

Attachment A
Meeting Summary
Transportation Advisory Committee
Monday, May 19, 2025

***In-person meeting with Virtual Option for Public (Via Zoom)**

Members (or Voting Alternates) Present:

Kent Moorman	Adams County – City of Thornton
Michele Ricco	Adams County
Chris Chovan (Alternate)	Adams County- City of Westminster
Jeff Dankenbring	Arapahoe County – City of Centennial
Brent Soderlin	Arapahoe County – City of Littleton
Bryan Weimer	Arapahoe County
Alex Hyde-Wright	Boulder County
Jean Sanson	City of Boulder
Sarah Grant (Chair)	Broomfield, City & County
Justin Begley	Denver, City & County
David Krutsinger (Alternate)	Denver, City & County
Jennifer Hillhouse	Denver, City & County
Larry Nimmo (Alternate)	Douglas County – City of Castle Pines
Tom Reiff	Douglas County – City of Castle Rock
Christina Lane	Jefferson County
Mike Whiteaker	Jefferson County – City of Lakewood
Maria D’Andrea	Jefferson County – City of Wheat Ridge
Hilary Simmons	Older Adults Special Interest Seat
Angie Rivera-Malpiede	Equity Special Interest Seat
Lisa Sakata (Alternate)	Environmental Special Interest Seat
Frank Bruno	Via Mobility Special Interest Seat
Brodie Ayers	Aviation Special Interests Seat
Ron Papsdorf	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Kyra Reumann-Moore (Alternate)	Regional Air Quality Council
Chris Quinn (Alternate)	Regional Transportation District
James Eussen (Alternate)	Colorado Department of Transportation Region 4

Members Attending Virtually or Additional Alternates Present:

Doug Rex (Alternate)	Denver Regional Council of Governments
Kellee Van Bruggen (Alternate)	Adams County – City of Arvada
Art Griffith	Douglas County
Jeff Boyd	Housing Special Interest Seat
Aaron Bustow (Alternate)	Federal Highway Administration (ex-officio)

Public: John Gardocki, Cory Schmitt, DJ Beckwith, Madi Sydnor, Medora Bornhoft, Noreen Smyth, Camilla Soechtig, JoAnn Mattson, Robert Simmons, Annelies van Vonno, Richard Driscoll, Jason Jarquio, Christina Leach, Dan Anderson, Tom Worker-Braddock

DRCOG staff: Nora Kern, Cam Kennedy, Todd Cottrell, Cole Neder, Jacob Riger, Zach Feldman, Max Monk, Aaron Villere, Lauren Kirgis, Steph Piperno, Erik Braaten

Call to Order

Chair Sarah Grant called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Public Comment

Jacob Riger paid tribute to Ron Papsdorf's tenure at DRCOG and highlighted a (small) sample of Ron's many accomplishments for DRCOG and the region.

April 28, 2025 Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

The summary was accepted.

Action Item

Amendments to the 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program

Todd Cottrell, Project and Program Delivery Manager, discussed that there are five proposed amendments for the 2026-2029 Transportation Improvement Program. The amendments have been found to conform with the State Implementation Plan for Air Quality.

Bryan Weimer moved to recommend to the Regional Transportation Committee the attached project amendments to the 2026-2029 TIP. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Discussion Items

Colorado Department of Transportation Active Transportation Plan

Aaron Villere, Senior Planner, introduced Annelies van Vonno, CDOT Bike and Ped Program Coordinator, who stated that CDOT's statewide Active Transportation Plan sets goals, policy recommendations, and action steps supporting walking, bicycling and human-powered transportation for all Coloradans. Building on feedback, CDOT created the Priority Active Connections Explorer—or PACE Tool—to assess and prioritize active transportation investments on the state highway system using fourteen data factors. The PACE Tool is intended as an interactive, map-based platform to score and prioritize road segments across the state and provide guidance both to CDOT and local agency partners to assess network priority segments and gaps for improvement.

2050 Regional Transportation Plan Update – Scenarios Results

Jacob Riger, Multimodal Transportation Planning Manager, described the transportation and land use scenarios tested as part of the scenario planning process for the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan major update. He also discussed the initial results from the scenario planning process. He noted the objective is to understand how and to what extent each scenario influences regional relationships between growth and development and urban form, multimodal transportation system approaches, and resulting travel and mobility patterns and outcomes.

Kent Moorman inquired about why only the Limited Roadway Expansion Scenario states it would occur if the region doesn't achieve the GHG Transportation Planning Standard-required greenhouse gas reductions. Jacob replied that this scenario was designed to test that concept since if the region does not meet reduction levels in the GHG rule then funding becomes restricted, and projects would have to be approved on a project-by-project basis. Everything would become much more limited in terms of projects that can move forward, so this is what this scenario depicts. Ron Papsdorf added that an air quality modeling assessment was not done for any of the scenarios and all these scenarios are only focused on the transportation outcomes.

Justin Begley inquired about the differences between the two land use scenarios labeled as Transit-focused and Transit-focused Plus. Jacob Riger replied that in layman's terms, the Transit-focused scenario generally uses the geographies of House Bill-1313 transit-oriented communities and housing density, while Transit-focused Plus adds the geographies associated with additional major transit investments included in the current 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.

