<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Attendee(s)</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Adam Burg</td>
<td>Legislative Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Kristin Sullivan / Andrea Berg / Brandan Slattery</td>
<td>Liquor Licensing Proposed Resolutions – Optional Premise and Liquor Tastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Kristin Sullivan / Brian Staley / Melanie Sloan</td>
<td>DRCOG TIP Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 P.M.</td>
<td>Raymond Gonzales</td>
<td>Administrative Item Review / Commissioners Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

DATE: March 5, 2019

SUBJECT: Resolution approving optional premise license in unincorporated Adams County and establishing specific standards for issuance of said optional premise license

Resolution authorizing tastings at retail liquor stores and at liquor-licensed drugstores in unincorporated Adams County

FROM: Kristin Sullivan, Director of Community & Economic Development Department
Andrea Berg, Customer & Process Development Manager
Brandan Slattery, Licensing Administrator

AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: Community and Economic Development Department

ATTENDEES: Kristin Sullivan, Andrea Berg, Brandan Slattery

PURPOSE OF ITEM: Provide information and purpose of establishing optional premise licensing and a permit for liquor tastings in Adams County

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve Resolution approving optional premise license type and Resolution authorizing liquor tastings in Adams County

BACKGROUND:

An Optional Premise Liquor License is defined as one primary licensed area plus additional area(s) on the property authorized to allow for the consumption of liquor. These additional area(s) can be turned on/off as needed.

C.R.S. 44-3-310(1) Optional premise license – local option states no optional premises license, or optional premises permit for a hotel and restaurant license, as defined in section 44-3-103 (33)(a), shall be issued within any municipality or the unincorporated portion of any county unless the governing body of the municipality has adopted by ordinance, or the governing body of the county has adopted by resolution specific standards for the issuance of optional premises licenses or for optional premises for a hotel and restaurant license. Currently, Adams County has one OP license. The proposed resolution would better align Adams County liquor licensing regulations with State liquor licensing regulations.

The Adams County Licensing Office has received a number of requests to authorize tastings at retail liquor stores and at liquor-licensed drugstores. This would also allow our small business liquor retailers to be more successful and competitive in the liquor industry. C.R.S 44-3-301(10) allows the governing body of a county to adopt a resolution to allow for tastings.
AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:

Community & Economic Development Department
Adams County Sheriff’s Office

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:

PowerPoint
**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Please check if there is no fiscal impact ☒. If there is fiscal impact, please fully complete the section below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Center:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Budgeted Revenue:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Revenue not included in Current Budget:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Budgeted Operating Expenditure:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Operating Expenditure not included in Current Budget:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Budgeted Capital Expenditure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Capital Expenditure not included in Current Budget:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New FTEs requested:</th>
<th>☑ NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Amendment Needed:</td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Note:**

**APPROVAL SIGNATURES:**

Raymond H. Gonzales, County Manager

Alisha Reis, Deputy County Manager

Bryan Ostler, Deputy County Manager

**APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:**

Budget
Liquor Licensing
Proposed Resolutions
Community & Economic Development
Overview

• New Resolutions
  – License type for Optional Premises
  – County Permit for Liquor Tastings
Optional Premise

- What is it?
  - One primary licensed area plus additional area(s) on the property authorized to allow for the consumption of liquor. These area(s) can be turned on/off as needed.
License Type for Optional Premise

• Background/Purpose
  • 44-3-310. Optional premises license - local option.
    – (1) No optional premises license, or optional premises permit for a hotel and restaurant license, as defined in section 44-3-103 (33)(a), shall be issued within any municipality or the unincorporated portion of any county unless the governing body of the municipality has adopted by ordinance, or the governing body of the county has adopted by resolution, specific standards for the issuance of optional premises licenses or for optional premises for a hotel and restaurant license. No municipality or county shall be required to adopt such standards or make such licenses available within its jurisdiction.
Why are we doing this now?

