best efforts to engage in collaboration to further fair decision making for the region.
- None
- There is definitely a variance in values particularly as it relates to our work in reduction of GHG. I do have doubts that some members share in committing to this work and finding solutions to support the GHG reduction goals from the state, perhaps waiting for the "political pendulum" to swing in a new direction?
- Effectiveness of Directors as liaisons to their home orgs is not measured or evaluated - but the opportunity to effectively liaison is in place and Directors are not getting the full benefit of membership if they don’t take info back and discuss with their colleagues. Trust of other Directors is relative based on experience. Most Directors appear to be able to consider new or challenging information.
Structure

Structure refers to the clarity members have about the scope of the Board’s authority and the roles and responsibilities assigned to its Directors.

1 = False, 2 = More false than true, 3 = More true than false, 4 = True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Avg 2022</th>
<th>Avg 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our group has set ground rules and norms about how we will work together.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a method for communicating the activities and decisions of the group to all members.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clearly defined roles for group members.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Structure supports Board efforts in collaboration and decision making.
- As a newer member I am still uncertain on the role and scope of the Finance Committee.
- I feel like my time in committee work is really just receiving info. There hasn't been much opportunity to work on projects but I believe that is just a timing issue.
The Executive Committee does a good job of running the sub-committees and Board meetings. F&B Committee has an agenda, descriptive reports and suggested motions that are fairly discussed and debated prior to a vote of members. Staff does a great job of answering questions and providing requested data. These decisions are promptly reported to the Board of Directors.
General Success

General Success reflects the perceived level of success achieved by the collaborative and assesses the extent to which members accomplished the objectives set out for the most recent performance period. The term objectives in this section refers to for example; Reduce VMT, Improve Air Quality, Reduce GHG, etc. as opposed to ‘outcomes’ that describe an end state or destination point.

1 = False, 2 = More false than true, 3 = More true than false, 4 = True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Avg 2022</th>
<th>Avg 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has led to new projects or efforts.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has accomplished its specific objectives</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has achieved extraordinary success.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has achieved more than its original objectives.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- The Board and staff achieve a high level of success within their assigned roles.
I am honored and proud to be a Board Director of DRCOG.

It appears there is some success in the GHG reduction work and a desire to collaborate and determine how we can take additional steps to meet these measures.

Most of the DRCOG objectives are aspirational in nature, long-term goals with that are certainly challenging. Objectives are subject to conditions outside of our control such as COVID, health issues, weather, economic conditions, etc. I believe the majority of Directors are sincerely working to change the public's behavior to achieve our vision in their home organization and see DRCOG as a "force multiplier," convener, facilitator and collaborator in that effort.

My personal view is that DRCOG as an institutional entity uncritically assumes growth is good. We have bad traffic problems that are not getting better (I-25 has been a mess north and south of I-70 as long as I can remember - I 76 has dangerous potholes). We have air quality problems that are shocking and not getting substantially better (Lakewood has unhealthy ozone levels on roughly 200 days per year). We have housing affordability problems that admittedly are common in many parts of the country. If growth is a mandatory pre-analytic vision why not encourage growth in rural and regional areas that currently have to be subsidized to keep schools and hospitals open? In my conversations with other board members there is no questioning of perpetual growth. This has not ended well and will get worse. I would like to see some different thinking but have failed in all my face to face individual conversations so I think I am a lone voice in the wilderness and don’t have much to contribute to build, build, build.
Community Involvement & Collaboration

Community Involvement & Collaboration refers to the extent to which the collaborative has engaged a wider or more diverse set of partners or has stimulated greater commitment to collaboration among communities/jurisdictions.

1 = False, 2 = More false than true, 3 = More true than false, 4 = True

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has increased my access to resources outside of my agency/organization for...</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has increased my knowledge of resources outside of my agency/organization.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has led to broader and more meaningful engagement of diverse partners.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has helped improve the way our participating jurisdictions work together.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in the emergence of new leaders committed to collaboration.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Involvement & Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Avg 2022</th>
<th>Avg 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has increased my access to resources outside of my agency/organization for my community.</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has increased my knowledge of resources outside of my agency/organization.</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has led to broader and more meaningful engagement of diverse partners.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has helped improve the way our participating jurisdictions work together.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in the emergence of new leaders committed to collaboration.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- The collaborative process effectively reaches beyond the Board and staff to engage the wider community.
- None
- There are a number of members who have been incredibly helpful in sharing resources and giving additional context.
- Guest speakers, both at work sessions and regular meetings, are usually on target and increase knowledge, widen views. Staff resources have been very helpful in providing assistance to my home organization. Directors should facilitate their home org staff collaborating more with DRCOG staff.
- This is not DRCOGs fault. DRCOG has worked with other entities to get transportation bills put to the electorate and they seem to universally fail. The people of Colorado do not want to pay for their transportation through taxes so they let shell companies backed by Goldman Sachs and others put up the money in ‘Public Private Partnerships’ that forces some of us to pay for the ‘express lanes’. This exacerbates inequality, is not economically efficient, creates confusing, dangerous, and wasteful ‘transition areas’ on highways like C-470, and allows wealthy individuals to not experience the terrible highway conditions that the working people have to suffer with. Very disappointing but this is not the fault of DRCOG.
Outcomes