Justin Begley asked how the heat maps vary depending on the Transit-focused and Transit-focused Plus scenarios. Jacob replied there are some subtle differences. Overall, the maps reflect that growth intensity is already forecasted to occur in many of the same geographic areas tested in the scenarios.

Tom Rieff inquired if a matrix was built to show all the different metrics that DRCOG measured with each scenario so that a side-by-side comparison could be used to help simplify the data. Jacob replied that there is a table of data on the scenarios and staff are working on creating a comprehensive scenario report, including conceptual planning-level scenario costs.

Jean Sanson asked if the 2050 Limited Roadway Expansion Scenario is showing that there is no more investment in roadway expansion projects but also there is no additional investment in transit or complete streets. Jacob stated if a project is already in the TIP, it was included, but otherwise major regionally funded roadway capacity projects were removed, and locally funded roadway capacity projects would be limited to four lanes.

Jean Sanson inquired if more research could be done to show how several scenarios might complement each other? For example, a scenario showing Limited Roadway Expansion Plus Transit or coupled with Complete Streets. Jacob replied it depends on the scenario; some scenarios could be combined such as Transit and Complete Streets, while others, such as the Limited Roadway Expansion, would be more difficult to combine. Ron Papsdorf added that DRCOG did not have time to run multiple combinations of scenarios, but there might be a way to create some hybrid scenarios combining aspects of the scenarios shown today.

Jessica Myklebust inquired why it appears some projects would not be finished in the Limited Roadway Expansion Scenario. While it shows the I-25 toll express lane system completed, it also misses Segments 2 and 3 of the I-25 corridor. Even in the Transit and Transit Plus scenarios, they aren't included even though they would help with rapid transit. Jacob Riger stated that if a project is in the TIP, then it is moving forward but anything that isn't currently in the TIP is not depicted. If a segment of I-25 is currently only in the planning stage and isn't actively being funded or under construction, it would not be included in these scenarios.

Bryan Weimer inquired how the regional housing gap is being incorporated into these scenarios. Zach Feldman replied that there is a lot of capacity for growth across the region and staff used control totals from the State Demography Office when calculating the number of households, population, jobs, etc. The assumptions about how much the region is going to grow in terms of all three of those metrics show that if more housing is not built then the region will not achieve the population, household, or job numbers that are being forecast, which will be detrimental to future economic growth in the region.

Tom Rieff mentioned the heat map shows growth in the region concentrated in Denver and the central urban area, but the market is still demanding single-family homes, especially in outer suburban locations, why does the model not take that into account and would a more realistic approach be better suited when modeling? Zach replied there are regional control totals for the scenarios, and the data regarding household growth comes from the State Demography Office. The heat map shows there will be growth across the region not just in the center but also in the east, north, and south. Ron Papsdorf added that this data is based on land use models that allocate growth over time based on several factors, including zoning capacity and the state demographer's growth forecast. Growth will occur across the region and because of the substantial growth in units being developed in Denver, that is why the heat map reflects that.

Brodie Ayers agreed with Tom Rieff's sentiments and inquired how the intensity of the growth scale was created for the current heat map since it seems to show, for example, no growth south of the Denver International Airport or Aurora or Adams County, etc. Even though those areas are going to have 45,000 new housing units south of the airport and another 15,000 new housing units north of the airport, for example. Zach explained that the GIS team built this map with a hex grid earlier this year, and it reflects information staff had access to as well as data shared by jurisdictions back in February and March. Growth is forecast in those areas, but because of the scale of the hex map it's just not as apparent. Jacob added that staff recognizes and appreciates that growth is occurring across the region.

Regional Multimodal Freight Plan Update

Cole Neder, Senior Planner, explained that the Regional Multimodal Freight Plan is a shared vision and strategic guide to help the Denver region identify opportunities to move freight and goods more efficiently. The plan focuses on two components: Updating the data and analysis components of the existing plan and meeting the requirements articulated in federal surface transportation legislation. This effort will expand the plan to focus on additional activities, including performance measurement, gap identification, land use analysis, and creating processes around project prioritization and implementation.

Brodie Ayers inquired how this plan will be incorporated into the scenario planning effort that was just presented since freight is a large part of the region's transportation network. Cole Neder replied that this is something staff is evaluating and figuring out how best to incorporate it into the 2050 RTP as well as other existing processes.

Community Based Transportation Planning Program Update

Nora Kern, Subarea and Project Planning Program Manager stated that the goal of this program is for DRCOG to assist member governments in improving transportation for low-income and marginalized communities in the region. \$2,500,000 is available for the full four-year set-aside program, with \$1.25 million expected to be allocated each two-year cycle. DRCOG staff recently completed the second of two pilot projects that preceded the formalization of this program as a TIP set-aside, the North Federal Community Transportation Plan and the Edgewater School Transportation Plan. She then updated on the five community based transportation plans currently underway.

Administrative Items

Member Comment/Other Matters

Chair Grant thanked Ron Papsdorf for his seven years of work at DRCOG and wished him the best in his new role in Houston.

Next Meeting – June 23, 2025

Adjournment

There were no additional comments and the meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.