AGENDA
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Tuesday, October 17, 2017
8:30 a.m.
1290 Broadway
Independence Pass Board Room

1. Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. August 15, 2017 RTC Meeting Summary
   (Attachment A)

ACTION ITEMS
4. Discussion on amendments to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
   (Attachment B) Todd Cottrell
5. Discussion on removal of the National Highway System designation for a portion of Peña Boulevard.
   (Attachment C) Jacob Riger – Jeff Sudmeier, CDOT – Rachel Carr, City and County of Denver/Denver
   International Airport

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
   Congestion in the Denver Region.
   (Attachment D) Robert Spotts
7. Update on progress towards the development for the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program
   (TIP) Regional/Subregional project selection model.
   (Attachment E) Douglas Rex

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS
8. Member Comment/Other Matters
9. Next Meeting – November 14, 2017
10. Adjournment

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) 480-6744.
MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ed Peterson
Paul Jesaitis (Alternate)
Debra Perkins-Smith (Alternate)
Bob Roth (Chair)
Douglas Rex
Ron Rakowsky
Herb Atchison
Heidi Williams
Jeff Kullman
Doug Tisdale
Tina Francone
Ed Peterson
David Genova

Others Present:

Flo Raitano (Alternate)
Bill Van Meter (Alternate)
Kate Williams (Alternate)

Public:

David Krutsinger, CDOT; Rachael Bronson, David DiGiacomo, City/County of Denver; Dr. R. Paul Williamson, Sustainable Systems of Colorado

DRCOG Staff:

Steve Cook, Todd Cottrell, Jacob Riger, Matthew Helfant, Emily Lindsey, Brad Calvert, Mark Northrop, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Chair Bob Roth called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Summary of July 18, 2017 Meeting

The summary was accepted as written.

ACTION ITEMS

Discussion on amendments to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Todd Cottrell presented the three requested amendments from CDOT Region 1.

- **2016-059** C-470 Managed Toll Express Lanes: I-25 to Wadsworth
  - Revise funding, add new funding sources to reflect final financing package

- **New Project** C-470: Wadsworth to I-70
  - New project for study and pre-construction activities

- **2016-080** I-25 S PEL: Monument to C-470
  - Add funding for NEPA activities between Monument and Castle Rock

Ron Rakowsky MOVED to recommend to the Board of Directors amendments to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Briefing on Denver’s Vision Zero Action Plan
Rachael Bronson, Denver Associate City Planner, presented Denver’s draft Vision Zero Action Plan. The plan is an approach to reduce and eventually eliminate fatal traffic-related crashes in Denver by 2030. The plan will focus Denver’s efforts:
- on the most dangerous streets (High Injury Network) that are ~5% of Denver’s street network, but where ~50% of fatalities occur; and
- in the most vulnerable communities (Communities of Concern) that represent 30% of Denver, but where 38% of all traffic deaths and 44% of pedestrian deaths occur.

There was discussion on several safety issues, including police enforcement; better education on pedestrian, bicyclist, and driver responsibilities; and light rail at street level.

Doug Rex noted DRCOG will be developing a Regional Vision Zero plan as part of its planning work program over the next 1½ to 2 years.

Briefing on Front Range Long Range Transit Planning
David Krutsinger, CDOT Transit & Rail Deputy Director, presented a briefing on CDOT transit and rail-related activities over the last five years.

It was noted the Southwest Chief and Front Range Passenger Rail Commission (reconstituted in May 2017) was directed in Senate Bill 17-153 to prepare draft legislation by December 1, 2017 to facilitate development of a front range passenger rail system.

The Commission is composed of members from BNSF and Union Pacific railroads, RTD, CDOT, and the Front Range MPOs, along with CDOT staff, Amtrak, and other voting and ex-officio stakeholders. The Commission held its first meeting on July 31 and anticipates meeting monthly, with subcommittees addressing Amtrak Southwest Chief issues and Front Range Passenger Rail options.

Herb Atchison noted the challenges of rail negotiations, having buy-in for a statewide ballot measure, competing transportation funding needs and priorities, and the population density needed to support passenger rail service.

Ron Rakowsky spoke in favor of establishing stops in DTC and Castle Rock for the Bustang service to downtown Denver.

Kate Williams asked if privately-owned rail could be considered as an option (citing Florida’s high-speed rail). Mr. Krutsinger said it is a model to look at; local governments would have to collectively guarantee development rights at the stations, which drives the ability to pay for the rail infrastructure.

Dave Genova commented that the freight railroads are more than willing to work with RTD, if there is a real project and funding. He said using RTD commuter rail lines/stations could potentially work, though interoperability issues and challenges need further analysis.

Debra Perkins-Smith asked if funding options were identified and whether the Commission will make financial recommendations to the legislature. Mr. Krutsinger said a full financial plan was developed for CDOT’s previous rail studies that included a 10-20% private partnership option (versus the 80% that is typical for a more densely populated area). He said the first step for the Commission is to further explore technical and other issues, with detailed financial plans to follow later.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Member Comments/Other Matters
The meeting was adjourned at 9:37 a.m. The next meeting is September 19, 2017.
To: Chair and Members of the Regional Transportation Committee

From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner
(303) 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 2017</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT**

DRCOG’s transportation planning process allows for Board-approved amendments to the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), taking place on an as-needed basis. Typically, these amendments involve the addition or deletion of projects, or adjustments to existing projects and do not impact funding for other projects in the TIP.

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**

DRCOG staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments because they comply with the current Board-adopted TIP Amendment Procedures.

**ACTION BY OTHERS**

*August 28, 2017* – TAC recommended approval.

**SUMMARY**

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

**Second Commitment in Principle**

In July 2008, the DRCOG Board approved a “second commitment in principle” (SCIP) to FasTracks corridors, in which specific dollar amounts were identified for eleven corridors.

In August 2017, the Northwest Corridor partners submitted a request to distribute their remaining allocation of federal SCIP funding, $1,746,000, to go towards two new Quiet Zone projects (see Attachment 2) as part of the TIP amendments. (Note: Per the adopting resolution, “…jointly-endorsed consensus requests may be submitted to DRCOG at any time and the Board of Directors, through the MPO process, will act on them as Policy Amendments to the then-adopted Transportation Improvement Program at its next scheduled opportunity.”).

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

- **New Project** Broomfield Quiet Zones
  A portion of the remaining SCIP funding allocated to the Northwest Corridor will be allocated to this new project, as agreed upon by the Northwest Corridor Partners
• New Project  Westminster Quiet Zones
A portion of the remaining SCIP funding allocated to the Northwest Corridor will be allocated to this new project as agreed upon by the Northeast Corridor Partners

RTD Amendments
The following three amendments to RTD projects are required by FTA to obligate partial or full FY 2017 funding by moving the funds into FY 2018. It should be noted RTD is not receiving any additional funding, it is just being moved into FY 2018 (and therefore the 2018-2021 TIP) to obligate previous TIP funding.

• 1997-084: RTD Preventative Maintenance: Transit Vehicle Overhaul and Maintenance
• 1999-052: State of Good Repair
• 2012-108: RTD Capital Improvements: Bus and Facilities Funding

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
Move to recommend to the Board of Directors the attached amendments to the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

ATTACHMENTS
1. Proposed TIP amendments

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning and Operations at 303-480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.
2012-010: Transfer funds to two new projects and update scope to reflect funding drawdown by Northwest Corridor Partners

Existing

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

TIP-ID: 2012-010  STIP-ID:  Open to Public:  Sponsor: DRCOG

Project Scope

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

Corridor projects previously approved using second commitment funds include:
- West Corridor (TIP ID 2007-042): July 2010, $7,422,000
- Denver Union Station (TIP ID 2007-057): July 2010, $2,519,000
- Gold Corridor (TIP ID 2008-111): May 2012, $6,461,000.
- Southeast Corridor (TIP ID 2007-059): July 2017, $1,928,000.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>$2,145</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP-M)</td>
<td>$2,461</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1,152</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,758</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Scope and Funding Table

