Opening Remarks Governor Jared Polis

- Mechanisms to address transportation regionally
  - Statewide perspective - many parts of the state aren’t part of these regions and can’t be a part of the tax base
  - Need a statewide solution so that areas don’t get left behind
  - How to move rural and urban populations forward at the same time
  - 109, 110, and CC failed because voters are afraid the money is going to other communities
    - Being able to tie the money to specific projects will help gain voter approval
  - Project-based asks are more likely to pass
- Affordable housing – long range focus and plans
  - Need to be creative in this area
  - Identified inventory of all State land for affordable housing
    - Potentially a bill to get longer term leases on affordable units
  - Implementing financing and tax credit programs
    - Need to focus development around corridors and affordable housing closer to where jobs are

Distilling the Secret Sauce — What Makes MMC & Our Region Unique

- Former Lakewood Mayor Bob Murphy
  - MMC has been a national model because it sets aside localism aside for regionalism
• “Collaboration is the new competition.” – Hickenlooper
• Our region is more competitive in the national market because we work together

Not-So-Trivial Pursuit: 27 Years of MMC
• MC Jackie Millet, Lone Tree

Colorado’s Fiscal Challenges, Mobility Infrastructure & Legislative Priorities
• House Speaker Representative KC Becker
• Transportation funding attempts at statewide level have failed (all 3)
• Having separate competing issues on the ballot causes issues
• Not supportive of raising fees unless it is bipartisan effort
  • Republicans have indicated support of charging EV users
• Empowering Transportation Planning Organizations
  • Concern that some areas will get left behind
  • Need to ensure that funds are not simply shifted around (hold harmless)
  • Having it on the table will help stimulate discussions with rural communities about statewide funding
  • Need consensus and unity amongst businesses
  • “Easy to get folks to ‘no’”
• Unwilling to fund transportation by cutting education or health care
• Amendment 23 mandates K-12 spending
• Medicaid is federally mandated and turning away Medicaid turns away federal dollars
• Would like to see a referred measure on ballot
• Rs want another $300M on top of the $550M going in from COPs and hospital provider fee
• Fiscal Reform
• Outside measures from Fiscal Policy Institute
  • Not sure that those will move forward
• Doesn’t think that there will be efforts inside Capitol for fiscal reform after failure of CC
• RTD
• Senator Tate’s legislation on Increasing audits and board seats at RTD
  o Not structurally significant
• Front Range Rail
• Not supportive of it until funding, technology, subsidy, ROW, etc. are identified
• I70 and RTD are higher priorities
• CDOT needs to look at a variety of solutions and not just pursue this one
• Per person subsidy on NW rail is over $50/per ride
  o Didn’t know this when voted on
  o This is the type of info you need prior to approving a district or major project
• Title 32 reform – Special Districts under heightened scrutiny
• CML advocating for added municipal oversight of metro districts
• Possible cap on interest rates that developers set by developers
• Conversations – no drafts yet of reforms
  o Transparency and something on MLS as disclosure
  o Several cities looking at special district reform — model ordinance being evaluated by Lone Tree that caps interest rate on debt
  o Uniform elections and election reform might be a worthwhile
• Remove ability of the developer to refinance debt without homeowner approval – resetting debt clock
• Why does it cost so much to run a district?
• Need a better model that works under TABOR
• Homelessness
• TABOR cap means some funding approved in 2019 will not be accessible
• Mental health and substance abuse funding are key to tackling crisis
• State need a comprehensive approach that spans departments
• Housing
• Construction defects issues and condos
• Garnett was key to passage of reforms in 2017
Will not want to see hard won compromise undone

- Bill advanced by CML to allow cities to use inclusionary zoning

Growth on the Ballot

- Elena Wilken, Housing Colorado
  - Housing Colorado has fought anti-growth measures since 2002
  - Working with the coalition against 122

- Sophia Mayott-Guerrero, Conservation Colorado
  - Conservation Colorado focuses on climate specifically
  - Growth at heart of work that she does
  - Statewide 60,000 member organization with offices across state
  - Growth caps increasingly disguised as pro-environment policy

- Simon Lomax, EIS Solutions
  - Advisor and researcher for free enterprise groups, coalitions, and trade associations
    - Advisor against Initiative 200 in Lakewood