- The proposed resolution will better align Adams County regulations with State Liquor Licensing regulations.
Permit for Liquor Tastings

• **Background/Purpose**

  • 44-3-409. Retail liquor store license.
    - (1) (c) (III) Allowing tastings to be conducted on the licensed premises if the licensee has received authorization to conduct tastings pursuant to section 44-3-301.
Why are we doing this now?

- This Tasting Resolution will allow our small business liquor retailers to be more successful and competitive in the liquor industry.
- Requests by a number of current Adams County liquor licensees.
Tastings Application

• Annual application and $100 submitted to Licensing Administrator
• Licensee shall provide Licensing Administrator and Sheriff’s Office with tasting schedule at least 72 hours prior to event
Tastings

• Conducted by trained individuals only
  – Minimum 21 years old
  – Store employees or industry representative
• Maximum of 1 ounce per tasting
• Maximum of 4 tastings per person
• Prohibit patrons from leaving licensed premises with an unconsumed sample
• Limit of 104 days per year
• Maximum of 5 hours per tasting
• Maximum of 4 tastings between Monday & Saturday
Recommendation

• Approve Resolutions:
  – Resolution approving optional premises license in unincorporated Adams County and establishing specific standards for issuance of said optional premises license
  – Resolution authorizing tastings at retail liquor stores and at liquor-licensed drugstores in unincorporated Adams County pursuant to C.R.S. § 44-3-301(10)
# STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>March 19, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT:</td>
<td>DRCOG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FROM:               | Kristin Sullivan, Director of Community and Economic Development  
|                     | Brian Staley, Deputy Director of Public Works  
|                     | Melanie Sloan, Senior Transportation & Mobility Planner |
| AGENCY/DEPARTMENT:  | Community and Economic Development |
| ATTENDEES:          | Kristin Sullivan, Brian Staley, Melanie Sloan |
| PURPOSE OF ITEM:    | Provide update on Subregional TIP Process |
| STAFF RECOMMENDATION: | Information update |

## BACKGROUND:

The 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) cycle is following a new dual model, whereby federal transportation funding that flows through the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) will be allocated both at the regional level and at the subregional level.

To administer this process at the subregional level, the ADCOG Subregional Forum was formed, consisting of representatives from each of the members of the collaborative transportation planning IGA – the City of Arvada, the City of Aurora, the Town of Bennett, the City of Brighton, the City of Commerce City, and the City of Federal Heights, the Town of Lochbuie, the City of Northglenn, the City of Thornton, the City of Westminster, and Adams County.

The regional TIP process took place in the fall of 2018. Unfortunately, none of the three applications submitted by the ADCOG forum were funded through the regional process.

The ADCOG Subregional Forum will receive a total of $34,533,000 for the subregional portion of the TIP. During the regional process, $1,600,000 was dedicated to the State Highway 7 Boulder to Brighton project. This leaves $32,933,000 for distribution through the ADCOG Subregional TIP.

The subregional call for projects was open from January 2, 2019 and to February 27, 2019. The ADCOG Subregional Forum received 16 TIP applications requesting a total $45,523,677. The applications represent a need that is $12.6 million greater than available funds. On March 21,
2019, the ADCOG Subregional Forum will select project that are recommended for funding and projects recommended for the waiting list. The recommended funding list will then be presented to the DRCOG Board on April 17, 2019. The purpose of this study session is to provide a process update and answer any questions about the subregional TIP applications.

All of the Subregional TIP applications are available on the County’s web site at the following address:

http://www.adcogov.org/county-transportation-priorities

AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:
Local Adams County cities and towns, adjacent subregions (counties), Colorado Department of Transportation, the Regional Transportation District, Denver Regional Council of Goverments, Public Works, Finance

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:
PowerPoint
Subregional Project List
2020-2023 Subregional Process Overview
**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Please check if there is no fiscal impact ☑. If there is fiscal impact, please fully complete the section below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Center:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Account</th>
<th>Subledger</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Budgeted Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Revenue not included in Current Budget:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Account</th>
<th>Subledger</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Budgeted Operating Expenditure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Operating Expenditure not included in Current Budget:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Budgeted Capital Expenditure:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Capital Expenditure not included in Current Budget:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New FTEs requested:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Amendment Needed:</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Note:**
Local match commitments are only required if applications are selected for funding. The local match commitments would not be needed until 2020 at the earliest and will be incorporated into future budget years if necessary.