Title: DRCOG Second Commitment to FasTracks Pool

Project Type: Transit Operational Improvements

TIP-ID: 2012-010  STIP-ID: Open to Public: Sponsor: DRCOG

Project Scope

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

Corridor projects previously approved using second commitment funds include:
- West Corridor (TIP ID 2007-042) - July 2010, $7,422,000
- US-36 Corridor (TIP ID 2008-114) - Feb 2011, $2,755,000
- Denver Union Station (TIP ID 2007-057) - July 2010, $2,519,000
- East Corridor (TIP ID 2008-111) - Nov 2011, $13,350,000.
- Gold Corridor (TIP ID 2008-111) - May 2012, $8,461,000.
- Northwest Corridor (TIP ID 2007-050) - May 2012, $1,200,000; June 2016, $5,058,000; September 2017, $1,746,000.
- North Metro Corridor (TIP ID 2007-055) - May 2012, $7,461,000.
- I-225 Corridor (TIP ID 2007-056) - July 2012, $7,250,000.
- Southeast Corridor (TIP ID 2007-059) - July 2017, $1,928,000.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,145</td>
<td>$715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,145</td>
<td>$715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**New Project**: Add new project funded with DRCOG SCIP funding as agreed upon by the Northwest Corridor partners

**Title**: Broomfield Quiet Zones  
**Project Type**: Safety  
**Sponsor**: Broomfield

**Project Scope**
Design and construct supplemental safety measures to comply with Federal Railroad Administration requirements to make crossing locations quiet zone compliant. Improvements will be made at both Brainard Drive and 112th Ave where they intersect with the BNSF Railway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
<th>Project Phases</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Initiate Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Initiate Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP-M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$473</td>
<td>$473</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$591</td>
<td>$591</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**New Project:** Add new project funded with DRCOG SCIP funding as agreed upon by the Northwest Corridor partners

---

**Title:** Westminster Quiet Zones

**TIP-ID:** Request

**STIP-ID:**

**Open to Public:** 2019

**Sponsor:** Westminster

**Project Type:** Safety

**Project Scope**

Design and construct supplemental safety measures to comply with Federal Railroad Administration requirements to make crossing locations quiet zone compliant. Improvements will be made at Lowell Blvd, W. 72nd Ave, and Bradburn Blvd where they intersect with the BNSF Railway.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Initiate Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Initiate Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP-M)</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$655</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Policy Amendments – October 2017**

**2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program**

**1997-084:** Add funding from FY 2017 to obligate project funding

### Existing

**Title:** RTD Preventive Maintenance: Transit Vehicle Overhaul and Maintenance  
**Project Type:** Transit Vehicles

**TIP-ID:** 1997-084  
**STIP-ID:**  
**Open to Public:**  
**Sponsor:** RTD

#### Project Scope

Ongoing program: Overhaul and maintenance for transit vehicles. A portion of these 5307 funds will be applied to capital cost of contracting. RTD has privatized service on fixed-routes and private carriers provide capital maintenance in addition to fixed-route bus service. In addition to routine capital maintenance, RTD will apply 5307 capital maintenance funds to bus fuel cost and utility cost for LRT vehicles as a result of the Federal Transit Administration expanded definition of allowable cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected County(ies)</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Revised Funding Table

**Amounts in $1,000s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal (5307)</strong></td>
<td>$116,220</td>
<td>$57,378</td>
<td>$57,952</td>
<td>$58,531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>$26,218</td>
<td>$11,475</td>
<td>$11,590</td>
<td>$11,706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$142,438</td>
<td>$68,853</td>
<td>$69,542</td>
<td>$70,237</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$351,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**1999-052**: Add funding from FY 2017 to obligate project funding

**Existing**

**Title**: State of Good Repair

**TIP-ID**: 1999-052  
**STIP-ID**: SST6740.010  
**Open to Public**:  

**Project Type**: Transit Operational Improvements  
**Sponsor**: RTD

**Project Scope**
Funds will be used for upgrades and maintenance of the 18th St Mall from Broadway to Market St. Funds will also be used for RTD’s transfer facilities at each end of the 18th St Mall, and other fixed guideway assets. Funds will also go toward on-going maintenance of rail guideways, and preventative maintenance of the Fixed Guideway Rail and assets, including maintenance of the LRT Rolling stock and LRT maintenance support. Includes funds for State of Good Repair funding and high-intensity motor bus.

**Affected Municipality(ies)**: Denver  
**Affected County(ies)**: Denver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (5337)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised Funding Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (5337)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,225</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,056</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$21,281</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$61,781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2012-108**: Add funding from FY 2017 to obligate project funding

### Existing

**Title:** RTD Capital Improvements: Bus and Facilities Funding  
**Project Type:** Transit Vehicles

**Project Scope**
Funds will be directed to capital improvements including the following:

1. Civic Center Station infrastructure improvements including improvements to the building, access areas, boarding areas, shelters, and overall accessibility through reconfiguration of adjacent park area;

2. Funds will also be used to purchase fuel efficient buses and vans equipped with ADA-compliant lifts.

#### Revised Funding Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amounts in $1,000s</th>
<th>Prior Funding</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>Future Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (5339)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,660</td>
<td>$5,367</td>
<td>$5,420</td>
<td>$5,475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,150</td>
<td>$1,074</td>
<td>$1,085</td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$11,810</td>
<td>$6,441</td>
<td>$6,505</td>
<td>$6,570</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 15, 2017

Board of Directors
Denver Regional Council of Governments
1280 Broadway, Suite 700
Denver, CO 80203-5606

Dear Board Members,

In 2015, the Northwest Corridor Partners reached consensus on the use of Transportation Improvement Funding (TIP) funding allocated per the Denver Regional of Council of Governments Resolution Number 20, of 2008 (FastTracks Second Commitment in Principle – SCIP – funding) for the Northwest Rail. The Northwest Partners include Longmont, Boulder County, City of Boulder, Louisville, Lafayette, Broomfield, Westminster, Adams County, RTD and CDOT. The Northwest Partners agreed SCIP funds should be used to implement Quiet Zones along the BNSF Railway alignment of the future Northwest Rail.

The Project Partner jurisdictions located in Boulder County requested their allocation of SCIP funding last year, and projects are now underway. Adams County, the City and County of Broomfield and the City of Westminster are now requesting the DRCOG Board approval of $1,746,000 to implement Quiet Zones along the BNSF Railway at Lowell Boulevard, W. 72nd Avenue, Bradburn Boulevard, 112th Avenue and Brainerd Drive.

If you have any questions, please contact Debra Baskett, City of Westminster Senior Transportation and Mobility Planner at 303 658 2129. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

The Project Partners

Eva Henry, Chair
Adams County Commissioner

Herb Atchison
Mayor, City of Westminster

Elise Jones
Mayor, City and County of Broomfield

Suzanne Jones
Mayor, City of Boulder

Robert P. Muckle
Mayor, City of Louisville

Dennis Combs
Mayor, City of Longmont
David Genova
KTD General Manager and CEO

Paul Jesaitis
CDOT Region 1 Director

Johnny Olson
CDOT Region 4 Director
To: Chair and Members of the Regional Transportation Committee

From: Jacob Riger, Transportation Planning Manager
303-480-6751 or jriger@drcog.org.
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**SUBJECT**
Discussion on the request of the City and County of Denver, by and through its Department of Aviation, to FHWA to remove the National Highway System (NHS) designation for the portion of Peña Blvd. east of E-470.

**PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS**
Recommend concurrence with the request of the City and County of Denver, by and through its Department of Aviation, to FHWA to remove the National Highway System (NHS) designation for the portion of Peña Blvd. east of E-470 to the airport terminal.

**ACTIONS BY OTHERS**
September 25 – TAC recommended concurrence.

**SUMMARY**
The National Highway System (NHS) is the federally designated system of roadways that are important to the nation’s economy, defense, and mobility. The NHS includes all interstate highways as well as other roadways that provide access to public transportation facilities, airports, ports, military installations, and intermodal facilities. In the Denver region (static maps, dynamic portal), the NHS includes all existing interstates, freeways, and toll roads, as well as US highways (e.g., US-85, US-285, US-287) and several arterials (Wadsworth Blvd., Arapahoe Rd., Colfax Ave., 104th Ave., SH-7, SH-119, and others).