Outcomes refer to the extent to which members believe the collaborative has had an impact on the outcomes it is targeting. For example an outcome is; The built environment accommodates the needs of residents of all ages, incomes, and abilities; Development patterns are easy to navigate, enhance multimodal connectivity, and maximize the ability for all people to access opportunities. (Metro Vision)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Avg 2022</th>
<th>Avg 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has resulted in improved outcomes for the population served.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has had an impact on the outcomes it is targeting.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is committed to a “no wrong door” approach where any idea can be considered.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- The organization’s outcomes translate into effective change for regional communities.
I do not hear my municipal staff reference working with or reaching out to DRCOG. I occasionally hear consultants mention DRCOG as a funding source, but no clear path or action in final reports. I am always trying to make the connection from staff to DRCOG resources. Not sure I’ve made much progress.

None

DRCOG’s outcomes are long-term aspirational goals and we are making strides in the right direction. Some Directors likely desire a more rapid and hard-line approach and others might prefer a slower and less costly approach.

In many respects DRCOG has participated in creating a Denver metro area that is much better from a built environment perspective than many similarly sized cities throughout the country. Nonetheless, the individuals in the public that I have spoken with see an ongoing flustercluck at DIA, crazy traffic on I-25 because of seemingly endless construction, confusing ‘express lanes’ on C-470 and other places. Most people I speak with feel that things are getting worse. There is a lot of ‘No one goes there anymore it’s too crowded’ sort of sentiment.
Membership Value

My community receives value from being a member of DRCOG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>More True than False</th>
<th>More False than True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Avg 2022</th>
<th>Avg 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My community receives value from being a member of DRCOG.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Our community is able to provide meaningful input into the organization’s policy discussions and receive benefits from its programs.
- Regional effort and staff to support. Easy to get our "money's worth", but resources underutilized by my municipality as far as I know.
- Agency on Aging is helpful and valued.
- I strongly believe we receive value from being a member of DRCOG.
- My community has a long history rooted in transit. The work of DRCOG is of significant importance to not only the direction of the region but also the direction of my community.
- The services of the AAA, planning and transportation alone are worth the price of membership. The dues are fairly calculated but that doesn't help organizations that have tight budgets. Providing the anticipated dues amount early in the year would be helpful in planning budgets.
- My town appreciates the grant opportunities that DRCOG exposes us to, the opportunity to participate in a comprehensive regional transportation planning effort (a messy but noble effort).
Our fee is trivial relative to the benefits. The GIS Data you make available is alone worth the cost of membership.

- The Sub-Regional forums with continued DRCOG staff presence have kept the local communities in our area engaged and working toward our shared, collaborative goals for transportation.
Additional Comments

- The staff and Board structure and leadership are effective in producing policy and program outcomes that support the mission and values of the organization. High functioning and successful! Thank you.
- This assessment is very well written. Thank you for the reminder emails to complete this survey!
- None
- The lack of in person meetings has impacted the true connection between board members. In spite of that, there has been positive, collaborative work. It’s important that we recognize though the need to be together and that Zoom, while allowing the official work to continue doesn’t allow for the informal collaboration, team building and communication.
- DRCOG likely has a role in planning to address homelessness through its interaction with the Metro Area County Commissioners and Metro Mayors Caucus. Transportation oriented development should probably be the only extent of DRCOG’s assistance to member organization on land use.
- I have been on hiatus from DRCOG meetings during COVID due to COVID and a sabbatical in Australia. I hope to participate more actively moving forward. I encourage my students to participate in the DRCOG adjacent/sponsored(?) citizen’s academy which I did a few years back. Even after doing that I feel overwhelmed by all the agencies, institutions, etc. I have recently been serving on some efforts at Greenhouse Gas Inventory work with ICLEI and Jefferson County. At the CML conference in June I asked the Facilities Manager from Littleton how he was going about this complex task of GHG monitoring. He said it would take a full-time person to do this and there was no way he had the funding to do it. I am personally very concerned about climate change and other environmental challenges and believe we are naive as to what it will cost to do the environmental accounting needed. It is a challenge that I feel DRCOG and almost all other Government and NGOs are not communicating well primarily because they are ignorant of the formidable and expensive nature of the challenge.