**APPROVAL SIGNATURES:**

Raymond H. Gonzales, County Manager  
Alisha Reis, Deputy County Manager

Bryan Ostler, Deputy County Manager

**APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:**
[Signature]
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ADCOG Subregional Forum
Funding Recommendations

March 21, 2019
Meeting Purpose

- Action needed today by the ADCOG Subregional Forum:
  - Agree and recommend to the DRCOG Board a suite of projects within the targeted ADCOG Subregional Funds and determine a waiting list (if needed).
Meeting Overview

- Public Comment
- Review the TIP Process: Subregional Share
- Review the ADCOG Subregional Forum IGA
- Presentation of ADCOG Subregional Forum Technical Committee work
  - Applications, scoring approach, scoring outcomes & funding recommendations
- Forum Discussion
- Recommendations to DRCOG Board
- Discuss Ongoing ADCOG Coordination
TIP Process Overview: Subregional Share

- First Year of Dual Model
  - A dual project selection model has two TIP project selection elements—regional and subregional
    - Within the Subregional Share, funds are proportionately targeted for planning purposes to predefined geographic units (counties) for project prioritization and recommendations to the DRCOG Board.
    - Each county subregion can add criteria specific to their subregional application accounting for local values.

- Total Subregional Funding: $34.533 million
- Available Subregional Funding: $32.933 million

  Broomfield SH7 Project funded through the Regional TIP Process - $1.6 million in subregional funds awarded
ADCOG Subregional Forum IGA

- Members (11) & Voting Members (11)
  - Adams County, City of Arvada, City of Aurora, Town of Bennett, City of Brighton, City of Commerce City, City of Federal Heights, Town of Lochbuie, City of Northglenn, City of Thornton, City of Westminster

- Voting Procedures
  - “A quorum of the Forum must be present to take a vote. The quorum is comprised of the simple majority (Six) of the Appointees (or Alternates in the absence of an Appointee). All Forum actions shall be made by motion duly seconded and approved by simple majority. Each Agency shall have one vote.”

- Forum Actions
  - “The Forum’s actions may include, but are not limited to . . . developing a recommended portfolio of projects for Subregional funding . . .”
ADCOG Technical Committee Work

• DRCOG Process, with modifications:
  • Scoring scale of 1 through 5 to provide clearer separation in project scores
  • 5 Additional Considerations:
    1. Does the project benefit a small community, which for this process is defined as a community with a population of less than 50,000 people?
    2. Is this project a suburban connector?
    3. Does the project address a gap in existing service?
    4. Is this the logical next step of a project?
    5. Is the project construction ready?
## Scoring Outcomes