The City and County of Denver and Denver International Airport (DEN) are requesting that FHWA remove the NHS designation on Peña Blvd. from E-470 to the airport terminal (see map in Attachment 1). This section of Peña Blvd. is currently designated as an NHS Intermodal Connector. Roadways with these designations provide access between major intermodal facilities and the other roadways/highways that comprise the NHS.

Denver’s rationale for requesting the removal of the portion of Peña Blvd. east of E-470 from the NHS is that when intermodal connectors were added to the NHS, DEN did not receive notice or an opportunity to meaningfully participate in the process; maps are conflicting as to what segment of Peña is an intermodal connector; and this segment of Peña was built by DEN, maintained and operated by DEN, on airport property and never a recipient of federal funds. DEN’s justification is provided in further detail in the attached letter and exhibits (Attachment 2).

Per FHWA guidelines, the request is submitted through the MPO (DRCOG) to CDOT, which formally submits the request to FHWA. If the DRCOG Board concurs with the City’s request, CDOT, DRCOG, and the City would work together to prepare the required documentation to submit to FHWA.

Staff from CDOT and the City and County of Denver/DEN will present this item at the meeting.
**PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS**
N/A

**PROPOSED MOTION**
Move to recommend to the Board of Directors concurrence with the request of the City and County of Denver, by and through its Department of Aviation, to FHWA to remove the National Highway System (NHS) designation for the portion of Peña Blvd. east of E-470 to the airport terminal.

**ATTACHMENTS**
1. Map of Peña Blvd. east of E-470
2. Statement of Justification from the City and County of Denver by and through its Department of Aviation
3. Letter and exhibits from City and County of Denver to CDOT (August 9, 2017)

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**
If you need additional information, please contact Jacob Riger, Transportation Planning Manager, at 303-480-6751 or jriger@drcog.org; or Jeff Sudmeier, CDOT, at 303-757-9063 or jeffrey.sudmeier@state.co.us.
The City and County of Denver, by and through its Department of Aviation, requests the support of the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) in proposing that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) remove that portion of Peña Boulevard east of E-470 (Peña East) located on Denver International Airport (“Airport”) from the National Highway System (NHS) pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 103(b)(3).

Applicable Law and Regulation

The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) has authority to:

[M]ake any modification to the National Highway System, including any modification consisting of a connector to a major intermodal terminal or the withdrawal of a road from that system, that is proposed by a State if the Secretary determines that the modification—

(i) meets the criteria established for the National Highway System under this title after the date of enactment of the MAP-21 [enacted July 6, 2012]; and

(ii) (I) enhances the national transportation characteristics of the National Highway System; or

(ii) in the case of the withdrawal of a road, is reasonable and appropriate.


By regulation, the FHWA requires modification proposals to include (1) a route description; (2) a statement of justification; and (3) statements of coordination. 23 C.F.R. § 470.113(a). FHWA regulations also require that modifications “enhance the national transportation characteristics of the National Highway System . . . follow the criteria listed in §470.107 . . . [and] consider the criteria contained in appendix D of [Part 470].

Notably, FHWA’s regulations were promulgated prior to amendments made to the FHWA’s authority to make modifications to the NHS by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act’s (MAP-21), Pub. L. No. 112-141 (July 6, 2012). These amendments include the italicized language in the statutory provision cited above. While FHWA regulations require all proposals to address whether the modification would “enhance[] the national transportation characteristics of the National Highway System,” DEN believes that, in the case of a withdrawal, the State must instead demonstrate why withdrawal is “reasonable and appropriate,” in accordance with the plain language of the statute.

Route Description

- Route name: Peña Boulevard E 470 interchange east to the Denver International Airport terminal ("Peña East")
- Route number: Not Applicable (Peña Blvd. is local roadway not identified as a State or Federal Highway with an associated route number); FHWA Intermodal connector C022A
- From intersecting route / To intersecting route (or begin mile point to ending mile point) description of the route in question: E-470 to Airport Terminal
- Segment length (in miles): 4.3 miles
- City / County / MPO (jurisdictional identifier): City and County of Denver. MPO – Denver Regional Council of Governments (DCOG)
- Map locating subject segment: attached
- Accompanying GIS Shapefile of the subject segment only: attached

Statement of Justification

As noted above, and on the face of the express statutory authorization to make modifications to the NHS, Denver believes that the withdrawal of Peña East from the NHS requires a finding that such withdrawal is "reasonable and appropriate," and not that withdrawal would "enhance[] the national transportation characteristics of the National Highway System." See 23 U.S.C. § 103(b)(3). However, Denver asserts that the removal of Peña East from the NHS is justified under either standard for the reasons set forth below:

A. The unique history and character of Peña East warrant its removal from the NHS.

Peña East is not a connector to an intermodal facility, but rather part of the intermodal facility, itself. Peña East is located entirely on Denver International Airport and serves as the Airport’s driveway.

Peña Boulevard is a unique airport access road in several respects:

- Peña Boulevard is the only means of access to Denver International Airport.
- Constructed in 1995, Peña Boulevard is located entirely on Airport property and was constructed for dedicated Airport access.
- Peña Boulevard was constructed without federal financial assistance and has been operated without federal grants of any kind for its entire 22+-year history.
- Denver used Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) revenue to construct Peña East. By law, PFCs only can be used for facilities used exclusively for airport purposes.
- Denver’s Department of Aviation operates, maintains and improves Peña Boulevard over its entire length from I-70 to the Airport terminal.

---

1 There is some confusion over the length of the segment, in part based on whether you measure to the “y split” prior to the terminal or its farthest point at the terminal.
Peña East serves as DEN’s “driveway” offering airport signage and amenities to travelers including rental car facilities, gas stations, a cell phone waiting lot, dog boarding, and long-term parking. The interchange of Peña Boulevard and E-470 signals to travelers, “You are now on the Airport, start paying attention to where you need to go.” Accordingly, Peña East is part of the Airport and should not be included on the NHS.

The portion of Peña Boulevard from I-70 to E-470 (“Peña West”) primarily serves Airport users. However, this roadway segment includes interchanges providing access to commercial and residential development in communities surrounding the Airport and, as a result, is used by some vehicles not destined for or originating from the Airport. Peña West properly is part of the NHS, and Denver is not requesting withdrawal of this roadway segment.

B. Maintaining Peña East on the NHS is inconsistent with the needs and priorities of the Denver community and region.

Removal of Peña East from the NHS is consistent with “existing and anticipated needs and any planned improvements to the route.” See 23 C.F.R. part 470, app. D ¶ 5. Denver has plans for commercial development in a portion of the median of Peña East. If Peña East remains part of the NHS, the FHWA has advised that Denver will have to cease its development plans, at significant cost to the Airport and community.

DEN is located 23 miles from downtown Denver. The Airport’s 12-mile-long access road can prove to be a strain on travelers looking for last-minute passenger amenities. Denver’s plans for commercial development in and around Peña East would enhance the limited offerings for travelers transiting to and from the Airport and generate non-aeronautical revenue. Federal law requires that all airport revenue be reinvested into the Airport.2 Non-aeronautical revenue plays a critical role in keeping the Airport competitive and airfares low, by reducing the proportion of capital and operating costs that must be recovered from airlines. Additionally, revenue from the commercial development of Peña East will provide Denver with resources it needs for critical projects without relying on heavy federal investment.

Today, virtually all of the land uses on Airport property are directly related to the Airport’s role as a transportation facility. Going forward, Denver intends to market and facilitate an expanded array of commercial non-aeronautical uses of Airport property as a means to make good use of the Airport’s vast size and to generate airport revenue that by law will be reinvested into DEN’s facility and reduce its reliance on federal dollars. These land uses may include hotels, offices, warehouses, manufacturing, retail, education and other compatible activities. Airport development initiatives will be stymied due to restrictions imposed on NHS roadways. Such restrictions are unnecessary with respect to Peña East, because this segment has not been constructed or maintained with federal funds, is subject to the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) regulatory oversight, and is part of the Airport, itself.

---

2 49 U.S. Code § 47107(b).
C. Keeping Peña East on the NHS would adversely impact existing NHS routes, specifically Peña West.