- 122 – Anti-growth ballot initiative
  - Status
    - Filed last year and affirmed by Supreme court Mid-December
    - Token senior and affordable housing
    - Definition of affordable senior housing – not industry standard and hard to measure
    - Capped in 11 Front Range counties at 1% per year with 1.15% for senior & affordable
    - Proponents cleared to file petition language and collect signatures
    - Cannot challenge constitutionality unless it passes

- What have we learned from prior growth initiatives?
  - Messaging is challenging – cap growth is easy to message
    - Key messaging on aging, health, affordability isn’t sexy
    - Messaging is incredibly challenging
  - Big picture – beatable but must take seriously
Symptom of the resurgence of populism in national dialogue
- Exploiting reasonable grievance by offering simple and heavy handed solutions that won’t work and probably will make problems worse
- Superficial “face value” appeal
- Need to convey that you hear legitimate and reasonable gripes and that you are working on solutions
- Populist campaigns focus negative emotion on outsiders “those people” – there is a moral dimension (Freedom! Happiness!)

- How can we message more effectively that growth limits are not the solution?
  - Show that you are listening and acting
  - Build biggest tent you can
  - Communicate the diversity and connectedness of the work already being done
    - E.g. the work that was already being done with citizens in Lakewood on how to manage growth for 2 years prior
- Growth cap messaging is typically xenophobic, classist and/or racist – but messaged broadly enough that it is hard to fight
  - Need to recognize the ways your constituents are different and what they bring to the community (how they add to the community – put a face to those “new” people)
    - Regular people that you know
- Need to build big tent and scope of initiative makes this critical
  - What will resonate in your community – what issues plague your residents? Who are your allies that are working on these issues? Work together together on outreach and share messaging
  - Talk about choice — why is this one size fits all – we are all individual cities and counties
  - Climate issue – Boulder’s growth limit has helped create a jobs/housing imbalance that has resulted 60k-70k driving into Boulder each day through many communities
- Emissions, maintenance, other impacts
  - Business community – Colorado Chamber of Commerce
    - Need to engage local Chambers and co-message
- Did the ballot issue fall along ideological lines for Lakewood?
  - Supporters had own big tent
  - Cuts across partisan and ideological lines
- Are there things you wish you could have communicated on moral dimension?
  - Wish we could have heard more from teachers about the struggle to afford to live in the community they work in
  - Need to be careful of the gentrification backlash of people saying no more
  - Trickle down impacts of antigrowth measures, for example on neighborhood schools not well understood
  - Until transportation issues are resolved – things like this will pass
    - #1 impact of growth in citizen minds is traffic
    - Need to talk about TOD and provide transit
  - Persuasive NO arguments are impacts on tax bills (seniors) and rent (younger people)
  - Arm yourself of facts about growth from State Demographer
    - Perception that they cannot afford housing because of other people
  - Need simple messaging in short term with storytelling and putting faces to issues
  - Nuanced messaging requires trustworthy messengers
    - Get backing and support of trusted organizations
- Don’t have to wait for a ballot issue to be filed to start making the messages known
  - “parks and open space disappearing” what is actually happening?
  - “roads are not being maintained” what is actually happening?
  - We need to catalog information, repaired XX lanes of road, added XX parks
- Get the facts out
- How do we create a uniform story that we can share?
- CRED and Church of Christ - LDS campaigns as examples that effectively humanized issue
  - Need to be thinking about the macro conversation but also about the local fact gathering and how you could work with your local chamber to show what you have been doing to grow in a way that cities
    - Need to look at where we have succeeded and fell short
    - Facts don’t move people emotion does
    - Development community as funder of campaigns but seen as bad guy – link to community benefits
    - Need a communications campaign and policy discussion

**Lunch with Special Performance by Opera Colorado Artists in Residence**

**Report of the Nominating Committee** (attached)

**Standing Committee Report Out** (attached)
- Housing Homelessness & Hunger Committee
  - Mayor Bud Starker, Wheat Ridge
- Transportation & Mobility
  - Mayor Jackie Millet, Lone Tree

**Small Group Discussion of Priority Issues for 2020** (Results Attached)
- Brainstorm Potential Priority Issue
  - Choose Top Priority
  - Role of MMC in effort?
    - Potential Meeting Topics?
    - Ad Hoc Committee?
  - Key activities or steps related to priorities?
  - Key Partners?
- Report Back Priority Selected, Key Activities & Key Partners

**Adjourn**
Households experiencing homelessness or who were at-risk of experiencing homelessness in Metro Denver received Flex Fund assistance. 139