### ADCOG Subregional TIP Application Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Ask</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
<th>$32,933,000</th>
<th>Type of Project (S=Study, P=Precon, C=Construct)</th>
<th>AC1: Sm Comm.</th>
<th>AC2 Sub. Connect.</th>
<th>AC3: Gap</th>
<th>AC4: Next Step</th>
<th>AC5: Constr. Ready</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Sheridan Boulevard Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>$31,433,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td>Interstate 270 Corridor Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>$29,633,000</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commerce City</td>
<td>Vasquez Boulevard Improvements</td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>$24,883,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JeffCo</td>
<td>Peaks to Plains Trial - 3 mile East Clear Creek Canyon Segment</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>$24,383,000</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>High Line Canal Trail - East Colfax Avenue to I-70</td>
<td>$3,301,267</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>$21,081,733</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Commerce City</td>
<td>US 85 / 120th Avenue Interchange, ROW Acquisition Activities</td>
<td>$6,800,000</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>$34,781,733</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Smart Commute</td>
<td>North TMP - Undererved Workforce Needs in the North I-25 Area</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>$23,181,733</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>SH-79 and I-70 Interchange Eastbound Ramp Improvement</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>$22,331,733</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Commerce City</td>
<td>89th Ave Widening, I-76 to Hwy 2 - Complete Design</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>$10,531,733</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>City-Wide Pedestrian Accessibility Enhancement – Closing Critical Gaps of Missing Sidewalks / Ramps</td>
<td>$935,200</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>$9,586,533</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lochbuie</td>
<td>I-76/Baseline Road Interchange Signalization</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>$8,896,533</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>104th Ave (SH-44) Widening, Colo Blvd to US-85</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>$7,296,533</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Northglenn</td>
<td>120th Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>$16,760,000</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>-39,463,467</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Fulton Street Bicycle Boulevard and Pedestrian Enhancements (Phase 2)</td>
<td>$1,910,610</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>-511,374,077</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements on Havana Street and Iola Street in Northwest Aurora</td>
<td>$916,600</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>-12,290,677</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Bridge Street &amp; I-76 Interchange</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>-12,506,677</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Recommendations

- These options provide the Forum with technical and funding focused approaches to allocating available subregional funds
  - Available: $32,933,000
  - Total Asks: $45,523,677
  - Difference: -$12,590,677
- ADCOG additional considerations provides the Forum opportunity to adjust the options provided, at their discretion
- Waiting Lists are included, where appropriate
  - Ranked in priority order with first right of refusal

- Option 1
  - Based on scores
  - Northglenn modifies project scope and reduces their ask to $7.3m (from $16.8)
  - Wait List:
    - Remainder of Northglenn project
    - Aurora’s 2 projects: Fulton St & Havana/Iola St
    - Brighton’s project: Bridge St/I-76 Interchange
    - Combined Total: $13,127,210
Funding Recommendations

• These options provide the Forum with technical and funding focused approaches to allocating available subregional funds
  • Available: $32,933,000
  • Total Asks: $45,523,677
  • Difference: -$12,590,677
• ADCOG additional considerations provides the Forum opportunity to adjust the options provided, at their discretion
• Waiting Lists are included, where appropriate
  • Ranked in priority order with first right of refusal

• Option 1A
  • Based on scores
    • Northglenn modifies project scope and reduces their ask to $7.0m (from $16.8)
    • Brighton’s project is funded: $300,000
  • Wait List:
    • Remainder of Northglenn project
    • Aurora’s 2 projects: Fulton St & Havana/Iola St
    • Combined Total: $12,827,210
Funding Recommendations

- These options provide the Forum with technical and funding focused approaches to allocating available subregional funds
  - Available: $32,933,000
  - Total Asks: $45,523,677
  - Difference: -$12,590,677
- ADCOG additional considerations provides the Forum opportunity to adjust the options provided, at their discretion
- Waiting Lists are included, where appropriate
  - Ranked in priority order with first right of refusal

Option 2

- Based on scores
  - Northglenn modifies project scope to include design, environmental and right-of-way/easements only and reduces their ask to $3.8m (from $16.8)
- Allows all projects to be funded
- Wait List:
  - Northglenn: construction portion of project on wait list
  - Total (estimate): $13,500,000
Funding Recommendations

- These options provide the Forum with technical and funding focused approaches to allocating available subregional funds
  - Available: $32,933,000
  - Total Asks: $45,523,677
  - Difference: -$12,590,677
- ADCOG additional considerations provides the Forum opportunity to adjust the options provided, at their discretion
- Waiting Lists are included, where appropriate
  - Ranked in priority order with first right of refusal

- Option 3
  - Based on scores
  - Reduces allocations to projects that stated they could achieve project goals at a lesser funding amount
    - $1,819,836
  - Allows all projects to be funded
    - Northglenn modifies project scope and reduces their ask to equal remaining funds
      - $5,989,160
  - Wait List:
    - Northglenn: unfunded portion of project
- This option was considered but not advanced because it did not provide significant benefit
Discussion and Recommendation to the DRCOG Board