DEN has been advised by the FAA that DEN can no longer pay for the operation and maintenance (O&M) of Peña West entirely with airport revenue, because, unlike Peña East, it does not serve airport patrons exclusively.3

Denver seeks to conceptually bifurcate Peña Boulevard so that Denver can take advantage of federal funding opportunities for Peña West, which serves the purposes for which the NHS was intended, while preserving Denver’s ability to develop Peña East in accordance with the Airport’s needs.

Denver used airport revenue to pay for the cost to construct, operate, maintain and improve Peña Boulevard in its entirety. However, in 2010, the FAA advised that Denver could no longer use only airport revenue in connection with Peña Boulevard because the amount of non-airport traffic – on Peña West – had grown to a more-than-nominal amount.

Since this time, Denver’s Department of Aviation has sought and received non-airport revenue in order to comply with FAA’s guidance. With the consent of the FAA, the Department of Aviation has sought and received one million dollars annually in support of the non-airport traffic on Peña Boulevard.

Recently, Denver has been working with the FAA to develop a long-term plan for funding the operation, maintenance and improvement of Peña Boulevard. Central to the plan is the principle that Peña Boulevard essentially is two roads: Peña East and Peña West. Peña East will continue to be used exclusively for airport purposes and funded exclusively with airport revenue. Peña West will be funded with airport and non-airport revenue in proportion to the level of airport and non-airport traffic. Denver is exploring federal and state grant programs that might provide the non-airport-revenue portion of roadway costs.

The combined effect of the FAA’s concurrence with Denver’s approach and withdrawal of Peña East from the NHS is that Denver will be better able to maintain both roadway segments: east and west. Accordingly, removal of Peña East, to the extent it would have an effect on other NHS routes in close proximity, see 23 C.F.R. part 470, app. D ¶ 7, would enhance Denver’s ability to maintain Peña West.

D. Peña East should be removed from the NHS as a technical correction. When intermodal connectors were added to the NHS, the procedure required by Federal law was not followed and DEN did not receive notice or an opportunity to meaningfully participate in the process.

Finally, withdrawal of Peña East is also reasonable and appropriate because it appears that it was not properly added to the NHS in the first instance.

When intermodal connectors were added to the NHS, the procedure required by Federal law was not followed and Denver did not receive notice or an opportunity to meaningfully participate in the process. Denver concludes that Peña East was inadvertently added, as evidenced by the failure to follow the statutory consultation process required.

---

3 Under federal law, the maximum expenditure of airport revenue toward the capital or operating costs of an access road must be prorated in proportion to its use by airport passengers. See FAA, Bulletin 1: Best Practices-Surface Access to Airports 5 (Feb. 10, 2004) (“Bulletin”), https://www.faa.gov/airports/resources/publications/reports/media/bulletin_1_surface_access_best_practices.pdf.
The 1995 National Highway System Designation Act, Pub. L. No. 104-59 (Nov. 28, 1995) required the state to work with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (“MPOs”) and local governments to make recommendations to the FHWA for intermodal terminals and connectors appropriate for inclusion in the system. Further, Colorado state law gives both the Public Highway Authority and the Regional Transportation Authority power to designate a roadway as part of the NHS, but requires cooperation and consent of the local jurisdiction.⁴

We can find no evidence that this cooperative process occurred or that Denver had any participation in the process.⁵ Had Denver meaningfully participated in the process to make recommendations for NHS inclusions, as contemplated by the Act, Denver would have recommended that the Airport-serving segment -Peña East - not be included as part of the NHS because Peña East is the Airport’s driveway and part of the Airport; it is not a “connector” to the facility, it is the facility itself.

**Statements of Coordination**

23 CFR §470.113 requires statements of coordination with adjoining States on State-line connections, with responsible local officials, and with officials of areas under Federal jurisdiction.

Since February 2017, Denver has met with a series of impacted local and Federal officials. As detailed below.

**Federal coordination:**

- Coordination with FHWA Colorado Division Office, in partnership with the Colorado Department of Transportation. In addition, DEN CEO Kim Day and Airport staff traveled to Washington, D.C. to meet with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) leadership and staff in on April 13 and April 25, 2017.

**Local coordination:** Denver coordinated with the Colorado Department of Transportation and the local Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG). To date, CDOT and DRCOG have raised no objections to DEN’s request to modify the NHS.

- On August 17, 2017, the Colorado Department of Transportation provided an overview of Denver’s request at the monthly meeting of the Colorado Transportation Commission. No objections were raised.
- On September 25, 2017, Denver presented its request to DRCOG’s Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). With no objections, the Committee recommend to the DRCOG Regional Transportation Committee (RTC) concurrence with the Denver’s request to remove Pena Blvd east of E470 from the NHS.
  - On October 17, 2017, Denver will present its request to DRCOG RTC.
  - On October 18, Denver is scheduled to present its request for support on this application to the DRCOG Board.

---

⁴ See C.R.S. §§ 43-4-510 and 43-4-610.
⁵ Despite exhaustive searches of archival records conducted by both the Airport and CDOT, the only documentation existing from that time is a Resolution approved by the Colorado Transportation Commission on April 15, 1993 proposing that Peña from DIA to I-70 be included on the NHS and a letter sent by CDOT to the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) dated June 26, 1995, where DEN is identified as an intermodal terminal and DRCOG is invited to work with CDOT to select connections to intermodal terminals. Letter and Resolution attached.
August 9, 2017

Colorado Department of Transportation
ATTN: Josh Laipply
    Chief Engineer
4201 East Arkansas Avenue
Denver, CO 80222

Dear Mr. Laipply:

Following our meeting on July 21, 2017, I am writing on behalf of the City and County of Denver, Denver International Airport ("Airport or DEN") to formalize a request through the Colorado Department of Transportation ("CDOT") to the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") for a correction to the maps reflecting the National Highway System ("NHS"). Existing maps are conflicting, and incorrectly include the portion of Peña Blvd. (east of E-470) on the NHS, when the segment of Peña Blvd. east of E-470 only serves the airport and functions as its "driveway." The inadvertent inclusion of the Airport-serving segment has stymied important development initiatives of the Airport. While the ultimate decision to correct official highway maps remains with the FHWA, we appreciate CDOT’s cooperation in initiating the administrative removal process.

When Congress made the initial NHS designation, Peña was not a part of the system.

The statutory history underlying the creation of the NHS provides context for Peña Boulevard’s ("Peña") inclusion into the system. In 1991, prior to the Airport and Peña being built, the U.S. Department of Transportation ("DOT") created the NHS through passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), Pub. L. No. 102-240 (Dec. 18, 1991). In 1993, the DOT designated the entire system, but did not include intermodal terminals – ports, railroad terminals, and airports (i.e., DEN). Therefore, at that time, Peña was not part of the NHS. In 1994, the DOT began the process of establishing the procedures and criteria for identifying major intermodal terminals and in 1995 codified a process to include intermodal connectors in NHS system. This 1995 National Highway System Designation Act (the "Act"), Pub. L. No. 104-59, § 101, 109 Stat. 570 (Nov. 28, 1995), required the state to work with Municipal Planning Organizations ("MPOs") and local governments to make recommendations to the FHWA for intermodal terminals and connectors appropriate for inclusion in the system.
When intermodal connectors were added to the NHS, DEN did not receive notice or an opportunity to meaningfully participate in the process.

State law gives both the Public Highway Authority and the Regional Transportation Authority power to designate a roadway as part of the NHS, but requires cooperation and consent of the local jurisdiction. See C.R.S. §§ 43-4-510 and 43-4-610. We can find no evidence that this cooperative process occurred. Despite exhaustive searches of archival records conducted by both the Airport and CDOT, the only documentation existing from that time is a Resolution approved by the Colorado Transportation Commission on April 15, 1993 proposing that Peña from DIA to I-70 be included on the NHS and a letter sent by CDOT to the Denver Regional Council of Governments1 (DRCOG) dated June 26, 1995, where DEN is identified as an intermodal terminal and DRCOG is invited to work with CDOT to select connections to intermodal terminals. (Letter and Resolution attached). Had DEN meaningfully participated in the process to make recommendations for NHS inclusions, as contemplated by the statutory authorization, DEN would have recommended that the private Airport-serving segment of Peña not be included as part of the NHS because this section of Peña Boulevard serves only airport traffic and is maintained exclusively by the airport using airport-related funds.

