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Today’s agenda

Presentation
- Introduction
- Scenario planning
- Determining investment
- Plan priorities and highlights

Discussion and Q&A
Denver Regional Council of Governments

**Area**
- Nine-plus counties (58 member governments)
- 5,288 square miles (comparable to Connecticut)
- 3.4 million people (comparable to Utah)

**Elevation**
- From Grays Peak (14,278 feet)
- To South Platte River (4,432 feet)

**Roles**
- Regional planning commission (state statute)
- Area Agency on Aging (federal)
- Metropolitan planning organization (federal)
Colorado Department of Transportation

- Maintains, repairs and plows over **23,000 total lane miles** of highway
- Maintains **3,447 bridges**
- Oversees **28 billion miles of vehicle travel** annually
- Plows about **6 million lane miles** each year
- Spends **$69 million** annually on snow removal
- Keeps over **35 mountains passes** open year-round
- Monitors **278 of 522 avalanche paths**
- Administers about **$11 million in federal grants** for transit operators and **$41 million in federal aviation grants** for airports
- Manages over **$5 million in federal grants** for safe driving programs
Regional Transportation District

- Cities and towns served: **40 municipalities in 6 counties + 2 city/county jurisdictions**
- Annual regular fixed-route service miles (bus and rail): **35,550,924**
- Weekday regular fixed-route scheduled miles: **135,495**
- Number of regular fixed routes (bus and rail): **143**
- Park-n-Rides: **89 with 36,021 spaces**
INTRODUCTION
Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r802cmpCvig
A growing region and a mature transportation system

- 1990: 1.89 million
- 2020: 3.36 million (plus 1.47 million)
- 2050: 4.41 million (plus 1.05 million)

Key transportation statistics:

- 5 Interstates
- 6 U.S. Highways
- 36 State highways
- 2 Toll highways
- 2 Class 1 railroads (BNSF and Union Pacific)
- 3 Mountain passes
- 4,000 Signalized intersections
- 9,800 Bus stops
- 17,700 Sidewalk miles
- 8 Airports
Planning process structure

Metro Vision Plan
*Shared vision for the future*

Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan
*20-plus year “vision” transportation system*

Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan
*20-plus year “affordable” transportation system*

Transportation Improvement Program
*4-year program of funded projects*
Key considerations

1. Focus on regional policy priorities
2. Dedicated programmatic investment for policy priorities
3. Emphasis on including multimodal projects
4. Significant public & stakeholder engagement
5. Regional collaboration for the region’s transportation plan
Project schedule and key milestones

1. June 2019: Visioning and education
2. November 2019: Investment priorities and scenario options
3. August 2020: Plan development
4. February 2021: Draft plan review

Key plan milestones:
- Plan kickoff
- Scenario planning analysis
- Small area forecast
- Project solicitation and evaluation
- Fiscally constrained project and program investment priorities
- April 2021: Plan adoption

Examples of engagement strategies used:
- Survey
- Pop-up events
- Scenario budget activity
- Advisory groups
- Photo contest
- Virtual open houses
Themes of public engagement

• Invest in transit, sidewalks/bike paths, safety
• Less interest in funding new roads/highways
• Reduce greenhouse gas emissions/vehicle miles traveled

survey  pop-up events  scenario budget activity  advisory groups  photo contest  virtual open houses  + more
Advisory groups

**CIVIC ADVISORY GROUP**

“...convened to develop the plan with guidance from interested residents who represent the diversity of communities and experiences in the Denver region and who may not have participated in transportation planning previously.”