Persons experiencing homelessness or who were at-risk of experiencing homelessness in Metro Denver received Flex Fund assistance. 331

95

Received Move-In assistance

44

Received Landlord Mitigation assistance

139

331

139

331

30+

organizations

across the seven-county metro region have connected households in need to Flex Fund assistance

Average cost per household = $1,143

Spent about $126,000 (Jan - Dec 2019)
MDHI Flex Fund

Leading and advancing collaboration to end homelessness in our region
Dedicated to everyone in the metro region having a safe, stable place to call home

Any organization who is a member of the Metro Denver Continuum of Care (CoC) or partners with OneHome can submit requests on behalf of households experiencing a housing crisis in Metro Denver.

**Types of Assistance**

**Move-in Costs:** Assistance to help literally homeless households with financial barriers obtain permanent housing.

- Security Deposits
- First Month’s Rent
- Application Fees
- Utility Deposits
- Relocation Costs

**Landlord Mitigation:** Assistance to support landlord/property owners who rent to our community's most vulnerable members and help tenants who were formerly homeless remain in good standing.

- Damage Repairs
- Rental Arrears owed to a previous landlord
- Vacancy Payments to a landlord

Thanks to the strong and consistent support of Metro Mayors Caucus, The Denver Foundation, and other private donors, MDHI is able to offer one-time, flexible financial assistance to households experiencing a housing crisis in Metro Denver.

**2019 Contributions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arvada</th>
<th>Golden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>Lakewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>Littleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Mar</td>
<td>Lone Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Longmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Pines</td>
<td>Northglenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Rock</td>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial</td>
<td>Sheridan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Hills Village</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbine Valley</td>
<td>Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce City</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacono</td>
<td>Wheat Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Colorado Housing and Finance Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater</td>
<td>The Denver Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>Personal and Private donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you!

For more information about MDHI's Flex Fund follow link below:

**www.mdhi.org/flex_fund**
Mile High Compact Overview

What is it?
The Mile High Compact (MHC) is an intergovernmental agreement drafted by the Metro Mayors Caucus and the Denver Regional Council of Governments in the spring and summer of 2000. The MHC was first executed on August 10, 2000, by 5 Counties and 25 municipalities. Since then, the number of signatory local governments has grown to 46, representing nearly 90% of the population in the Denver region and 55% of Colorado’s total population. The first city and county led agreement of its kind in the nation, the signatories to the MHC agree to:

- Work together to guide growth in the Denver region
- Establish urban growth boundaries that adhere to Metro Vision 2020, the region’s long-term growth plan
- Prepare comprehensive plans that address a common set of principles
- Link their plans to growth management tools to ensure the vision in the comprehensive plan is implemented (e.g., zoning regulations, urban growth boundaries/areas and development codes)
- Explicitly link comprehensive or master plans to Metro Vision, ensuring a regional approach to growth management

The MHC is voluntary and enforceable by the signatories only. With Colorado’s strong home rule tradition, the voluntary nature of the agreement was essential to its adoption. The elected officials who drafted and adopted the MHC believed that meaningful action was warranted to manage growth in the state, but that the solutions were best crafted by those who would carry them out and not imposed as a one-size-fits-all solution through the initiative process or legislature.

Why did we do it?
In the late 1990s, rapid growth and sprawling development, as evidenced by growing traffic congestion and a dearth of affordable housing, combined to create the sense that growth in Colorado was out of control. The circumstances fueled conversations throughout the state about the best methods to manage growth and mitigate sprawl. In 1999, a half dozen bills were introduced in the Colorado General Assembly to address growth. The ideas included a variety of new mandates for local governments including urban growth boundaries and comprehensive plans with the force of law. Conversely, bills were also introduced to restrict the ability of local governments to regulate development at all. When the 1999 General Assembly session ended without any growth control measure passing, the public responded with a draconian initiative of their own, Amendment 24 that would have required voter approval of areas designated for growth and development. Fortunately, that measure was defeated soundly with 69.9% of the voters saying no.