Maps are conflicting as to what segment of Peña is an intermodal connector to the NHS.

By the time Congress passed Moving Ahead for Progress for the 21st Century (MAP-21), Pub. L. No. 112-141 (July 6, 2012), Peña was depicted on NHS maps as an intermodal connector and appeared in lists and tables maintained by FHWA and identified as an intermodal connector. The maps, lists, and tables are inconsistent in how they describe the facility and the length they give.2 For example, an FHWA interactive map suggests that Peña west of E-470 was part of the pre-ISTEA Federal Aid-Primary system, but not the portion east of E-470.3 Peña east of E-470 is included on FHWA’s list of intermodal connectors in Colorado (facility ID CO22A) and is described as running from the “E-470 interchange east to airport terminal,” and is listed at 4.3 miles.4 However, published on the same website, the FHWA U.S. List of NHS Connectors, uses the same facility ID, but describes the Intermodal Connector segment as “E-470 interchange,” and shows

---

1 DEN and CDOT are currently in the process of working with DRCOG to determine what role DRCOG has with respect to DEN’s current request to remove Peña east of E-470 from the NHS.
2 A review of the FHWA interactive map website and map metadata failed to identify sources for the NHS layer or information about when each segment was added. The FHWA intermodal connector’s website similarly did not date facility additions or provide any information about when and how each segment was added to the NHS. Without historical data to compare against, there is no way to know when the Airport-serving segment was officially added from these sources.
the length as 0.7 miles.\textsuperscript{5} The inconsistencies in the various publications emphasize the need to correct NHS maps and other supporting publications.\textsuperscript{6}

DEN has always operated under the premise that the Airport serving segment of Peña east of E-470 is subject solely to FAA’s regulatory oversight, that it would be maintained exclusively with airport revenue, and that the Airport has authority to develop the median and adjacent areas.

The construction bids for Peña were received in early 1992 and the final construction was completed in late 1994. Current DRCOG traffic counts show that E-470 bisects Peña Blvd. based on use: the Airport-serving segment carries 125,000 vehicles per day and does not connect into the broader roadway system for all practical purposes\textsuperscript{7}, while the western portion carries 85,000 vehicles per day and has major intersections with non-airport owned roadways at Tower Rd, 56th Ave, 40th Ave, and Green Valley Ranch Blvd.\textsuperscript{8}

As early as 1991 when preliminary designs of Peña were completed, the Airport was in consultation with air carriers in anticipation of an application to the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") for approval of a passenger facility charge ("PFC"). On January 30, 1992, the Airport placed on file an official application with the FAA and three months later, on April 28, 1992, received a Record of Decision from the FAA, approving a PFC on DEN air carriers in order to pay for facility construction of Denver International Airport, including the main access road (i.e. Peña). FAA ROD (Apr. 28, 1992). The use of PFC revenue is strictly limited to projects that enhance safety, security, or capacity, reduce noise, or increase air carrier competition. See 49 U.S.C. § 40117. FAA’s decision to approve the use of PFCs for construction of Peña was based on important factors, including that Peña from the Airport terminal to the Tower Road interchange is the airport’s primary access road and intended “clearly for the exclusive use of airport patrons.”

Since its inception, DEN has always operated under the premise that the Airport is subject to the FAA’s regulatory oversight, that operation and maintenance of Peña is the sole responsibility of the Airport, with no responsibilities falling to other DOT agencies. Moreover, the Airport estimates that it will spend $1M annually of airport revenue for operation and maintenance costs for Peña. The Airport has always paid for operation and maintenance on Peña; it has never sought FHWA funds or services from the FHWA or CDOT for Peña Blvd. Further, the segment of Peña east of E-470 that is mistakenly included on the NHS is part of the airport proper that has been developed to provide services demanded by airport patrons and tenants.

\textsuperscript{6} For reference, DEN Planning measures the Airport-serving segment of Peña, east of E-470 as 4.87 miles and the portion of Peña Blvd. west of E-470 as 7.21 miles.
\textsuperscript{7} While there is an interchange with Peña Blvd. and Jackson Gap Rd, which ties into 56th Ave, the traffic counts show that there is no significant vehicle diversion along this route; at 56th Ave and Monaghan Rd, the closest count location, had an ADT of only around 500 cars. DRCOG Regional Traffic Counts, http://gis.drcog.org/trafficcounts/ (last visited July 24, 2017).
including a cell phone lot, remote airport parking lots with shuttles to the terminals, and rental car and other airport-related businesses. The Airport has plans for commercial development that remains uncertain under FHWA jurisdiction so long as the portion of Peña Blvd. east of E-470 remains improperly classified as part of the NHS.

Similarly, directional signage on the airport-serving side of Peña is typical of other airports in the final approach. This is likely because the FAA has addressed the applicability of the MUTCD in AC 150/5360-12E, which attempts to balance the unique circumstances of airports with safe highway engineering. While the FHWA clarified the application of the MUTCD under 23 CFR § 655.603(a) to “all streets, highways, or bicycle trails open to public travel” by noting that roads within “shopping centers, airports, and sports arenas” were subject to the manual’s requirements, the Preamble to the Final Rule explained that this list was provided only as “general examples of what [open to public use] means....” See 71 Fed. Reg. 75,112. In response to a comment from AASHTO, the Preamble goes on to note that FHWA does not “require State or local agencies to police the private properties open to public travel to ensure compliance with the MUTCD.”

Relatedly, the Airport was informed by the FAA that it was impermissible to continue to use exclusively airport revenue for the portion of Peña west of E-470, clearly part of the NHS, because it serves measurable non-airport traffic. Correcting the maps of the NHS will allow the Airport to continue to fund the operation and maintenance of the airport serving segment of Peña, pursue important commercial development initiatives both in the median and adjacent to Peña, and preserve the Airport’s eligibility for federal transportation funds necessary to complete a capacity expansion project on Peña Blvd. west of E-470 serving a portion of the general public. If Peña east of E-470 remains on the NHS, DEN’s hands will be tied and funding eligibility for Peña west of E-470 will be in jeopardy.

The Secretary of Transportation has statutory authority to withdraw roads from the NHS when it is reasonable and appropriate.

As you know, DEN is and will continue to pursue a legislative change to the NHS map. To date, we have garnered the support from the U.S. Senate. Last month, the Senate Appropriations Committee passed an FY18 transportation appropriations bill that would require DOT to remove Peña east of E470 from the NHS.9 We are not aware of any opposition to this effort.

However, since the timeline for a legislative change is uncertain and Airport development projects are on the horizon, we are hopeful that no opposition from CDOT’s Transportation Commission will be sufficient for FHWA to remove the Airport-serving segment of Peña from the NHS. 23 U.S.C. §103(b)(3)(A)(ii)(II) supports that removals can be made when it is “reasonable

---

and appropriate.” Further, FHWA guidance contemplates technical corrections without involvement of the Secretary.\textsuperscript{10}

We very much appreciate CDOT’s cooperation in this process and are respectfully requesting the assistance of CDOT in approaching FHWA with this request. Please do not hesitate to contact me with questions or let me know how I can be of further assistance in this process.