- Action needed today by the ADCOG Subregional Forum:
  - Agree and recommend to the DRCOG Board a suite of projects within the targeted ADCOG Subregional Funds and determine a waiting list (if needed).
    - Due: April 5
    - DRCOG Board Meeting:

- Recommendation:
  - Projects to receive Subregional Share Funding Level
  - Projects on the wait list (if needed)
Ongoing Coordination

- IGA supports ongoing coordination of ADCOG
- Suggest
  - TIP debrief discussion
  - Ongoing meetings for transportation project coordination
2020-2023 Subregional Share Process

1. **Preparation** (October - December 2018) – Subregional forums prepare for subregional allocation process.
   - Subregional application: Subregions can use the regional application as is or may change the weighting and/or add additional questions. If the application is adjusted, it must be reviewed by DRCOG staff.
     - During this time, DRCOG will release a subregional application template.

2. **Applications** (January – February 2019)
   - The Subregional Share Call for Projects opens for 8 weeks after the regional projects have been selected.
   - DRCOG assigns funding targets to each subregion by funding type and year.
   - Develop project lists: Subregional applications are submitted to the subregional forums. Goal is that total projects submitted equal at least 200% of funding target.
   - CDOT/RTD concurrence will be due soon after call opens. Applicants are responsible for requesting required concurrence.

3. **Scoring** (March 2019)
   - Staff from each forum will score projects.
   - Each forum prioritizes and prepares a funding recommendation within their funding target.

4. **Recommendation** (April 2019)
   - Each forum’s funding recommendation is due to DRCOG in early April.
   - Subregions present their recommendations to the Board of Directors.
   - DRCOG works with sponsors on project scopes and funding types to begin development of the draft TIP document.

5. **Approval** (April - May 2019)
   - TAC and RTC recommendation on the subregional projects.
   - Board action on the subregional projects.

6. **Final TIP Adoption** (June – August 2019)
   - TIP public hearing document is released.
   - TIP public hearing.
   - TAC and RTC recommendation on TIP document.
   - Board action on TIP document.
# DRAFT Subregional Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Segment/Description</th>
<th>Received (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td>I-270 Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design</td>
<td>I-25 to I-70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Highline Canal</td>
<td>Colfax Ave &amp; I-70 Underpass</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$4,851,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,301,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Havana St &amp; Iola St, NW Aurora</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,291,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Accessibility Enhancement</td>
<td>City-wide</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,336,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$935,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Havana/Fulton Bike/Ped Improvement</td>
<td>Montview Blvd &amp; 26th Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$2,691,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>SH 79 and I-70 Interchange Eastbound Ramp Improvement</td>
<td>Eastbound I-70 Off-ramp to SH 79 Intersection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Bridge Street &amp; I-76 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce City</td>
<td>88th Ave.</td>
<td>I-76 to Highway 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasquez Blvd Improvements</td>
<td>Vasquez, from 52nd Ave to E 64th Ave</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 85 &amp; 120th Ave - Phase I</td>
<td>ROW acquisition for grade separation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$12,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochbuie</td>
<td>I-76 &amp; Baseline Interchange Signalization</td>
<td>Signalizing and Re-striping</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northglenn</td>
<td>120th Ave Improvements</td>
<td>Washington St to approx.. 150’ east of RR tracks (near Old York St connection)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$20,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton</td>
<td>104th Ave Widening: Colorado Blvd</td>
<td>Colorado Blvd to US 85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DRAFT Subregional Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>Funding Requested</th>
<th>Funding Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>Sheridan Multimodal Improvements SH 95 (Sheridan Blvd), US 36 to Turnpike Dr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Commute</td>
<td>Flexible Micro Transit Service &amp; Mobility Options 120th to 144th along I-25 corridor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>Peak to Plain Trail 3-mile East Clear Creek canyon Segment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$29,999,420</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>$112,468,687</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,523,677</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>