The Caucus had worked with members of the legislature during the session to identify the issues that combined to create the appearance of a crisis and to suggest suitable responses. The issues included

- Water and Air Quality
- Traffic Congestion
- Lack of Choices in Communities
- Open Space — Loss of Farmlands
- Eco-system — Endangered Species
• Loss of the Sense of Community
• Unmet Workforce Needs
• Unmet Affordable Housing Needs

Understanding that the defeat of Amendment 24 did not signal an end to the discussion, the Metro Mayors Caucus and DRCOG, at the MMC Annual Retreat on February 12, 2000 agreed to draft an intergovernmental agreement that would bind local governments to each other to manage growth in accordance with Metro Vision, the region’s development plan. The MHC was both an effort to acknowledge public concerns and evidence a commitment to using existing tools to work together to overcome the region’s challenges. The MHC signing was broadly covered by the local media and, over time, the national media as well.

Who Signed the Compact
MILE HIGH COMPACT:

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this _____ day of ___________ 200 __, pursuant to Article XIV, Section 18(2)(a) of the Constitution of Colorado and Section 29-1-203 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, by and among the cities of ________________________, [home rule and/or statutory cities], and towns of ________________________, political subdivisions of the State of Colorado, hereinafter referred to as "Cities", and the counties of ________________________, Colorado, bodies politic organized under and existing by virtue of the laws of the State of Colorado, hereinafter referred to as "Counties."

I. WHEREAS, the Cities and Counties recognize that growth and development decisions can impact neighboring jurisdictions and the region; and

II. WHEREAS, Metro Vision 2020, collaboratively created by DRCOG members, business, environmental and neighborhood leaders; provides a regional framework for local decisions on growth and development within the Denver Regional Council of Governments' (DRCOG) region; and

III. WHEREAS, the Cities and Counties are willing to make a commitment to the accommodation and encouragement of planned growth and development, to the orderly extension of urban services, to the enhancement of the quality of life, to the protection of the environment, and to the promotion of the economic viability of their respective communities and the region; and

IV. WHEREAS, the Cities and Counties support planned growth and development to maximize efficiency through coordination among jurisdictions, provide for the orderly extension and integration of urban services, promote the economic vitality of the Cities and Counties and enhance the quality of life of its residents; and

V. WHEREAS, the Cities and Counties have Comprehensive/Master Plans that provide for the development within their respective jurisdictions; and they recognize the need to have consistent and coordinated comprehensive plans and master plans in order to provide for the orderly growth and development of the region; and

VI. WHEREAS, the Cities and Counties desire to voluntarily and collaboratively set forth the principles defined herein that illustrate their commitment to address the nature and location of growth within their individual and overlapping jurisdictions and the region as a whole.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises and covenants contained herein, the undersigned Cities and Counties (hereinafter referred to as we) agree as follows

1. Metro Vision 2020. We acknowledge that Metro Vision 2020 is the comprehensive guide for the development of the region. Moreover, we agree that Metro Vision 2020 is a dynamic document that reflects changes in the region.
2. **Comprehensive/Master Plan.** We acknowledge that comprehensive/Master plans are critical tools in translating the community's vision into more specific goals, policies and programs to manage their long-range growth consistent with the communities' and the region's vision. We agree to develop and approve Comprehensive/Master Plans for each of our respective communities and to update these plans on a regular basis, as determined by each jurisdiction.

3. **Comprehensive/Master Plan Principles.** We recognize that there are certain fundamental principles that guide the development of a comprehensive/Master plan. We agree to rely on the following principles in developing or amending our Comprehensive/Master Plans:

- **Metro Vision 2020.** Local comprehensive/master plans will be consistent with the regional vision provided by Metro Vision 2020 and will incorporate its core elements:
  - Designating the extent of urban development within a specified area;
  - Creating a balanced multi-modal transportation system;
  - Establishing a hierarchy of mixed-use, pedestrian and transit- oriented- urban centers;
  - Preserving four free-standing communities of Boulder, Brighton, Castle Rock and Longmont;
  - Development of a regional open space system,
  - Preserving the region's natural environment, especially air and water quality.

- **Public participation.** The comprehensive plan/master plan will be developed through a public participation process with the specifics determined by each jurisdiction, but which will include a public hearing prior to the adoption of the comprehensive plan/master plan.

- **Reflection of community values.** The comprehensive/master plan will be a reflection of the community's values and the region's vision.

- **Translate the vision into specific goals, policies and programs.** The comprehensive/master plan will translate the vision for the community into specific goals, policies and programs and/or provide implementation strategies.

- **Provide for the broad needs of the community.** The comprehensive/master plan will provide for the diverse life-style, and life-cycle needs of the community (residential and business).

- **Long-range view.** Local comprehensive/master plans will address the development and redevelopment of the community for a fifteen to twenty-year period.