**YOUTH ADVISORY PANEL**

“...convened to ensure that younger voices were heard during the plan process. The panel brought together high school age representatives from DRCOG’s member government youth boards and commissions throughout the region.”
Themes of stakeholder engagement

- Multimodal projects with regional benefit
- County forums’ candidate project rankings
- Geographic balance and social equity
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions
Input highlights

- 2 advisory groups guided the process through 12 meetings
- 1,360 responses to online questionnaires and activities
- 6 pop-up events where 470-plus people shared their input
- 3 virtual public meetings
- 219 photos submitted
- 282 comments on draft plan
- 1 public hearing
- 50 county transportation forum meetings
- 43 DRCOG committee and board meetings

Promotion and outreach highlights

- 27 presentations to regional partners
- 1,032 video views
- 13 eblasts sent
- 8,923 visits to online engagement site
- 116 social media posts
- 2,581 plan website visits
SCENARIO PLANNING
DRCOG’s approach

Explores “what if” alternative futures

Relative comparisons, not rigorous evaluation of scenarios, nor choosing/judging scenarios

Understanding relationships between urban form and the transportation system on mobility

Choices & tradeoffs from individual scenarios

Provide guidance and direction for plan development
Scenario analysis

Land Use Scenarios

- 2050 Base
- Infill
- Centers

Transportation Scenarios

- 2050 Base (2040 FCRTP)
- Off-Peak Congestion
- Managed Lanes & Operations
- Travel Choices
- Transit
- Automated/Connected Vehicles
Off-Peak Congestion

Less than 1% change in vehicle miles traveled and transit trips

*(Regional person delay decreases by 3%)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM Peak I-25 from C-470 (Lone Tree) to SH-7 (Broomfield)</th>
<th>Daily Volume I-25 @ Speer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020 Base</td>
<td>70 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050 Base</td>
<td>88 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Peak Congestion Scenario</td>
<td>79 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Build out the freeway/interstate system to address off-peak congestion.

Some traffic is diverted from arterial streets onto I-70 and I-25.

While there are few changes at the regional level, some specific corridors have significant impacts.
Managed Lanes & Operations

Improve operations & traffic flow on region’s highways/freeways.

People in vehicles experience **25% less delay** on average.

**3% increase** in vehicle miles traveled
(~800,000 more daily VMT compared to the 2050 Base)

- Travel reliability increases significantly on the region’s freeways.
- Fewer secondary crashes and improved safety due to enhanced incident management.
Travel Choices

Increase travel & mobility choices along region’s major arterials.

- More than **twice** as many teleworkers
- **400,000 fewer** drive alone work trips every day
- **50% increase** in bicycle/pedestrian trips
  
  *Slight decrease in transit trips*

Due to safer roadway design there are fewer crashes, injuries, and fatalities.

Even with reduced speed limits, there is less total delay.
Transit

Improve and expand the region’s transit network and service.

79% of households have good transit access to jobs
(Compared to 58% in the 2050 Base)

76% more transit trips
(Small decrease in walk and bike trips)

100,000 more households use transit
(14% of all households)

Free transit provides personal, mobility, and equity benefits.

There is a 2% decrease in vehicle miles traveled.
Land use scenarios: households & employment

Regional Household Growth to 2050

Regional Job Growth to 2050

Anchored to Local Zoning and Permitted Plats

Location Choice Models’ Calibration
Introduce change by making different choices available

**Infill**

What if local governments allow for more urban and suburban redevelopment and infill?

Urban + Inner suburban

\[11\%\text{ of region’s land area}\]

**Centers**

What if local governments focus opportunity for development around key centers and corridors?

Rapid transit stations + Urban centers + Employment centers

\[3\%\text{ of region’s land area}\]

*Sourced from the region’s shared vision, the Metro Vision Plan.*

* 2010 Census Urban Area was 15% of region’s land area
## Beyond visualization to metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Metric</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Infill</th>
<th>Centers</th>
<th>MV Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Density</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional population-weighted density</td>
<td>6,152</td>
<td>7,620</td>
<td>9,816</td>
<td>6,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people per mi.$^2$</td>
<td>people per mi.$^2$</td>
<td>people per mi.$^2$</td>
<td>people per mi.$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Centers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of total households in urban centers</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of total jobs in urban centers</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobs/Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median distance of household growth to a top 10 employment center</td>
<td>5.8 mi.</td>
<td>2.6 mi.</td>
<td>1.8 mi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Stability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of single-family areas remaining in that range of development intensity</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensity of Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of households in highest range of development intensity</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What if local governments allow for more urban & suburban redevelopment and infill?