Best Regards,

Kirsten J. Crawford
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City and County of Denver

Cc: Kim Day, Chief Executive Officer, DEN
Mark Baker, Senior Vice President of AIM, DEN
Dan Reimer, Assistant General Counsel, DEN
Rachel Carr, Federal Affairs Manager, DEN
Doug Rex, Acting Director, DRCOG

Enclosure: 4

COLORADO PROPOSED NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The proposed NHS was approved by the transportation commission on April 15, 1993 and submitted to the FHWA on May 7. It consisted of the following mileages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Routes</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>2,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>3,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NHS Target Mileage</th>
<th>Additional Requested Mileage</th>
<th>Possible STRAHNET Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+8)</td>
<td>(+22)</td>
<td>(+30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>668</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major Statewide Routes are:**

- **I-25** From New Mexico State Line to the Wyoming State Line
- **I-70** From Utah State Line to the Kansas State Line
- **I-76** From Denver to the Nebraska State Line
- **I-225** In Denver
- **I-270** In Denver
- **U.S. 24** From Divide to Limon
- **U.S. 34** From Granby to I-76 at Wiggins (part in Rocky Mountain National Park is not on the NHS)
- **U.S. 40** From Utah State Line to I-70 at Empire Junction, in Denver from Broadway to I-70 East and from Limon to Kit Carson
- **U.S. 50** From Grand Junction to the Kansas State Line
- **U.S. 85** In Denver from SH 470 to I-25 and from I-76 to Greeley
- **U.S. 160** From the New Mexico State Line to I-25 at Walsenburg
ATTACHMENT 3

U.S. 287 From the Oklahoma State Line to Kit Carson and in Denver from West Colfax Ave. to the Wyoming State Line
U.S. 550 From the New Mexico State Line to Montrose
U.S. 666 From the New Mexico State Line to U.S. 160

Major Regional Routes are:

S.H. 14 From Fort Collins to I-25
U.S. 36 From Boulder to Denver
S.H. 45/ Pueblo Blvd. From I-25 south of Pueblo to I-25 north of Pueblo
I-70 B From U.S. 50 in Grand Junction to I-70 at Clifton
S.H. 82 From Glenwood Springs to Aspen
S.H. 93 From Golden to Boulder at Baseline Road
S.H. 119 From Boulder to Longmont and I-25

In Colorado Springs

S.H. 16/Peaceful Valley Road From I-25 to Powers Blvd.
S.H. 83/ Academy Blvd. From I-25 south of Colorado Springs to I-25 North of Colorado Springs
Airport Rd. From Powers Blvd. to Academy Blvd.
Powers Blvd. From I-25 south of Colorado Springs to I-25 north of Colorado Springs
Woodman Road From I-25 to Powers Blvd.

In Boulder

U.S. 36 Spur/ Baseline Road From U.S. 36 to S.H. 93
S.H. 157/ Foothills Pkwy. From U.S. 36 to S.H. 119

- 2 -
In Denver

S.H. 2/U.S. 6/
Colorado Blvd. From I-25 to I-76

U.S. 6/
6th Ave. From S.H. 93 & 58 to Broadway

S.H. 30/
6th Ave. From I-225 to Buckley ANGB

S.H. 83/
Parker Rd. From E-470 to Colorado Blvd.

S.H. 88 From Colfax Ave. to U.S. 285 and from U.S. 85 to I-25

S.H. 121/
Wadsworth Blvd. From Martin Marietta Plant to 120th Ave.

S.H. 128/
120th Ave. From Federal Blvd. to Beltway/Tower

S.H. 177/
University Blvd. From S.H. 470 to I-25

U.S. 285/
Hampden Ave. From S.H. 470 to I-25

S.H. 470 From U.S. 6 to I-25

E-470 From I-25 to Parker Road

Beltway/Tower Road From 120th Ave. to Pena Blvd.

Buckley Rd./
Quincy Ave. From I-70 to Parker Road

Fox/23rd
Pair/Broadway/
Lincoln Pair From North I-25 to South I-25

Pena Blvd. From DIA to I-70

Peoria St. From I-70 to Fitzsimons AMC
Additional Requested Routes are:

**Statewide**

U.S. 285/
S.H. 17/
U.S. 24

From the New Mexico State Line to Denver

In Boulder

U.S. 36/
18th St.
S.H. 119

From U.S. 36 to S.H. 119

From S.H. 157 to U.S. 36

In Denver

S.H. 30/
Hampden/
Havana Ave.

From I-25 to Alameda Ave.

U.S. 40/
Colfax Ave.

From Broadway to Speer Blvd.

S.H. 44/104th Ave.

From Wadsworth Blvd. to Beltway/Tower Rd.

S.H. 75/
Bowles Ave.

From S.H. 470 to Santa Fe Drive

S.H. 88/
Arapahoe Rd.

From University Blvd. to Parker Rd.

1st Ave./
Speer Blvd.

From Colorado Blvd. to I-25

Alameda Ave.

From Colorado Blvd. to Buckley Rd.

Beltway S.E.

From Parker Rd. to Pena Blvd.

Beltway N.E.

From Beltway/Tower Road to I-25

The NHS was developed in accordance with Section 1006 of the ISTEA and used the "illustrative" NHS as a base. Additional routes were added based on input from CDOT staff, MPOs and local governments.

The requested system slightly exceeds the target mileage of 2976. It is over by 30 miles. In addition, the Department has requested an additional 325 miles for routes that should be on the NHS but were not included because of the mileage limitation placed on Colorado by FHWA.

Action by FHWA has been projected by June 30, 1993 and congressional action by September 30, 1995.
June 26, 1995

Mr. George Schuernstuhl  
Director of Transportation Services  
Denver Regional Council of Governments  
2480 W. 26th Avenue, Suite 200-B  
Denver, CO 80211

Dear Mr. Schuernstuhl:

Our letter to you dated December 6, 1995, requested your assistance in completing an inventory of all intermodal facilities in Colorado to be used by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in developing the criteria and procedures for identifying National Highway System (NHS) connections to Intermodal Terminals. Several Transportation Planning Regions (TPR's) provided responses to the December 6 request and we submitted the data requested by FHWA to them in January of this year. Attached is a copy of an April 14, 1995, memorandum from the FHWA Headquarters Office in Washington, D.C. to their Regional Administrators, and the "Guidelines and Criteria for Identifying NHS Connections to Major Intermodal Terminals". Copies of this information was also sent you May 17, 1995. Copies of an FHWA list of major intermodal termiansl are also attached.

The following list includes major intermodal terminals from the FHWA list plus others we have identified from information you supplied us and work we have done on the Intermodal Management System.

1. Denver International Airport  
2. Denver Union Station  
3. Denver Bus Station (Greyhound)  
4. Denver DRGW  
5. Denver UP  
6. Denver BN  
7. Rolla UP  
8. Broomfield Park and Ride  
9. Burkhardt Transit Station and Park and Ride  
10. Southmoor Park & Ride  
11. Table Mesa Park & Ride  
12. Thornton Park & Ride  
13. Wagon Road Park & Ride  
14. Civic Center Transit Station  
15. Market Street Transit Station

We would appreciate your review of this list and any correction or additions you may have. We also would appreciate any data you have on these intermodal facilities as requested by FHWA in Attachment 2.

A number of these facilities will require connections to the NHS and we would like to work with you on the selection on these connections.
Mr. George Scheuernstuhl  
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Please contact me at 757-9819 or Mr. Dallace Unger at 757-9814 of this office to set up a meeting to discuss this matter. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Dave Ruble, Manager  
Intermodal Business Group

DR:mt

(CC of all letter to TPR's to Dave Ruble  
and Brian Pinkerton (included FWMATT for  
Brian))

Greg F. will obtain input from transit,  
terminal bus, terminal carriers and shipper  
operators

CC of ORCOCG letter to Regions 1, 4, 6.
To: Chair and Members of the Regional Transportation Committee

From: Robert Spotts, Senior Transportation Planner
303-480-5626 or rspotts@drcog.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 2017</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
DRCOG maintains a federally-required congestion management process (CMP). One component of the process is the calculation of congestion measurements for roadways in the DRCOG region, and presentation within an annual report on traffic congestion. The annual reports have been prepared since 2006.