- **Dynamic.** The comprehensive/master plan will be a dynamic document and be able to reflect changes in the community.

- **Long range plan for major infrastructure.** The comprehensive/master plan will address the major infrastructure that will be needed to support the development of the community. The incremental, implementing elements of the long-range- plan will be identified in the capital improvements/project plan.
• **Coordinated.** The comprehensive/master plan will coordinate the various elements, such as transportation, land use, community facilities, that must come together in order to provide for the desired quality of life.

• **Intergovernmental collaboration.** Issues that overlap or affect neighboring jurisdictions or districts will be addressed in a collaborative process.

4. **Elements of a Comprehensive/Master Plan.** We agree to include and/or address the following elements within our comprehensive/master plans.

• **Land use and growth coordination.** This element includes identification of the desired land use patterns, where growth is anticipated or desired to occur over the time period of the plan, and the anticipated amount of development at the end of twenty years or buildout. An urban growth boundary/area will be based on these decisions.

• **Provision of services and community facilities.** This element provides a description of the essential services and community facilities (for example, schools, fire, police recreation, libraries, etc.) to be provided or available to the community, the level of such services, and what services and/or community facilities are necessary in the future to address future growth for the plan period.

• **Utilities.** This element provides a description of how utilities with sufficient capacity will be provided to serve planned development and redevelopment. Such utilities should include, but not be limited to water, wastewater and drainage.

• **Transportation and transit.** This element addresses how the community plans to accommodate the transportation demand for the timeframe of the comprehensive/master plan, including alternative modes of transportation such as trails and bikeways, and transportation demand reduction strategies. This element also reflects Metro Vision 2020 regional multimodal transportation plans.

• **Parks and recreation.** This element addresses how the community provides future parks and recreation facilities and opportunities to serve the community. Plans for trail corridors, bike paths, etc. will be coordinated with overlapping and neighboring jurisdictions.

• **Open space.** This element addresses the community's future open space preservation which will be coordinated with, but not limited by, the plans of overlapping and neighboring jurisdictions and the Metro Vision 2020 Open Space Plan.

• **Economic viability.** This element includes a review and projection of the economic viability of the community based on existing and projected commercial/industrial activities and employment included in the comprehensive/master plan and their impacts on the other elements of the plan.

• **Housing.** This element addresses how projected population changes, and development and redevelopment are anticipated to affect the mix, affordability, availability and redevelopment needs of the community's housing stock. The relationship between housing and jobs may be addressed in the context of the subregion or to the individual community.
• **Urban design/Community image/identity.** This element addresses how the community will shape its boundaries and urban landscape to further its identity and image.

• **Environmental resources and hazards.** This element identifies key environmental resources, such as wildlife corridors and habitat areas, which are important for the community to preserve and to identify hazard areas that should not be considered for development. This could also be included as part of the land uses element since it provides the basis for future land use. This element addresses the effects that the location and type of growth and land development have on air and water quality.

5. **Urban Growth Areas or Urban Growth Boundaries.** We agree to adopt Urban Growth Areas or Urban Growth Boundaries, as established by Metro Vision 2020, within our comprehensive/master plans, or in the case of counties by resolution of the Board of Commissioners, and to allow urban development only within those areas. We will encourage and support the efficient development within our Urban Growth Areas or Urban Growth Boundaries consistent with the goals of Metro Vision 2020. Modifications to Urban Growth Areas or Urban Growth Boundaries will be addressed through Metro Vision 2020's flexibility process. We agree to address nonurban growth outside of the Urban Growth Area or Urban Growth Boundary through subregional planning, intergovernmental agreements, comprehensive/master plans or revised Metro Vision policies.

6. **Comprehensive/Master Plan Approval.** We will develop our comprehensive plan/master plan through an inclusive public participation process including, but not limited to, a public hearing.

7. **Comprehensive/Master Plan Implementation.** We will use our comprehensive/master plan for updating local zoning and development regulations. Moreover, we will develop and adopt policies, procedures, and/or ordinances to implement and enforce our comprehensive/master plans that are consistent with the provisions of our comprehensive/master plan.

8. **Coordination with Other Plans.** We will work to coordinate our plans with neighboring and overlapping governmental entities and work to integrate our plans at a sub-regional level.

9. **Intergovernmental Agreements.** We will enter into additional intergovernmental agreements, when necessary, to address discrepancies and/or inconsistencies at the jurisdictional boundaries or any other planning and coordination matters.

10. **Dispute Resolution.** Individual communities will pursue dispute resolution processes.

11. **Term.** We will annually jointly evaluate the effectiveness of the processes set forth herein and to propose any necessary amendments. If any parties consider withdrawing from the agreement, they must notify DRCOG by April 1st with the action to be effective by the following January 1st.

12. **Intent of Agreement.** This Agreement is intended to describe rights and responsibilities only as between the named parties hereto. It is not intended to and shall not be deemed to confer rights to any persons or entities not named as parties hereto. We, by signing this Agreement, intend to implement its provisions in good faith.
COMMITTEE NAME: MMC Transportation and Mobility Committee (TMC)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
- Chair – Mayor Marc Williams
- Mayor Adam Paul, Lakewood
- Mayor Jackie Millet, Lone Tree
- Mayor Clint Folsom, Superior
- Mayor Herb Atchison, Westminster
- Roberto Venegas, Aurora
- Debra Baskett, Westminster

MEETING FREQUENCY & SCHEDULE: At the call of the chair or as scheduled by the committee

KEY STRATEGIES & DELIVERABLES:
- Identify and implement sustainable funding for multi-modal transportation throughout Colorado and within the Denver metro region
- Engage and work with DRCOG and other MPOs, TPRs, COGs, and other transportation stakeholders on ETPO legislation adoption and steps for implementation
- Engage with RTD regarding decision-making on service cuts and new general manager
- Support legislation to expand state, regional and local transportation and mobility funding on a case by case basis
- Spotlight the importance of and candidates for the 2020 RTD Board elections
- Partner with multi-sectoral MobilityNEXT collaborative to identify pilot projects that advance solutions in four areas: Arterial Efficiency, RTD Service Options, Workforce Mobility and First/Last Mile Logistics
- Regularly update MMC on transportation and mobility issues

2020 COMMITTEE OBJECTIVES:
Passage by the General Assembly of legislation to authorize transportation planning organizations to function as regional transportation authorities as outlined in statute. Enable these organizations, with voter approval, to levy taxes to fund transportation and mobility initiatives within their boundaries.

Maintaining adequate and reliable transit service throughout the region through close cooperation with RTD and DRCOG.
COMMITTEE NAME: MMC Homeless/Housing/Hunger Committee (H3C)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
- Mayor Bud Starker, Wheat Ridge
- Mayor Linda Olsen, Englewood
- Mayor Tara Beiter-Fluhr, Sheridan
- Mayor Tera Radloff, Castle Pines

MEETING FREQUENCY & SCHEDULE: Third Friday of the month

KEY STRATEGIES & DELIVERABLES:
- Build on Success of Hunger & Homelessness Awareness Week with greater participation in proclamations, clothing and food drives and other events to raise public awareness and build public will for meaningful solutions
- Repeat events for mayor engagement like Mayors Build for Habitat
- Ensure high level participation in January 29 ADU workshop
- Monitor Emergency Housing Assistance Flex Fund disbursements & ensure sustainable funding
- Highlight effective programming & policies within the region to address affordable and workforce housing, homelessness, and hunger
- Monitor implementation and help to convene or promote interdependent data sharing on homelessness underway, including
  - Multi-county Integrated Data Management System (IDMS/Data Warehouse) Pilot
  - Federally Mandated Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)
  - Use of metrics to assess efficacy of interventions and maximize existing resources
- Develop and utilize relationships with housing authorities active within metro area
- Regularly update MMC on housing, homelessness, & hunger issues

2020 COMMITTEE OBJECTIVES:
Some of the initiatives kicked off in prior years are still underway, including the transition of Colorado’s HUD designated COC transition to a new Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), and the MDHI housing flex fund. MMC’s role in many initiatives may be limited to using the bully pulpit to keep the problem, the need for meaningful solutions and the funding and political will to implement them atop the crowded regional and statewide agendas. The H3C will continue to work in 2020 to build greater awareness — among mayors, councils, peer organizations and the public — of the regional homelessness crisis and identify areas where regional collaboration and mayors speaking with one voice can help to address the contributing factors including the lack of affordable housing. We will conduct a regional workshop for public officials on the design, permitting, and finance of accessory dwelling units. We will also explore options to expand summer food sites in the metro area to reduce the numbers of children that go hungry when schools are closed in summer months.