- **6% decrease** in vehicle miles traveled
- People in vehicles experience **11% less delay** on average
- Almost **twice** as many transit trips
  *and a 50% increase in walk and bike trips*

A range of housing options across the region benefits individuals and families and can improve the economic vitality and diversity of local communities.

Commercial vehicle trips decrease with consolidation of stops.
Vehicle miles traveled decreases by **14.5 million** each day

(\sim 11\% \textit{less VMT compared to the 2050 Base})

**Twice** as many walking and biking trips

(\sim 16\% \textit{of all trips taken in the region})

A range of housing options across the region benefits individuals and families and can improve the economic vitality and diversity of local communities.

More transit trips than in the “Transit” Scenario.
What if local governments focus development around key centers and corridors?

- **8% decrease** in vehicle miles traveled
- Over **3 times** as many transit trips
- Over **twice** as many walk and bicycle trips

**Connected urban centers across the region accommodate a growing share of the region’s housing and employment and support existing neighborhoods.**

**Average Person Delay per Trip decreases by 27%. Some localized areas experience more congestion.**
Centers + Transit

Vehicle miles traveled \textbf{decrease 24\%}

\textbf{3 times} as many walk and bicycle trips

\textbf{6 times} as many transit trips

(\textit{2.4 million transit trips daily})

Connected urban centers across the region accommodate a growing share of the region’s housing and employment and support existing neighborhoods.

More total person trips since there is more free-time for short trips.

People in vehicles experience 50\% less delay on average.

Improve/expand the region’s transit network and service.
Comparisons of outcomes

Vehicle Miles Traveled (% Change from 2020)

- 2050 Base/Off-Peak Congestion: 45%
- Managed Lanes & Operations: 49%
- Travel Choices: 37%
- Transit: 43%
- Infill: 36%
- Centers: 33%
- Infill + Travel Choices: 28%
- Centers + Transit: 10%
Comparisons of outcomes

Transit, Walk, & Bicycle Trips (% Change from 2020)

- 2050 Base/Off-Peak Congestion: 47%
- Managed Lanes & Operations: 45%
- Travel Choices: 101%
- Transit: 64%
- Infill: 119%
- Centers: 257%
- Infill + Travel Choices: 178%
- Centers + Transit: 368%
Comparisons of outcomes

Vehicle Hours of Delay (% Change from 2020)

- 2050 Base/Off-Peak Congestion: 98%
- Managed Lanes & Operations: 51%
- Travel Choices: 73%
- Transit: 87%
- Infill: 78%
- Centers: 51%
- Infill + Travel Choices: 53%
- Centers + Transit: -15%
Other transportation scenarios

- Electric vehicles
- Automated/Connected vehicles
DETERMINING INVESTMENT
Policy framework & desired outcomes - “vision & needs”

**USDOT**
- FAST Act
- Planning Factors
- National Goals
- Performance Measures

**Vision & Needs**

**DRCOG**
- Metro Vision Plan
- 2040 MVRTP
- 2020-23 TIP
- Active Transportation Plan
- Multimodal Regional Freight Plan
- Taking Action on Regional Vision Zero
- Mobility Choice Blueprint
- Coordinated Transit Plan
- Congestion Management Process
- Regional ITS Architecture
- Scenarios Analysis

**Local**
- Transportation plans
- Comprehensive plans
- Subarea/District plans

**State**
- HB-1261

**CDOT**
- Statewide Transportation Plan
- 4-P Process
- 10-Year Strategic Projects
- Strategic Transportation Safety Plan
- Express Lanes Master Plan
- Asset Management Plans/Priorities

**RTD**
- FasTracks
- Regional BRT Feasibility Study
- Asset Management Plans/Priorities
- Reimagine RTD
CDOT’s 10-Year Plan & 2045 Statewide Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Potential Criteria</th>
<th>TC Guiding Principle</th>
<th>Potential Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Extent to which project addresses safety deficiencies at locations with known safety issues (as indicated by Level of Safety Service (LOSS) 3 or 4), or other known or projected safety issues.</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Extent to which project addresses safety deficiencies at locations with known safety issues (as indicated by Level of Safety Service (LOSS) 3 or 4), or other known or projected safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Extent to which project addresses a mobility need, including congestion reduction, improved reliability, new or improved connections, eliminations of “gaps” or continuity issues, new or improved multimodal facilities, improves efficiency through technology, or improved access to multimodal facilities.</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Extent to which project addresses a mobility need, including congestion reduction, improved reliability, new or improved connections, eliminations of “gaps” or continuity issues, new or improved multimodal facilities, improves efficiency through technology, or improved access to multimodal facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>Extent to which a project supports the economic vitality of the state or region, including supporting freight, agricultural, or energy needs, or providing or improving access to recreation, tourism, military, job, or other significant activity centers.</td>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>Extent to which a project supports the economic vitality of the state or region, including supporting freight, agricultural, or energy needs, or providing or improving access to recreation, tourism, military, job, or other significant activity centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management</td>
<td>Extent to which project addresses asset life, including improving Low Drivability Life pavement or poor rated structures.</td>
<td>Asset Management</td>
<td>Extent to which project addresses asset life, including improving Low Drivability Life pavement or poor rated structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Nature</td>
<td>Strategic nature of project, regional or statewide significance, leverages innovative financing and partnerships, and balances short term needs vs. long term trends.</td>
<td>Strategic Nature</td>
<td>Strategic nature of project, regional or statewide significance, leverages innovative financing and partnerships, and balances short term needs vs. long term trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Priority</td>
<td>Priority within the Region, based on planning partner input including priorities expressed in Regional Transportation Plans.</td>
<td>Regional Priority</td>
<td>Priority within the Region, based on planning partner input including priorities expressed in Regional Transportation Plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TC Guiding Principle:
- Mobility Programs and projects leveraging new technology development
- Integrated System Impacts and Benefits
- Asset Management / Preservation Benefits
- Impact of Asset Management decision on asset life and function
- Financial Leverage, Financial Innovation, and Partnerships
- Short term projects vs. Accommodating Long-Term Projects trends
- How does the system look in 30 years and how does this project fit in?
- Regional flexibility / related smaller scale projects
Planning process

Needs

- County Meeting Input
- Input
- Data Finding
- Public Input
- Stakeholder Meetings

Projects

- Corridor Needs
- Previously Identified
- Unmet Needs
- Modal Integration

Plan

- RTD & TPR Chairs Meeting
- 10 Year Strategic Project Pipeline
- 2045 Regional Transportation Plan Development
- 2045 Regional Transportation Plans

TPR Homework:
- Identify most important corridor needs

TPR Inputs:
- Validate corridor needs
- Project Priorities

TPR Input:
- Public Input

= TPR Meetings
Project sources

- Transit Plan
- Transit Development Program
- Outrider Planning
- Freight Plan
- Aviation Plan
- Development Program
- Corridor Studies
- Smart Mobility Plan
- Safety Plan
- Projects from Previous RTP*

- Assest Management Program
- CDOT Regions
- Mobility Hubs Planning
- Truck Parking Assessment

*As applicable
Priority projects exercise

- Which projects would contribute most toward improving safety in the region?
- Which projects would contribute most toward improving mobility in the region?
- Which projects would contribute most toward economic vitality in the region?
- Which capital projects would also address an asset management need?
- Which projects are most strategic?
Regional BRT Study

- Completed in 2019
- Data driven evaluation to identify 3 to 5 corridors with highest potential to compete for FTA Small Starts funding
- Study developed a proposed District-wide Regional BRT Network that could be phased in over time
- The study worked to include language that assured stakeholders of RTD’s support of local agency BRT investments across the district
Recommended regional BRT corridors

AVERAGE TRAVEL TIME SAVINGS

- Alameda: 22%
- Parker/Leetsdale/Speer: 16%
- Colorado: 22%
- Havana: 12%
- 38th/Park: 11%
- I-25: 9%
- Federal: 22%
- Broadway: 22%

0 5% 10% 15% 20% 25%
Reimagine RTD

• Two-year effort to evaluate and forecast the changing transportation needs of Denver region (currently underway)

• Key tasks:
  • Assessing resources and capacity
  • Development of Systems Optimization Plan
  • Development of Mobility Plan for the Future
Investment types in the MVRTP

Investment Priorities

- Specific Projects
- Project Categories
- Allocations
- Narrative Content
Investment priorities framework – overall process

Subregional Priorities → Evaluation Process → Interagency Priorities → Interagency Coordination Process

Policy Framework & Desired Outcomes “Vision & Needs”

DRAFT Program and Project Investment Priorities

Committee and Board Review Period

FINAL Program and Project Investment Priorities

Revenue Assumptions

Draft Financial Plan

“Vision & Needs”
Project types in the MVRTP

- Air quality regionally significant roadway capacity projects
- Air quality regionally significant rapid transit capacity projects
- Arterial safety and vision zero improvements
- Active transportation improvements (bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, trails)
- Freight improvements (bridge reconstructions, overpasses/underpasses, new bridges)
- Corridor planning – roadway and transit (generalized corridors/concepts)

Must be in an RTP to be eligible for TIP funding!
Candidate project submittals

107
County Transportation Forums

25
CDOT Region 1 & CDOT Region 4

5
Regional Transportation District

137 Total Candidate Projects
### Metro Vision Plan Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>An Efficient and Predictable Development Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase housing and employment in urban centers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOBILITY</th>
<th>A Connected Multimodal Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve and expand the region’s multimodal transportation system, services and connections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operate, manage and maintain a safe and reliable transportation system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>A Safe and Resilient Natural and Built Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Connect people to natural resource and recreational areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce the risks of hazards and their impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIVABILITY</th>
<th>Healthy, Inclusive, and Livable Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase access to amenities that support healthy, active choices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve transportation connections to health care facilities and service providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VITALITY</th>
<th>A Vibrant Regional Economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve access to opportunity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve the region’s competitive position.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional considerations for evaluation

- Public and stakeholder engagement to date
- Input from the Regional Evaluation Panel
- 2050 scenario analysis results
- DRCOG’s Metro Vision Plan
- FAST Act requirements
- DRCOG’s federally required air quality regionally significant capacity project requirements
- DRCOG 2050 travel demand estimates
Available funding

Revenues available for use (billions)

- DRCOG administered funds: $3.8 billion
- CDOT administered funds: $18.2 billion
- RTD administered funds: $34.4 billion
- Other regional system funds: $10.8 billion
- Non-regional system funds: $65.5 billion

Regional agencies’ investment profile (billions)

- DRCOG:
  - Capital projects: $3.8 billion
  - Programmatic: $3.0 billion
- CDOT:
  - Capital projects: $18.2 billion
  - Programmatic: $11.6 billion
- RTD:
  - Capital projects: $34.4 billion
  - Programmatic: $33.7 billion

DRCOG

CDOT

RTD

Capital projects
Programmatic
Projects and programs

**Multimodal mobility**
Multimodal capital projects

$8.2 billion

**Air quality**
Transportation Improvement Program set-asides

$373 million

**Regional transit**
Regional bus rapid transit projects
Corridor transit planning projects and program

$1.2 billion
$725 million

**Safety**
Arterial safety and Regional Vision Zero projects and program

$465 million

**Active transportation**
Active transportation program

$180 million

**Freight**
Freight program

$220 million

**Local projects**
Locally funded projects

$4.0 billion
Project and program investment priorities

**Multimodal mobility**
Provide more ways to travel by car, bus, bicycle, and foot.

**Freight**
Maintain efficient movement of goods within & beyond the region.

**Active transportation**
Expand travel options for vulnerable and underserved transportation users.

**Safety**
Increase the safety for all users of the transportation system.

**Air quality**
Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**Regional transit**
Expand the region’s rapid transit network.
Current conditions

Percent of all fatal crashes by travel mode (2013-2017)
- Car: 56%
- Walking: 19%
- Biking: 4%
- Motorcycle: 21%

Number of fatalities by travel mode (2000-2019)

Regional High-Injury Network
- 1.5% of all roads are part of a critical corridor
- 9% of all roads are part of the Regional High-Injury Network
- 100% of all roads in the Denver Region
Safety funding & outcomes

- Federal Boulevard Multimodal Improvements: $50 million
- US-285 Congestion Mitigation Improvements: $88.2 million
- US-36: $20 million
- US-36/28th St. & SH-93/Broadway: $15.2 million
- SH-42: $50 million
- West Mississippi Avenue: $18.6 million
- Brighton Boulevard: $19.8 million
- Chambers Rd: $16.7 million
- Sheridan Safety Improvements: $17.1 million
- Colfax Safety Improvements: $12 million
- US-85 Operational & Safety Improvements: $6.1 million

$465M in 2050 RTP projects dedicated to safety improvements

0 goal for Vision Zero traffic fatalities

$313M for 11 safety projects

$152M for safety program
Active transportation current conditions and funding & outcomes

- Smith Rd Bike/Ped Facilities: $4 million
- RTD Rail Trail: $6 million
- St. Vrain Greenway: $4 million
- McCaslin Regional Trail: $3 million
- Clear Creek Greenway: $50 million
- S. Platte River Trail: $50 million
- Bear Creek Trail: $31.2 million

$180M in 2050 RTP projects specifically dedicated to active transportation

7 Active transportation projects, plus:

$31M set aside for other bicycle and pedestrian improvements

154 miles of new regional trails
Air quality current conditions and funding & outcomes

- Air quality conformity is for regional system, not individual projects
- 2050 MVRTP passed all emission budget tests

34% reduced per capita greenhouse gas emissions with the 2050 RTP by 2050 compared to 2020 levels

$3B in transit, active transportation and freight projects to reduce emissions
Current conditions

How is the region’s system used?

On an average weekday in 2019

- 120 million person miles traveled
- 15 million person trips
- 2 million bike/pedestrian trips
- 13 million motor vehicle trips
- 86 million vehicle miles traveled
- 10 million vehicle trips
- 350,000 hours of extra congestion delays

Average daily vehicle miles traveled per person (2010-2019)

- 2019: 0% VMT growth
- 2019: 84.3 million daily VMT
- 2019: 25.37 VMT per person
Multimodal mobility funding & outcomes

- Smoky Hill Road: $10 million
- US-85 Corridor: $150 million
- SH-66: $50 million
- Pena Boulevard: $263 million
- County Line Road: $9.5 million
- I-25/Crystal Valley & Happy Canyon Interchanges: $110 million
- Lincoln Avenue: $24 million
- Wadsworth Boulevard: $91 million
- SH-93: $200 million
- Indiana St: $39 million
- Kipling Street: $250 million
- SH-52: $20 million

12,700 fewer driver trips forecast with the 2050 RTP compared to the future trend without the 2050 RTP (weekday)

$7.5B invested in the 68 multimodal projects and programs
Freight current conditions and funding & outcomes

**How does Denver International Airport serve the region?**
- 672 million pounds of cargo in 2019
- 69 million passengers in 2019
- 22 million passengers’ origin or final destination was within the Denver region.

**How does freight move through the region?**
- 574 freight railroad-roadway crossings
- Trucks carry over 90% of total goods by tonnage.

- Peoria Street Bridge: $19 million
- Alameda Pkwy. Bridge over I-225: $20 million
- 47th Avenue/48th Avenue: $45.2 million
- Ward Rd./BNSF: $60 million

20% fewer vehicle hours of delay forecast with the 2050 RTP compared to future trend without the 2050 RTP

$220M in 2050 RTP projects specifically dedicated to freight

4 freight projects and programs in the 2050 RTP plan, plus:

$76M set aside for other freight improvements
How does the transit system serve the region’s residents?

- **142 routes**
  - **130** bus
  - **8** light rail
  - **4** commuter rail

- **1,293 vehicles**
  - **1,026** bus
  - **201** light rail
  - **66** commuter rail

- **55.4 million annual service miles**
  - **35.9 million** bus
  - **14.1 million** light rail
  - **5.5 million** commuter rail

- **94.8 million annual boardings**
  - **60.5 million** bus
  - **24.5 million** light rail
  - **9.7 million** commuter rail

---

**General public transportation**
Regular, continuing shared ride surface transportation services that are open to the general public.

**Fixed route**
A system of providing designated public transportation in which a vehicle is operated along a defined route according to a fixed schedule.

**Paratransit**
Complementary transportation service required by the Americans with Disabilities Act for individuals with disabilities who are unable to use fixed route transportation systems.

**Human service transportation**
Shared ride surface transportation services (oftendemand responsive services) that are open to segments of the general public defined by age, disability or income.

**Boardings**
The number of times passengers board public transportation vehicles.
Regional transit funding & outcomes

- NW Rail Peak Period Service Plan: $700 million
- Colfax Ave. BRT & Extension BRT: $350 million
- SH-119 BRT: $350 million
- Colorado Blvd. BRT: $35 million
- Alameda BRT: $61 million
- Broadway/Lincoln BRT: $61 million
- 38th/Park BRT: $40 million
- Speer/Leetsdale/Parker BRT: $95 million
- Federal Blvd. BRT: $94 million
- North I-25 BRT: $97 million
- New Bus Maintenance Facility: $50 million
- Regional Mobility Hubs: $200 million
- South Boulder Rd.: $75 million
- SH-7: $100 million
- US-287: $200 million
- West Colfax: $26.6 million
- RidgeGate Parkway Transit Corridor: $100 million
- Castle Pines Transit Corridor: $20 million
- Golden/Mines Autonomous Circulator: $3.5 million

374,000
transit trips are forecast in 2050,
an increase from 229,000 in 2020

60%
of people in 2050 are forecast
to have good access to jobs via
public transit

78%
of people in low-income and
minority areas in 2050 are
forecast to have good access to
jobs via public transit

$2.7B
invested in 20 transit projects

146 miles
of new bus rapid transit projects

10%
higher transit ridership compared to
future trend without the 2050 RTP
DISCUSSION
Links

**Denver Regional Council of Governments** ([https://drcog.org/](https://drcog.org/))

- Metro Vision Plan ([https://metrovision.drcog.org/](https://metrovision.drcog.org/))
- Regional Transportation Plan ([https://drcog.org/2050-metro-vision-regional-transportation-plan](https://drcog.org/2050-metro-vision-regional-transportation-plan))

**Colorado Department of Transportation** ([https://www.codot.gov/](https://www.codot.gov/))


**Regional Transportation District** ([https://www.rtd-denver.com/](https://www.rtd-denver.com/))

Thank you!

QUESTIONS?

Christopher Primus, PTP | Christopher.Primus@hdrinc.com
Chris Quinn | Chris.Quinn@RTD-Denver.com
Jan Rowe | Jan.Rowe@state.co.us
Alvan-Bidal Sanchez, AICP | Asanchez@drcog.org