Staff will present draft results and topical items from the upcoming 2016 Annual Report on Roadway Traffic Congestion in the Denver Region, such as the growth in VMT, regional congestion measures, and the impacts of traffic crashes and incidents on congestion.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
1. Staff presentation

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Robert Spotts, Senior Transportation Planner, at 303-480-5626 or rspotts@drcog.org.
## Topics

1. Daily Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT)
2. Measuring congestion
3. Impacts of crashes on traffic congestion
DRCOG Congestion Management Process

- MPOs are federally required to monitor roadway traffic congestion
  - Database of network details, volumes, and delay measures
  - Results used in project evaluation for RTP and TIP

---

DRCOG Congestion Management Process

- DRCOG Annual Reports on Traffic Congestion since 2006
  - Regional VMT change
  - System system performance measures (person and vehicle delay)
  - Key congested locations
  - Special subjects

- Reporting to FHWA
  - FAST-Act federal performance measures (2018)
    - Work with CDOT
DRCOG Congestion Management Process

**Congestion Mitigation Program (CMP)**
- CMP roadway network and segment attributes
- Current & forecasted traffic data
- Regional performance measures & segment travel delays calculated with defined scoring system
- Identify key congested corridors, intersections, and bottlenecks

**Monitor Effectiveness**
- Annual reporting of performance measures
- Evaluate benefits of completed projects and programs

**Incorporate Strategies into the Transportation Planning Process**
- CMP results used in evaluation of projects for RTP & TIP
- Identify and evaluate projects & programs that reduce congestion
- Congestion Mitigation Toolkit (Avoid, Adapt, Alleviate)

**Regional Partners (RTD, CDOT, RAQC, Local Governments)**
- Transit service
- Managed lanes (HOV, toll, etc.)
- Incident management
- Real-time information, technology

**DRCOG Regional Program**
- Way to Go Program/Regional TDM
- Traffic Signal Program
- ITS, Management, & Operations Program

**Implementation (Projects & Programs)**

---

1. **VMT Trends**

   **Average Daily VMT in the Denver Region (2000 - 2016)**

   - **Total VMT**
     - 2000: 60
     - 2016: 84
   - **VMT/Capita**
     - 2000: 1.2%
     - 2016: 25.5%
   - **2040 Metro Vision Target**
     - 23 VMT/Capita

---
Why is VMT Increasing?

- Booming economy
- Consistently low fuel costs
- Population growth

VMT Annual change data sources: FHWA Monthly VMT Reports; State HPMS (Highway Performance Management System); CDOT continuous traffic counter results; DRCOG traffic count database.

2. MEASURING CONGESTION
Congestion Mobility Score – 5 measures

- Grades based on total score from 0-20 (5 pt. scale per measure)

### Duration
- How long does the congestion last?
  - Number of hours per day congested

### Severity
- How much of driving time is in delayed conditions?
  - Percent of travel time in delay in peak hour

### Magnitude
- What is the total amount of delay for all travelers at that location?
  - Total daily delay time per mile

### Variation
- What is the variation in travel time between off-peak and rush hour?

### Reliability
- How often do crashes or incidents occur?
  - Crashes per mile per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11 to 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17 to 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arterial Methodology – Broadway segment example

### Traffic Volume
- All day volume - 33,960 vehicles
  - (49,240 persons)
- Peak hour volume - 2,800 vehicles

### Roadway Capacity
- 4 thru lanes
- Max capacity of 6,000 vehicles per hour
- Roadside factors incorporated
- Resulting capacity of 3,660 vehicles per hour

### Travel Delay
- Uncongested time = ___ minutes
- Peak hour time = ___ minutes
- Delay is ___ minutes per person

Signals
On street parking
Non signalized access points
Bus activity
New Methodology for Freeways- INRIX Data

- INRIX collects minute by minute speed observations on roadways, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year
  - Available through CDOT – Thanks!
  - Real world speed observations vs. calculated speeds
  - Used for FHWA performance measures – CDOT & DRCOG in 2018

Estimating Future 2040 Conditions

- Use the DRCOG Focus Travel Model to estimate the future change in traffic volumes, person volumes, operating speed, and travel delay on every segment
  - Assume 2040 MVRTP roadway network and transit system
  - Changing demographics of population
  - Household and employment growth
Map of 2016 and 2040 CMP Grades - DRAFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11 to 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17 to 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Congestion Performance Measures - Regional Roadway System -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2040 (RTP)</th>
<th>% Change between 2015 and 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Measures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles of Travel</td>
<td>62,950,000</td>
<td>25,141,997,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Travel</td>
<td>1,405,000</td>
<td>475,050,000</td>
<td>1,981,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Delay</td>
<td>218,000</td>
<td>73,822,000</td>
<td>403,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Delay Per Driven Registered Vehicle (2)</td>
<td>7 minutes</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
<td>9 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Delay Per Household</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>57 hours</td>
<td>13 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person Measures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Miles of Travel</td>
<td>84,443,000</td>
<td>28,541,655,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Hours of Travel</td>
<td>1,897,000</td>
<td>641,317,000</td>
<td>2,674,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Hours of Delay</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>99,660,000</td>
<td>544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Delay Per Resident</td>
<td>5m 30s</td>
<td>34 hours</td>
<td>7m 30s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Travel Time in Delayed Conditions</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Variation (peak vs. off peak)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Miles of Roads Congested for 3+ Hours</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Percent of total Lane Miles)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Travel Delay Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vehicles (3)</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>424,800,000</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Vehicle Persons (3)</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>838,200,000</td>
<td>4,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Delay</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>1,263,000,000</td>
<td>6,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit and Other Regionwide Measures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RTD Transit Boardings</td>
<td>332,000</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Transit Boardings</td>
<td>95,200</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Park n Ride Parking Space Utilization (out of 32,011 spaces)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeled Bicycle and Pedestrian Trips</td>
<td>1,409,700</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2,081,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Crashes (2014)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>69,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(Congestion Mobility Grade of D or F)
Corridor Congested in 2018
Corridor Congested by 2040

---

10/5/2017
3. IMPACTS OF CRASHES

Impacts of Crashes

- 69,800 “Reported” crashes in 2014 in the region (200/day)
- Fatalities and serious injuries biggest concern
- Reduce and mitigate impacts of crashes
  - Incident Management Plans, Traveler alerts
  - Clearing of crash and incident scenes (e.g. CDOT Motorist Patrol)
  - Roadway design elements
- Freeways experience greatest impact of crashes
Examining an individual crash with INRIX data

- DRCOG maintains a database of reported crashes in the region
- Using INRIX, we can examine the duration and severity of congestion associated with a crash

Example Crash in June 2016
Westbound I-70 near W. US-6 at 4:00 pm

Day before crash
Day of Crash
Day after crash

W.B. Direction of travel

5 Mile Backup Queues
4 Hours to Clear Out
Example Crash in June 2016 at 4:00 pm

Average Speed from Wadsworth to US-6 on WB I-70 During Crash Response

- Day of Incident
- Average Day

Effects on surrounding area

7:30 pm

- Average Day
- Day of Incident
Mitigating Congestion – DRCOG & Partners

Avoid it
Real-Time Information
Extra Night in Mountains
Flexible Work Hours
Telework

Adapt to it
Mobility Choices:
- Alternative modes
- Transit, Walk, Bicycle
- Car/Vanpool
Real-Time Information
Efficient Land Use Designs

Alleviate it
Add Lanes / Capacity
Improve Operations:
- Traffic Signals
- Signing and Striping
- Access Management
- Incident Management
Expand Transit Facilities
To: Chair and Members of the Regional Transportation Committee

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 2017</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
An update on progress towards the development of the Regional/Subregional project selection model for the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
August 16, 2017 – Board action regarding 2020-2023 TIP set-asides
September 20, 2017 – Board action regarding 2020-2023 TIP focus areas

SUMMARY
In February, the DRCOG Board of Directors acted to accept the TIP Review Work Group’s white paper entitled Recommended Funding and Project Selection Framework for the 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program. The report highlighted the key characteristics of the recommended Regional/Subregional Dual Model framework for the allocation of DRCOG-administered federal funds associated with the 2020-2023 TIP. The Board also directed the TIP Review Work Group (renamed the TIP Policy Work Group) to continue its discussions and develop the draft 2020-2023 TIP Policy based on this framework.

At the October RTC meeting, staff will provide an update on the work performed by the TIP Policy Work Group, as well as direction provided by the Board to date.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
February 14, 2017 - Staff provided a briefing on the TIP Review Work Group’s report to the Board regarding possible funding and project selection framework for the next TIP call for projects.

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
1. Staff presentation

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information please contact Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director, at 303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org.
Two models for project selection

Federal Funds administered by DRCOG

Regional model
  - DRCOG’s current model
  - Centralized process: All applications submitted to MPO

Regional/subregional model (dual model)
  - Seattle, Chicago
  - Has both regional and subregional allocation elements
2016-2021 TIP - Project Selection and Targets
All values are 4-year totals of DRCOG federal funds - CMAQ, STP-Metro, and TAP (Jun. 19, 2014)

Set Aside Programs
- TDM ($6.4 Mil.)
- Way 2 to Go ($7.2 Mil.)
- Traffic Signal/ITS ($16.8 Mil.)
- Station/Urban Center Studies ($2.4 Mil.)
- Air Quality ($7.2 Mil.)
  $40 Mil.

DRCOG Federal Funds
For 2016-2021 TIP
~$266 Mil.

Other Commitments
- Carry Over ($7 Mil.)
- 1st FasTracks Commitment ($8 Mil.)
- 2nd FasTracks Commitment ($12 Mil.)
- I-70 ($25 Mil.)
  ~$52 Mil.

TIP Call for Projects
~ $174 Mil.

Phase 1 Selection (75%) ~ $131 Mil.
Targets:
- 38% to Roadway Capacity ($49.5 Mil.)
- 22% to Roadway Operational ($28.5 Mil.)
- 15% to Bicycle/Ped ($21 Mil.)*
- 15% to Roadway Reconstruction ($20 Mil.)
- 6% to Transit Service ($8 Mil.)
- 3% to Transit Passenger Facilities ($4 Mil.)

Remaining Projects

Phase 2 Selection (25%) ~ $43 Mil.
- Consider Other Factors
- All projects compete

TIP dual model concept

Set-Aside
Programs

DRCOG TIP funds

TIP Calls for Projects

Regional projects pot (incl. Other Commitments)

Subregional projects pot
Establish TIP Focus Areas

- Regional priorities: What would the Board like to do with DRCOG funding to make life better?
- Discussed at Board Workshop
- Approved focus areas at September Board Meeting
  1) **Improve mobility infrastructure and services for vulnerable populations** (including improved transportation access to health services).
  2) **Increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network**
  3) **Improve transportation safety and security**

• Should the focus areas be used as a litmus test for project eligibility or should focus areas be used more as a guide for investment decisions?
  • A guide for investment decisions, and not a project eligibility component.

• Should the consideration of focus areas involve quantitative evidence, qualitative evidence or both?
  • Combination of both quantitative and qualitative.

• Should the consideration of focus areas be different for Regional Share projects vs. Subregional Share projects?
  • Considered in both the Regional and Subregional Share processes.
TIP Set-asides

- Programs with funding “off the top”
- $49.4 million to programs and pools (August Board Meeting)
  - $40 million in 2016-2021 TIP
  - Four of the five set-asides have individual call for project components
- New set-aside: Human Services Transportation ($4 million)
  - Improve services and mobility options for vulnerable populations
- Regional Traffic Operations and Technology
  - Increased funding amount by $3.2 million

Proposed 2020-2023 TIP Set-Asides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Set-Asides</th>
<th>Proposed Set-Asides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station Area Master Plans/Urban Center Planning Studies</td>
<td>Urban Center or Station Area Master Plan&lt;br&gt;Next step studies&lt;br&gt;Corridor-wide studies&lt;br&gt;Area planning and implementation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</td>
<td>Regional TMA partnerships&lt;br&gt;Traditional TDM marketing projects&lt;br&gt;Small infrastructure projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way to Go Program</td>
<td>Trip-planning, tracking, ride-sharing&lt;br&gt;Advertising and promotions&lt;br&gt;Employer outreach&lt;br&gt;Community outreach&lt;br&gt;Guaranteed Ride Home&lt;br&gt;Vanpool&lt;br&gt;Transit/Realtime&lt;br&gt;School pool&lt;br&gt;Bike to Work Day&lt;br&gt;Commuter assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM Services</td>
<td>Way to Go program&lt;br&gt;Regional TMA partnerships&lt;br&gt;TDM projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Operations</td>
<td>Approximately one-third for DRCOG's Traffic Signal Program (staff and consultant costs), remaining for project solicitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Improvements</td>
<td>Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC) receives&lt;br&gt;Vehicle fleet technology&lt;br&gt;Ozone Aware Outreach Program&lt;br&gt;Dedicate and administer to local projects&lt;br&gt;Ozone SIP modeling study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Improvements</td>
<td>Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC) would receive:&lt;br&gt;Vehicle fleet technology&lt;br&gt;Ozone Aware Outreach Program&lt;br&gt;Ozone SIP modeling study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Service Transportation</td>
<td>DRCOG would receive funding to improve service and mobility options for vulnerable populations by funding underfunded/underused trips and adding stock expansion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed 2020-2023 TIP Set-Asides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Set-Asides</th>
<th>Proposed Set-Asides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station Area Master Plan</td>
<td>Community Mobility Planning and Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Center or Station Area Planning and Implementation activities</td>
<td>small area planning and transportation studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</td>
<td>small infrastructure projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Model – Regional Share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects/programs providing a significant regional benefit</td>
<td>Funds primarily used to supplement larger regional projects/submitted by regional partners (e.g. CDOT, RTD, public authorities and other entities that qualify for federal funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified application process</td>
<td>must be able to quantify the benefits to the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way to Go Program</td>
<td>Community Mobility Planning and Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip planning, tracking, ride-sharing</td>
<td>Small area planning and transportation studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and promotions</td>
<td>Small infrastructure projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer outreach</td>
<td>Community outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Operations</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Operations and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Air Quality Council (RAQQ) receives</td>
<td>Approximately one-third for DRCOG Traffic Signal Program staff and consultant costs, remaining for project solicitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Improvements</td>
<td>Regional Air Quality Council (RAQQ) would receive:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC) receives</td>
<td>vehicle fleet technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Operations and Technology</td>
<td>Ozone Awareness Outreach Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Operations</td>
<td>Local project coordination study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Service Transportation</td>
<td>DRCOG would receive funding and issue project solicitations to improve service and mobility options for vulnerable populations by funding unfunded/uninsured trips and reducing stock expansion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Share

- Projects/programs providing a significant regional benefit
- Funds primarily used to supplement larger regional projects/programs submitted by regional partners (e.g. CDOT, RTD, public authorities and other entities that qualify for federal funds)
- Simplified application process
  - Must be able to quantify the benefits to the region
Dual Model – Regional Share

Regional Share

• Regional share definition and eligibility?
  • High level facilities
    – Freeways (may include regional arterials)
    – Rapid Transit
    – Regional bikeways

Dual Model – Subregional Share

Subregional Share

• Funds proportionately targeted to predefined sub-geographic units for project identification and recommendation
  • Counties to be used
  • Subregional share needs to be “meaningful”

• How should funds be proportionately targeted?
  • Combination of population, employment, PMT
Dual Model – Subregional Share

Subregional Share

- Governance:
  - Establishment of subregional “forums” to coordinate a project prioritization process
  - Every local governmental unit within the county is invited to participate
  - CDOT and RTD non-voting
  - Other stakeholders at the discretion of subregional forums

- Board’s Role:
  - Process oversight
  - Ultimate decision makers on subregional projects.
    » Make sure projects are consistent with MV, RTP and Focus Areas

Example Dual Model Concept

DRCOG Federal Funds

- Set-Asides
  - Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
  - Way to Go
  - Regional Transportation Operations (RTO)
  - Station Area Master Plans/Urban Center Studies (STAMPs)
  - Air Quality

Regional Share and Previous Commitments
Call for Regionally Significant Projects
Similar to structure used for current TIP

Subregional Share
Proportionately targeted for planning purposes to predefined sub-geographic units for project identification and recommendation by eligible stakeholders within each subregion.

DRCOG Board Final Project Selection 2020-2023 TIP
Set-Asides (As Proposed)
- Community Mobility Planning & Implementation
- TDM Services
- Regional Transportation Operations & Technology
- Air Quality Improvement
- Human Service Transportation

~$50 Million (Proposed)

Regional Share and Previous Commitments (e.g., I-70 East)
Call for Regional Projects/Programs
Similar to structure used for current TIP.
30% = $69 Million

Subregional Share
Proportionately targeted for planning purposes to predefined sub-geographic units for project identification and recommendation by eligible stakeholders within each subregion.
70% = $161 Million

Example County Allocations
4-Year Federal Total (Subregional Share 70% of Total)
Avg of 2015 Pop & Employ, and 2016 PMT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Avg of 2015 Pop &amp; Employ, and 2016 PMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Year Funding (in Millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>19.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>9.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>24.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>9.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>16.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Weld</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS