

Community Accelerated Mobility Program Report

Electric Mobility for Unhoused Community Members

Developed by the Denver Streets Partnership

Table of Contents

- Executive Summary..... 2**
- Introduction..... 3**
- Current State..... 4**
- Best Practices..... 8**
- Community Engagement..... 10**
 - Micromobility and Other Electric Mobility..... 12**
 - Public Transit..... 17**
 - Personal Mobility (Walking, Biking, and other Modes)..... 22**
- Pilot Programming..... 26**
- Recommendations..... 27**
 - Micromobility and Other Electric Mobility..... 28**
 - Public Transit..... 29**
 - Personal Mobility (Walking, Biking, and other Modes)..... 31**
 - Other Suggestions..... 33**
- Micromobility Action Plan..... 35**
- Appendix..... 41**
 - Focus Group Protocol and Survey..... 41**

Executive Summary

In Denver, and across the United States, accessible and reliable transportation is a critical, but often overlooked, service for unhoused community members. With funding from the Colorado Energy Office, the Denver Streets Partnership set out to work in partnership with shared micromobility providers and the City to explore strategies specifically focused on ensuring unhoused residents can affordably access electric alternatives to motor vehicles, primarily electric bikes and scooters.

The primary object of this project was to engage with unhoused community members on their daily experiences and challenges as it relates to transportation in Denver. The Denver Streets Partnership and community partners held 10 focus group sessions, engaging more than 100 unhoused community members across seven different housing sites in the region. Focus group conversations shed light on numerous issues and opportunities that would enhance the everyday experience of unhoused community members. Shared micromobility was a key topic, with many participants speaking about their usage of the Lime Access program, which offers a free, 30-minute ride option. Shared micromobility is beginning to gain popularity and usage among unhoused community members due to this program and the enhanced mobility freedom micromobility provides, compared to other modes of transportation.

Focus groups discussions also covered other modes of transportation, primarily public transit, walking, and biking. When speaking about RTD bus and rails, participants spoke to challenges and frustration with current frequency and level of service. Lack of bus stop amenities like adequate lighting, seating, and shade at bus stops was also a common theme among participants. Additionally, unsafe conditions for walking and biking was a recurring theme through all focus groups sessions. Participants expressed challenges when walking and biking on corridors like Colfax, Federal,

Sheridan, Evans, Colorado, Quebec, and Park, primarily due to the nature of the high moving and dangerous driver behavior on those corridors.

To meet the needs identified in focus group sessions, the top recommendation for this grant program is to develop a sustainable funding model to continue a free micromobility program for low-income residents. Consistent and dedicated funding for a low-income micromobility program directly assists not only unhoused community members, but other low-income residents throughout Denver. Micromobility is an essential service for many and the City and County of Denver should consider subsidizing and expanding upon the current program to meet the current and future micromobility needs. The report also includes recommendations on other improvements to transportation infrastructure and services that would positively impact unhoused community members, and all Denver residents by creating enhanced mobility choice for everyone.

Introduction

In 2023, Denver Mayor Mike Johnston signed an emergency declaration to help 1,000 people experiencing homelessness get into temporary or permanent housing in the City and County of Denver. The program, originally called House1000, now [All in Mile High](#) (webpage), repurposed or built eight new housing sites (hotels and tiny homes) and as of October 2024, has successfully relocated more than 2,000 unhoused residents into publicly-funded housing sites. With a clear focus from the City on unhoused residents, the Denver Streets Partnership (DSP) saw All in Mile High as an opportunity to engage with these residents around transportation options and improvements at the new sites developed by the City and other shelters across the Denver region.

With funding from the Colorado Energy Office, the DSP was able to work in partnership with shared micromobility providers and the City to explore strategies specifically focused on ensuring unhoused residents can affordably access electric alternatives to

motor vehicles, primarily electric bikes and scooters. Specific objectives of this grant-funded work included the following: 1) develop partnerships with City agencies, community partners, and shared micromobility operators to understand the current state of transportation at housing sites and in the region, 2) directly engage unhoused residents to understand transportation needs and challenges 3) research best practices on the intersectionality of transportation systems and unhoused populations, 4) develop micromobility educational pilot projects at several housing sites in the City and County of Denver, and 5) develop recommendations and an Action Plan based on the findings of this work.

Current State

The impact of unsafe and unreliable transportation systems on unhoused community members has been well documented and studied. A [2007 survey](#) (webpage) of individuals experiencing homelessness found that transportation was often cited as a major barrier to health management, securing employment, and permanent housing. A similar [study](#) (PDF) mentions that 42% of people were forced to turn down an employment opportunity due to a lack of a route to get to a job site, and 21% had missed a job interview, due to difficulties with public transportation. A [2015 Harvard University study](#) (PDF) found access to transportation is “the single biggest factor in the odds of escaping poverty and avoiding homelessness.” The study noted how safe and reliable transportation systems are critical to holding down a job, getting to school, keeping service appointments, and other aspects of daily life.

In Denver, and across the United States, accessible and reliable transportation for people experiencing homelessness is a critical, but often overlooked, service for unhoused community members. Countless organizations specialize in support services for housing, job placement, physical and mental health care, food access, health, and other vital resources for individuals experiencing homelessness. By contrast, little to no direct services or advocacy focus specifically on transportation

services. Unhoused residents are often left to their own devices or rely somewhat on case managers to get them the basic transportation services they need. The work described in this report aimed to prioritize partnership and engagement between municipal government, service providers, and advocates to ensure that transportation is a top priority and unhoused community members receive adequate services and support.

Before DSP began any engagement directly with unhoused community members, our project team met with service providers who work on a day-to-day basis with people experiencing homelessness to understand the existing transportation services and challenges in the Denver region. The organizations we met with included the City of Denver Mayor's Office, Colorado Coalition for the Homeless, Housekeys Action Network, Denver Rescue Mission, Catholic Charities of Denver, Urban Peak, the Downtown Denver Partnership Street Team, and Colorado Village Collaborative.

From the conversations our project team had with the partners mentioned above, several key transportation themes were evidently clear.

- A small, but not insubstantial percentage of the population receiving services from providers deal with some sort of physical or mental disability, or addiction issues that prohibit them from using micromobility options
- A majority of the population does not have access to a personal motor vehicle
- The top transportation options for people include:
 - RTD services - bus, train, Access-a-Ride
 - Micromobility services - Lime and Lyft bikes and scooters
 - Personal mobility - walking, biking, or using other personal mobility devices
 - Denver Department of Housing Stability (HOST) Circulator Shuttle Bus
 - City of Denver Connector Microtransit Program

- Other transportation services - Bayaud Enterprises (an unhoused community service that offers transportation services for their programming), relying on friends/family for rides, Uber/Lyft
- Community members often have a lot of personal items with them, which may make it difficult to utilize micromobility or other transportation options to transport items.
- Community members often have to leave shelters and temporary housing to access employment, medical appointments, permanent housing opportunities, grocery stores, and other essential services. Lack of reliable transportation services options is a major barrier that can have negative implications if crucial appointments are missed.
- Transportation budgets at shelters are predominantly spent on RTD tickets for community members.

The DSP project team also met early on with the City of Denver Department of Transportation and Infrastructure (DOTI) and identified them as a crucial partner for this project. DOTI has jurisdiction around many of the roadway improvements for Denver, including planning, design, and construction. In conversation with DOTI staff, their team noted that they believe approximately 40% of pedestrian fatalities in 2023 were people experiencing homelessness. While this statistic is staggering, it is not hard to believe. People who are experiencing homelessness often rely on transit (bus and train) which run on the same streets as some of Denver's High Injury Network, where the preponderance of fatal traffic crashes occur. Colfax Avenue, Federal Boulevard, Colorado Boulevard, Evans Ave, Sheridan Boulevard, and Quebec Street, among others, are often the highest used bus routes in the city, as well as some of the most dangerous corridors for people walking in the region.

The locations of housing sites also contribute to the issue of dangerous walking, biking, and transit. Many housing sites are located near dangerous thoroughfares that

are associated with high speed moving traffic and pedestrian crashes. Colorado Village Collaborative has sites located near Colorado Boulevard, Santa Fe Drive, and Evans Boulevard. Urban Peak, Colorado Coalition for the Homeless, St. Francis Center, Denver Rescue Mission, and Catholic Charities are all located in the vicinity of Park Avenue, Broadway, and 20th Street in downtown Denver. Other sites are located in the industrial areas of Denver, near Interstate 70 between 48th Avenue and Smith Road. These areas are surrounded by dangerous and busy roads (due to industrial traffic), and often lack connectivity to major destinations and basic walking and biking infrastructure like sidewalks, protected bike lanes, and proper street level lighting.

Here in Denver, service providers like the Colorado Coalition for the Homeless (CCH) have created reports and advocacy tools to push for improved transportation access for unhoused residents. In their [new report](#) (PDF), CCH says that “transportation is essential to getting to medical appointments, case management meetings, lease ups, work, shelter, and more. It is therefore imperative that we craft transportation strategies and policies with the needs of the unhoused community in mind.” The report goes on to detail several key factors that must be considered to improve this issue. Specifically, reducing cost for transportation, advocating for better transit service, improving safety conditions for vulnerable road users, and increasing transit-oriented development are all key themes in the CCH report.

Best Practices

One of the objectives of this project was to conduct best practices research across the United States to glean what other like-minded organizations, housing providers, and other partners are doing to increase transportation access for people experiencing homelessness. To this end, the DSP reached out to organizations in several cities, primarily Sun Belt cities and cities with large populations of unhoused residents including San Diego, California; Los Angeles, California; San Francisco, California; Portland, Oregon; and Las Vegas, Nevada. Many of these organizations mentioned that,

similar to Denver, there are not dedicated services providers or programs focused on increasing micromobility access and programming in their respective communities, but other programs are dedicated to personal mobility (walking and biking) and transit.

For example, the San Francisco Bike Coalition's (SF Bike Coalition) Bike it Forward program refurbishes donated and reclaimed bikes, then distributes them for free, predominantly to people experiencing homelessness. The Bike it Forward program gives out approximately 30-50 bikes per month, while also offering bicycle education courses, and assistance for securing bicycle locks, helmets, lights, and other gear needed. Similar to Denver, representatives from the SF Bike Coalition noted that micromobility doesn't allow people to carry their belongings, many shelters are in isolated areas that are dangerous and hard to navigate, and there are issues with safety while riding bikes and scooters.

Father Joe's Village, a housing and service provider for unhoused residents based in San Diego, California, operates a similar program to Bike it Forward but on a smaller scale. Father Joe's Village runs an earn-a-bike program where 10-15 people involved with Father Joe's Village services opt in to a weekly bike ride with a staff supervisor. On these bike rides, participants will learn about route planning, build competency on the bike, and other bicycle basics, and after a certain number of miles ridden, participants will receive the bike, along with bicycle accessories. Through this program, Father Joe's Villages has been able to enroll approximately 200 people and given away approximately 65 bikes. A representative from Father Joe's Villages reported that programming like this helps individuals increase their personal transportation competency over time, helps build strong relationships within the community, and restores people's confidence on bikes.

In Los Angeles, Metro (LA's transit operator) operates [Metro Homeless Outreach Teams](#) (webpage). These teams are deployed on Metro buses, trains, and stations to

engage with unhoused riders and connect them to resources. Denver has a similar program with the Downtown Denver Partnership's Street Team, but a program dedicated to outreach on transit does not exist in Denver.

Through the City's Department of Transportation, Portland, Oregon, offers a Transportation Wallet (webpage) program, which allows collection of passes and credits for use on transit, streetcar, bike-share, e-scooters, taxis, Uber and Lyft, and parking. This Wallet is essentially a one-stop-shop for all of the different types of transportation services that exist in Portland. Along with the basic Transportation Wallet: Access for All program offers people and households living on low-incomes a package of FREE transportation options like transit, e-bike or e-scooter-share, and ride-share (Uber/Lyft) or taxis. The Access for All program focuses on reducing barriers to using transportation options like cost, technology access, credit/debit card requirements, and low-income verification processes for different providers. In conjunction with the City of Portland, Portland State University conducted research on the Transportation Wallet program, specifically for those who fell into the low-income bracket of the program. The findings were outstanding. According to the Portland State study (webpage), "nearly half of the respondents indicated that they tried to use new modes that they never used before with the Transportation Wallet, which was correlated with increased sign-ups and usage of ride-hail, e-scooter and bike share services." The study also found that "participants appeared to use each mode more than they would have otherwise" and "the program reduced stress related to how people might meet their basic travel needs." The development of a similar program in Denver would likely yield similar results and be a widely used service for people experiencing homelessness. More information on the development of a Transportation Wallet program in Denver can be found in the recommendations section of the report.

Community Engagement

A primary goal of this project was to engage with unhoused community members on their daily experiences and challenges as it relates to transportation in Denver. From the beginning, the project team wanted to focus on a more personal and in-depth community engagement approach, instead of a traditional community outreach approach anchored by widespread surveys and web-based engagement. The project team felt that small-scale focus groups would ensure the type of in-depth engagement needed for this project and lead to a more open and honest discussion while building trust within the community. For almost every focus group session, both a DSP team member and a member of the City's DOTI staff was present, taking notes, facilitating, and asking questions to participants. Preliminary findings from focus group conversations were shared with transportation professionals across the nation at a Federal Highway Administration convening in September.

The project team used the questionnaire attached in the appendix to guide the focus group conversation, each of which lasted about one hour and included approximately 10 participants. At each focus group, food and beverages were provided, as well as a \$40 gift card to compensate participants for their time and feedback. The project team also invited a staff member of each service provider to attend the focus groups to help facilitate conversation and be a familiar face in the room. After each focus group, participants also completed a short paper survey (attached in the appendix) with additional questions.

The focus groups were hosted in collaboration with three service providers: Colorado Village Collaborative, Denver Rescue Mission, and Urban Peak. The project team was able to conduct 10 focus group sessions, engaging more than 100 unhoused community members, with these three service providers across seven different housing sites. The demographics of each focus group were fairly split between men

and women, with some groups only being men and other groups only being women. Through Urban Peak, we also conducted a focus group with unhoused residents who were under the age of 25. Throughout all of the focus groups, our team heard stories, ideas for improvement, as well as positive and negative interactions with the Denver transportation system. It is impossible to recount every issue that community members spoke on during these focus groups, but there were a few key themes that resurfaced in each conversation, described in detail below.

Micromobility and Other Electric Mobility

When asked what types of transportation focus groups participants use on a regular basis, micromobility (shared scooters and bikes) was often mentioned as one of the most utilized forms of transportation. When the focus groups were conducted, the City and County of Denver had contracts with micromobility providers Lyft and Lime. Almost every focus group participant noted that they primarily use Lime bikes and scooters. Both micromobility providers offer discounts for low-income residents, but the Lime program (Lime Access) is preferred to Lyft's program (Community Pass), primarily due to Lime offering free rides (for 30 minutes) and Lyft offering a discounted \$3 a month fee while charging 5 cents per mile. After the focus groups were completed, Lyft announced they would be leaving the Denver market and their fleet share would be replaced by micromobility provider Bird.

Mobility Freedom

When discussing micromobility in the focus groups, many participants noted the reason they use micromobility is due to the greater mobility freedom the service provides compared to RTD transit and other transit services. With limited frequencies and other service issues currently occurring on RTD routes, micromobility allows people to still access important services and appointments that are crucial to their

daily lives. Many respondents mentioned when RTD was late or if they had just missed a bus or train, they would often pick up a nearby bike or scooter and partially or completely finish their trip back to their housing site. Bikes and scooters are often used to make trips between housing sites and transit services. Many people noted that they would pick up micromobility at their specific housing site and take the short trip to the nearest RTD rail station or bus stop.

These types of timely connections are crucial to those experiencing homelessness. Missing a health appointment, housing opportunity, job interview, or other crucial meeting could have drastic implications. In addition, many housing sites also have time restrictions, so if a person is not back in time to secure a bed for the night, they might have to spend the night outside or quickly find a vacancy at another housing site. Utilizing micromobility to help fill in gaps where other rapid and reliable transportation options are lacking reinforces what researchers and scholars have noted over the years, that due to many unhoused residents not owning personal cars, shared micromobility can help unhoused residents access employment, health services, and other necessities.

Affordability

Affordability of micromobility stands out as a key factor for the reason many unhoused residents opt to use the service compared to other transportation services in Denver. As indicated above, an overwhelming majority of the unhoused community members utilizing micromobility, use Lime for bike and scooter, because of the Lime Access program, which offers free, 30-minute rides (with proof of eligibility - eligibility include SNAP, Medicaid, Federal Subsidized Housing, and more). This type of affordability (even though time-limited) is truly unprecedented, especially when considering how much multiple trips on RTD rail and bus can cost. Continuing free service for

low-income populations is crucial for ensuring the unhoused population can have access to micromobility.

E-bikes

During conversation on micromobility, and biking in general, numerous focus group participants brought up Denver's and the State of Colorado's electric bicycle (e-bike) rebate programs. Participants expressed their interest in the program at length, wanting to know more information on how to get signed up for the program, what exactly the program entails, what types of bikes are eligible, and many other considerations.

For the City of Denver, the structure of the e-bike rebate program can pose challenges for someone who is experiencing homelessness. Among other things, potential applicants who are unhoused may not have the documentation readily available to apply for the program, may not have access to the technology needed to apply on the day-of, or may have crucial appointments that conflict with the timing of the rebate application window. The State of Colorado e-bike tax credit program can also pose challenges. Since the credit is for only \$450, residents may have to still pay a large amount of money for the remaining balance of an e-bike, which in many cases is insurmountable for someone with low-income.

In the past, Denver's Climate Action, Sustainability, and Resiliency Office (CASR), had worked with service providers and directly with unhoused community members to provide referrals to the program in order to access a voucher for an e-bike. This type of service is crucial to ensure an equitable application process and should be explored in the future.

Insufficient Access

While micromobility is often used among unhoused community members, there are continuing issues with access that do pose a problem, one of the biggest being the number of bikes and scooters being placed in critical areas for unhoused community members. During housing site tours and through conversation during the focus groups, it was clear that there are not enough bikes and scooters available for the number of people living at large housing sites. Many participants noted the bikes and scooters that were currently near the housing sites were ones that have been picked up from other locations and brought directly to the housing site. Due to the lack of micromobility supply near housing sites, competition for limited bikes and scooters can occur and potentially pose issues for people trying to leave housing sites to access key destinations. Access concerns (specifically the number of bikes and scooters) were also indicated at and near RTD transit stations and high usage bus stops. This presents challenges for those who have longer connections from transit stations to housing sites and other key destinations.

Along with physical access to micromobility devices, focus group participants commented on access issues due to difficulties with personal accounts tied to the micromobility apps. Participants spoke of frustration with changing over micromobility accounts if their phone was broken, stolen, or if they had to get a new phone and experienced difficulty transferring their account, which causes issues with accessing the bikes and scooters. The apps, the transferring of accounts, and other in-app account changes should be clear and seamless to ensure sustainable use of the devices and micromobility in general.

Poor Condition and Maintenance

Issues with the condition and maintenance of bikes and scooters provided by micromobility providers was frequently identified as a major issue by focus group participants. Whether that be flat tires, broken pedals, poor alignment on the bike, or

other mechanical issues, these nagging problems can make a big difference in how someone moves around. Some participants noted that the poor condition of the bikes and scooters has led to minor crashes and injuries from falling from the bike or scooter.

Issues with maintenance requests to micromobility providers when mechanical issues occurred was also a key theme in focus groups. Participants mentioned having issues logging maintenance requests in the micromobility apps, specifically that the issues they were having with a bike or scooter were not available to log as an issue in the app. Others noted that even when maintenance requests were filed, the problem on the bike or scooter would not be fixed, or it would take a long amount of time to get the problem fixed. While these issues do sound somewhat minor, it is important that a vital transportation option, like micromobility, actually has proper working devices. Riding on improper or broken bikes and scooters can not only be dangerous to the user, but also time consuming.

Safety Concerns due to Infrastructure

Similar to the concerns that were mentioned in the “Personal Mobility” section of this report, personal safety on micromobility was a top concern for focus group participants. Specifically, the poor condition of sidewalks and roadways was mentioned numerous times across all focus groups. Participants recounted story after story of riding on a Denver street or sidewalk on a micromobility device, then suddenly hitting a pothole or small rise in the sidewalk and being thrown from a bike or scooter. Several participants even shared their recent scars and road rash from falling and hitting the ground after being thrown from a bike or scooter after hitting a spot of poor pavement. These injuries often went unreported at the time of injury, either because of no clear method reporting at the time of the injury or participants did not feel comfortable calling police or first responders.

Participants also noted the lack of adequate space to accommodate micromobility devices on roads and sidewalks. As mentioned previously, a lot of housing sites are located in industrial areas with little or no sidewalks or bicycle infrastructure, so when people are riding on sidewalks or roadways they are often riding on narrow sidewalks or high-stress streets. Providing adequate and safe infrastructure so that people of all ages and abilities and on all modes of transportation is basic dignity and should be implemented if we want to see people to continue using micromobility.

Public Transit

Public transit, specifically RTD bus and rail, was noted as the most commonly utilized forms of transportation among focus group participants, with 95% noting they use RTD service, and 40% of focus group participants noting they use RTD at least once a week. RTD is an essential service in the Denver metro region. Currently, there are over 100 bus routes and 10 rail lines, as well as specialized services like Flatiron Flyer, Access-a-Ride, the free downtown shuttles, and Senior Ride. Outside of RTD, there are other public transit services that are accessible to the general public that help fill in the gaps left behind by RTD. Services like the Montbello Connector, the HOST Circulator bus, and transportation services offered by employment and health services are often used by unhoused community members.

Widespread Availability

Specifically, for unhoused community members, RTD is a vital service because of its availability and presence across the City of Denver. Whether it is bus or rail, residents can access a good majority of the city (and sections of the larger Denver region) on major thoroughfares and on some local corridors. While a majority of focus group participants use both RTD rail and bus, RTD bus service was used by a larger number of focus group participants (and most likely unhoused community members in general).

RTD bus service covers a larger area of the Denver region and proximity to stops is much closer on average than most rail stops. Numerous RTD bus routes were mentioned across all focus group sessions, but routes that were mentioned several times include: 15 and 15L - Colfax (and Colfax-Limited), 0 - South Broadway, 40 - Colorado, 21 - Evans, 38 - W. 38th Ave, 31 - Federal, and the 51 - Sheridan. When discussing bus service several focus group participants across all groups spoke about their satisfaction for the reliability of the 15 - Colfax. Many participants noted that other higher usage routes should function like the 15 - Colfax, with greater frequency and better reliability. The 15 - Colfax route was also praised for its transit amenities. Covered shelters, trash cans, real-time headway graphics, and other amenities were mentioned and noted to be included on other routes across the region.

While not discussed at length compared to RTD bus service, RTD rail service is utilized among focus group participants and the wider unhoused population. Specifically, A, D, E, H, and W-lines were mentioned as high priority routes for several focus group participants. Due to its proximity to several housing sites, the A-Line is one of the highest usage transit lines in the region for unhoused community members. Some focus group participants who use both bus and rail service expressed a greater satisfaction while using rail service compared to bus service. Participants mentioned RTD rail service is much more reliable, safe (on some trains), cleaner, and overall easier to navigate than the bus.

Even though RTD bus and rail service does have its shortcomings, the service it provides does have a great impact on transporting unhoused community members in Denver. For unhoused community members who have physical disabilities, and therefore cannot rely on micromobility or personal mobility (walking and biking), RTD bus and rail service may be the only option to get around. More discussions on RTD services and improvement to those services is further discussed below in this section and in the "Recommendations" section.

Additional Transit Services

Outside of RTD bus and rail services, focus group participants spoke about two other services that have filled in gaps where RTD and other transportation methods have lacked. The [Denver Connector Microtransit Program](#) (webpage) (or Connector), which serves Montbello, Globeville/Elyria-Swansea, and West Denver was mentioned several times across all focus groups as an impactful service that is often used by unhoused community members when they are in need of a quick ride in those specific areas. The [City of Denver Department of Housing Stability \(HOST\) Shuttle](#) (webpage) (often referred to as “Circulator bus” or “shuttle”), which is a relatively new service, was also spoken about at length. The Circulator bus stops at several major housing sites across the City of Denver, including Denver Rescue Mission sites, HOST micro-housing sites, Catholic Charities sites, medical clinics, and other important destinations. The Circulator has a fairly limited schedule, which can make it somewhat restrictive, however the service is free of charge.

Both of these transportation services are relatively new to Denver, and both services have great opportunity to grow. Participants were grateful for the new services, but also expressed that both services should be expanded. Speaking about the Connector, participants advocated for the expanding service area outside of Montbello, Globeville/Elyria-Swansea, and West Denver, as well as expanding times services were available. On the Circulator bus, the primary improvement was to extend the times and frequency the shuttle runs. Currently, the Circulator stops service around 3 PM and is not available on weekends, which poses quite the barrier for unhoused community members who need to access destinations outside of those times.

Poor RTD Service

One of the largest issues negatively impacting unhoused community members is the level of service provided by RTD bus and rail operations. At every focus group session participants spoke to the service level issue issues currently plaguing RTD, which have direct effects on their everyday life. Participants mentioned that buses do not come frequently enough, noting the sometimes hour wait times between buses in some areas are simply unacceptable. Several participants who had physical disabilities said these long wait times take a toll on the body, especially when bus stops do not have adequate amenities like shelters or benches.

Other participants stated that RTD buses' timing is unreliable and causes issues with catching a bus and transferring buses. Buses being early and leaving before the scheduled time, buses being 5 to 10 minutes late, and issues with buses being bunched together, slowing down service, were mentioned in focus group sessions. Lastly, some participants expressed the need for expanded service in specific areas, most of which were outside of Denver's core city center. Areas like Aurora, west Denver suburbs (Lakewood, Wheat Ridge, etc.), and northwest Denver suburbs (Arvada and Westminster) were mentioned for additional service, in terms of routes and frequency of routes.

Similar to what was mentioned in the "Mobility Freedom" section of this report, transportation connections, whether that be on micromobility or on RTD, are vital. Missing a bus or train can result in missing a health appointment, housing opportunity, job interview, or other crucial appointment could have long-term consequences and potentially prolong how long someone stays unhoused.

Poor RTD Rider Experience

The other major challenge affecting unhoused community members was the continued negative experience while riding RTD bus and rail. Across all focus groups this took many different forms, but some of the major themes are expanded upon below.

Stereotyping. Perhaps the most mentioned comment associated with a negative experience on RTD was due to pervasive stereotyping towards people perceived to be unhoused. The project team heard countless stories of stereotyping from operators, security, and other passengers on RTD bus and rail services. Participants shared stories about waiting for a bus and drivers continuing without stopping, not being allowed on the bus due to their physical appearance, or being treated differently than other passengers by security officers and operators due to their appearance or type of fare they paid with.

Fare enforcement. Inconsistencies regarding fare enforcement also contribute to poor rider experience for unhoused community members. Many of the focus group participants often utilize low-income programs to access RTD tickets, which is a positive service that is available for residents. However, several focus group participants spoke about RTD security asking for additional information to prove that their low-income ticket was actually valid. In some circumstances, community members did not have those documents available to them and were forced to vacate the train or bus. Participants also spoke to inconsistencies with fare collection on RTD bus service. Many participants noted that some RTD operators will allow passengers to board even though they may be a few cents short of total fare. However, some passengers spoke of being 5 to 10 cents short of total fare and were told they could not board the bus. Enforcement and removal from an RTD bus or train over 5 to 10 cents, especially for someone who may be making a critical trip on RTD, is somewhat trivial. Overall consistency with fare enforcement would benefit in alleviating some of the issues that focus group participants spoke to.

Personal safety concerns. Several participants brought up concerns over personal safety in and around RTD bus and rail facilities, citing how unsafe conditions affect overall experience on RTD. Many focus group participants directly cited instances where open air drug use on RTD trains impacted their perception of safety. In several focus group sessions, many women specifically noted feeling unsafe at RTD bus stops and rail stations due to factors like lack of proper lighting, low security near RTD facilities, and lack of safety features at RTD facilities.

Personal Mobility (Walking, Biking, and other Modes)

Outside of RTD services and micromobility, personal mobility, like walking and biking are very common among focus groups participants and the general unhoused population. Among focus group participants, 64% noted they walk at least once a day (whether it be short or long distances) to access everyday destinations or other modes of transportation like RTD services. A handful of participants had access to a personal bicycle, but many mentioned that using micromobility fills in the gap where a personal bicycle would typically be useful. When listening to the comments and experiences of participants, it was clear that the conditions for walking and biking near housing sites and across the Denver region are generally unsafe. Safety for people walking and biking has been a key issue for Denver for years now, however people continue to be injured and killed while walking and biking on city streets. It is important to recall the statistic mentioned at the beginning of this report provided by DOTI, that approximately 40% of fatalities involving a person walking in 2023 were believed to be people experiencing homelessness.

Protected Bicycle Infrastructure

During focus group sessions, there were very few positive anecdotes mentioned when discussing walking and biking in the Denver region. One of which was about the places

people feel safe while walking or biking. Many participants felt the most comfortable when biking on protected bike lanes or off-street trails. Several participants mentioned the new Broadway bikeway and noted they felt safe on a street that they previously had not been able to bike on really at all. Even with the positive notes about the Broadway bikeway, it was clear that there were still issues with the bike facility, specifically concerns over left hand hooks from drivers and the disruptive end to the bikeway near Interstate 25. At sites in central and southwest Denver, participants also expressed use and satisfaction with the Cherry Creek and South Platte River trails. Both trails are continuous and protected, which was a common positive theme mentioned by focus group participants. It's clear from focus group sessions that for the people who bike and use micromobility that these types of protected and continuous bike facilities are popular and encourage mobility for unhoused community members.

Dangerous Corridors for Walking and Biking

One of the major talking points during each focus group was dangerous corridors for walking and biking. Across each focus group participants mentioned countless corridors, but a specific few were mentioned multiple times, including Colfax, Federal, Sheridan, Evans, Colorado, Quebec, and Park. Each of these streets is excessively wide, with high moving traffic speeds, and overall designed to prioritize moving cars over the safety of all modes of transportation. All of these roads are also on Denver's High Injury Network (webpage), which are streets within the city that have disproportionately high rates of traffic crashes resulting in death or serious bodily injury.

Lack of Pedestrian-Scale and Transit Amenities

In almost every focus group, participants discussed at length their negative experiences with basic amenities while walking or waiting at RTD bus and rail stops. Specifically, participants called out insufficient street lighting, lack of trash cans,

restrooms, and seating as major concerns and areas for improvement. This issue is often exacerbated for people with disabilities. Waiting for RTD buses and trains at stops and stations without adequate amenities like shelters or benches can be difficult and often painful for those with disabilities. Providing basic amenities like seating, trash cans, bus shelters and restrooms throughout the Denver region would greatly improve everyday experiences for not only people who are unhoused, but everyone in the region.

Areas where many housing sites are located lack proper street lighting, which compounds already existing safety issues in those areas. During many focus group sessions, participants expressed that they are more active in the nighttime (several participants referred to themselves as “night owls.”) With this in mind, it’s important that lighting near housing sites and roads connecting to housing sites have proper pedestrian level lighting. These comments also share similarities to personal safety concerns brought up by participants when discussing RTD and are intrinsically connected.

Poor Roadway and Sidewalk Infrastructure

Similar to the comments made when discussing micromobility, many focus group participants expressed discontent with the state of sidewalks and roadway conditions in the Denver region. Whether that be potholes, large rises in sidewalks, missing segments of sidewalks, narrow sidewalks, or no sidewalks at all, all of these inconsistencies negatively affect the experience to walk, bike, roll, or take micromobility in the region. Similar to how the lack of pedestrian-level amenities affect people with disabilities, poor sidewalk infrastructure is also felt on a greater scale for people with disabilities. Oftentimes, when sidewalks are in poor condition or lack connections, people are forced to walk closer to moving traffic, or sometimes even in the roadway, which is clearly unsafe for people trying to access everyday destinations.

Pilot Programming

In conjunction with engagement, the project team conducted pilot programming to enhance outreach for micromobility programs available to unhoused community members. The DSP continued its collaboration with Denver Rescue Mission and Colorado Village Collaborative to hold two pilot program activities at housing sites. The goal of the pilot programming was for micromobility providers to conduct outreach with unhoused community members, answer questions, sign up community members with low-income micromobility programs, and learn about other important transportation resources.

At the first pilot program at Denver Rescue Mission, the DSP and micromobility provider Lime engaged more than 30 individuals with educational resources and information on low-income micromobility programs. Lime was able to give out 30 helmets to individuals, and sign up 5 people for their low-income program, Lime Access. The project team was also able to conduct additional engagement through surveying and one-on-one outreach. Several individuals spoke about their use of micromobility as a primary mode of transportation, but had safety concerns due to unsafe conditions for use, specifically due to unsafe streets and poor driver behavior resulting in crashes.

The second pilot program was in partnership with Colorado Village Collaborative. Outreach was similar to the first pilot program, with educational resources and information on low-income micromobility programs provided by micromobility provider Lime. The DSP was able to lead a short bike and scooter ride (on micromobility devices) with unhoused community members to [Bikes Together](#) (webpage), a local nonprofit bike shop and community hub for equitable bike access and education. At Bikes Together, individuals were able to tour the shop and learn about services Bikes Together offers. Specifically, Bikes Together highlighted their Learn and Repair

program, which allows people to sign up for a free session where people can work with a mechanic to fix their personal bike. An individual was also able to sign-up for Bikes Together's 4-Part Mechanic Class, which is a series where individuals learn everything to fix and maintain bikes over four classes.

Recommendations

At the end of every focus group session, the discussion focused on looking forward to how the City and County of Denver DOTI, RTD, other transportation service providers, and other stakeholders can improve the transportation system and experience for unhoused community members in the Denver region. The recommendations that emerged from these discussions will improve the transportation system and experience for not only unhoused community members, but with everyone in the Denver region who walks, bikes, takes transit, or uses micromobility.

Recommendations are broken down into four major categories that mirror the three main themes from the Community engagement section as well as "Other Recommendations" that are not directly linked to the other categories, but should be considered in conjunction with all other recommendations.

The top recommendation relevant to the goals of this grant-funded project is to develop a sustainable funding model to continue a free micromobility program for low-income residents. Micromobility (specifically with Lime) is highly used among unhoused community members because of the free, 30-minute rides. A free service will always be preferred to any type of low-cost program no matter the user, and is particularly important for our city's lowest income residents who must make difficult decisions about how to allocate their limited resources. To ensure that this transportation option remains easily accessible to unhoused residents, the City should seek to continue and potentially even expand the free service option with consistent, dedicated funding. In the future, any micromobility providers (currently Lime, and now Bird) should have

similar, if not identical, low-income programs. This recommendation is the top priority for this project and the project team has elaborated further on how to sustainably subsidize a free micromobility program in the “Action Plan” section of the report. Below are additional recommendations that would support the success of our primary recommendation and generally improve transportation access for people experiencing homelessness.

Micromobility and Other Electric Mobility

Recommendation #1: Increase Micromobility Availability

Partners: Micromobility providers (Lime and Bird), City of Denver DOTI

Timing: Short Term

Increasing general micromobility access across Denver would be beneficial for countless unhoused community members. Specifically, increasing the amount of micromobility devices at and near crucial destinations for unhoused community members is needed immediately. A repeated and scheduled drop of bikes and scooters at housing sites should be a procedure that is negotiated by the City of Denver and micromobility providers. Micromobility placement at high usage RTD bus stops and rail stations such as 40th and Colorado, Central Park, and Peoria Station, Evans Station, I25 and Broadway, and Colfax at Auraria is also recommended.

Expanding the range of micromobility outside of the Denver boundary would also improve micromobility access for unhoused community members. Several participants noted that only being able to use Lime Access in the City and County of Denver is a connectivity issue when they need to access destinations in Lakewood, Englewood, and Aurora. Allowing micromobility into other municipalities bordering Denver would most likely be a long-term solution, as micromobility providers would need to develop contracts and regulations on micromobility devices, which can be a lengthy process.

Recommendation #2: Improve Maintenance and Condition of Micromobility Device

Partners: Micromobility providers (Lime and Bird)

Timing: Medium Term

Poorly maintained micromobility devices is a major concern for unhoused community members using micromobility regularly. To ensure working bikes and scooters are reliably available for people to use, when a device is broken or needs maintenance, it should be replaced with a working device in a timely manner. Micromobility providers could develop programming for unhoused community members to help identify major maintenance issues and make sure issues are being fixed regularly. Micromobility providers should also look to phase out bikes and scooters that have repeated maintenance claims reported to avoid recurring use of bikes and scooters in poor condition.

Public Transit

Recommendation #1: Improve RTD Bus Service Frequency

Partners: RTD

Timing: Long Term

One of the biggest improvements that could be made to enhance the transportation system for unhoused community members is improving RTD bus reliability and frequency. Too many of the RTD routes currently have 30 minute to 1 hour long wait times, which is simply unacceptable. Increasing frequency, especially on high usage routes, would drastically reduce wait times, improve connections, and most likely increase public transit usage in Denver. Following guidance from the [Denver Moves Transit Plan](#) (webpage), moving to a 5-10 minute frequency on routes like the 15 and 15L - Colfax (and Colfax-Limited), 0 - South Broadway, 40 - Colorado, 21 - Evans, 38 -

W. 38th Ave, 31 - Federal, and the 51 - Sheridan during a majority of service hours would be beneficial for Denver residents.

Recommendation #2: Improve RTD Operator /Security Training

Partners: RTD

Timing: Medium Term

To curb the issues unhoused residents are experiencing with stereotyping and unfair treatment on RTD buses and trains, RTD should expand upon its current training model. From the [RTD webpage](#) (webpage), training consists of “customer service skills, de-escalation techniques, knowledge of the fare system and schedules.” RTD has also created several [de-escalation videos](#) (webpage) to handle specific situations on bus and rail. However, from the focus group discussions, it is evident that issues still persist with RTD operators and security and unhoused community members who use transit. In the near term, RTD could look to partner with service providers working with unhoused residents to apply training learned from providers and apply it to the RTD service context.

Recommendation #3: Expand Low-Income Fare Programs

Partners: RTD

Timing: Medium Term

Currently, RTD has a low-income program called LiVE, which is fairly popular among the focus group participants the project team spoke to. Several participants did note that the program was often difficult to access and for some was still slightly too expensive to warrant signing up for. Increased fare reduction and enhanced awareness for this program should be considered. Other programs like Free Fare for Better Air, which made all RTD bus and rail service free for the month of August in 2022 and 2023,

should be brought back and expanded. Focus groups participants spoke at great lengths on their satisfaction with Free Fare for Better Air, noting the program gave them greater mobility freedom and allowed them to travel to places they normally wouldn't due to RTD fare constraints. The Free Fare for Better Air program was a success, with RTD seeing increasing ridership by 12% in July and August of 2023.

Personal Mobility (Walking, Biking, and other Modes)

Recommendation #1: Infrastructure Improvements on High Injury Network Roads

Partners: City of Denver DOTI, Colorado Department of Transportation

Timing: Long Term

In some areas in the Denver DOTI and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) have improved street safety, however there are still countless streets that need complete redesign and infrastructure improvements to increase safety for all modes of transportation. Roads like Federal, Sheridan, Colfax, Quebec, and Evans are in drastic need of redesign away from a car-centric design, to a design that prioritizes all modes of transportation and increases safety. Infrastructure improvements like road diets, lane narrowing, added mid-block crossings, pedestrian level lighting, and other traffic calming improvements are essential to improving safety for people walking, biking, rolling, taking transit, and driving on these roadways. Like many other recommendations in this report, increased funding and staff attention is needed to accelerate planning and implementation for these types of projects.

Recommendation #2: Improve Sidewalk Conditions

Partners: City of Denver DOTI

Timing: Long Term

The City of Denver is already taking important steps to improve sidewalk conditions through the new Denver sidewalk ordinance and program. This program, which will target equity areas to repair and build new sidewalks first, will most likely fix some of the issues that were highlighted by focus group participants. For more direct and immediate concerns over issues with sidewalks and roadways, outreach is needed to unhoused community members on how to report improper and dangerous roadway conditions. Outreach sessions and resource sharing with unhoused community members on the 311 program and how it is operated could be beneficial in how certain problems with sidewalks and roads can be addressed.

Recommendation #3: Improve Pedestrian Scale Amenities

Partners: City of Denver DOTI, RTD

Timing: Long Term

Discussed several times throughout this report, there is a clear need for funding and staff dedicated to implementing and maintaining basic amenities like seating, trash cans, bus shelters and restrooms throughout the Denver region, specifically near RTD bus and rail stops. These additions throughout the RTD network would greatly improve everyday experiences for people walking, biking, and utilizing RTD services.

Pedestrian-scale lighting should also be built on high-usage transit and multimodal corridors to increase safety and improve overall travel experience. Similar to the outreach recommendations about 311 with roads and sidewalks, unhoused community members should be aware of how 311 requests can be submitted for issues like broken street lights and other lighting issues.

Other Suggestions

Recommendation #1: Develop Direct Referral Program with CASR E-bike Rebate Program

Partners: City of Denver CASR Office, Unhoused service providers, e-bike shops

Timing: Medium

The CASR e-bike rebate has been overwhelmingly positive for residents and has provided e-bikes at a lower price point for thousands of Denver residents. However, there are certain program accessibility issues for people with low-incomes or for unhoused community members. Potential applicants who are unhoused may not have the documentation readily available to apply for the program, or they may not have access to the technology needed to apply on the day-of, or there may be other crucial appointments that conflict with the timing of the rebate. Developing a direct referral program between the City of Denver’s Climate Action, Sustainability, and Resiliency Office (CASR) and service providers is crucial to ensure an equitable application process exists for unhoused community members. Although not widely known to the public, a small direct referral program existed for a period of time, but does not exist anymore. These referrals should be revisited and possibly expanded for future rebate cycles.

Recommendation #2: Transportation Wallet for Essential Transportation Services

Partners: RTD, Micromobility providers, HOST, service providers

Briefly explained in the “Best Practices” section of this report, innovations like a Transportation Wallet would reduce barriers to using transportation options and make using transportation programs and other essential services more convenient. Many unhoused community members have a “Clarity” card, which is essentially a card that assists case managers to track and manage client information, services, and outcomes. If unhoused community members were able to load transportation tickets, SNAP, social security information, and other essential services onto their Clarity card, issues over transportation service access and management would decrease. From the Portland Transportation Wallet program, users indicated that they tried to use new

modes that they never used before with the Transportation Wallet, which was correlated with increased sign-ups and usage of ride-hail, e-scooter and bike share services.” Transportation Wallet participants also noted the program reduced stress related to how people might meet their basic travel needs.

Recommendation #3: Transportation Resource Guide

Partners: RTD, Micromobility providers, DSP, service providers

At every focus group session, the project team asked about what important resources and services unhoused community members use to make their daily transportation experiences more accessible. The project team heard about a majority of the programs mentioned in this report, but there are most likely new programs, resources, and other services that are available to unhoused and low-income community members which are not readily known to the majority of the population. Compiling and developing a resources guide, similar to the guide developed by DRMAC, that discloses every discounted program, resource, or piece of important information available to the public is needed. A resource guide would be mass produced and presented to all housing sites and be available to case managers, staff at housing sites, as well as the general public. Creating a resource guide would entail a layered partnership between all essential transportation services like RTD, Lyft, Lime, Bird, HOST, DOTI and other partners who offer transportation services.

Micromobility Action Plan

In cities across the United States, public transportation funding is often subsidized by local, state, and federal governments. The same cannot be said for micromobility. In order for shared micromobility to operate sustainably, public funding is needed to support operational cost and low-income programs. This project has displayed the

importance micromobility plays in the daily travel needs for unhoused community members in Denver. Micromobility is a growing transportation mode in Denver and needs to be funded and operated at a high level if we are going to continue offering vital services to the people who need it the most.

In Denver, all operations and low-income programs, like Lime Access, are funded and run by the micromobility providers. Over time, relying on private entities to bear the entire cost for a program is unsustainable. Micromobility providers control the supply and management of a micromobility fleet in the market, and if the cost of a low-income program becomes too unsustainable, micromobility providers could negotiate to stop offering a low-income program or completely pull the micromobility fleet altogether, both of which would be catastrophic, especially to already impacted communities like unhoused community members. The primary recommendation of this report is for the City of Denver to either fully or partially subsidize a shared micromobility low-income program. Our team believes this change is needed to continue sustaining the current low-income program that directly assists not only unhoused community members, but residents throughout Denver.

Estimated Costs and Opportunities for Funding

Currently, it is estimated annual administrative costs to run the low-income micromobility program is approximately \$5-6 million, with an approximate \$15 million in missed revenue from low-income micromobility users. To maintain current operational levels and account for micromobility growth, it is estimated that subsidizing a low-income program would cost approximately \$7-\$8 million per year. There are several funding strategies that would assist the City and County of Denver with a low-income program subsidy. In the State of Colorado, micromobility providers or the City of Denver could receive up to \$1.5 from the State of Colorado with its Community Accelerated Mobility Program (CAMP), the grant program that funded the

development of this report. Large scale Federal transportation grants could also help the City of Denver fund a low-income micromobility program. The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (webpage) (CMAQ) and Transportation Alternatives Program (webpage) (TAP) both have funding available to support micromobility programs in cities across the United States.

Funds from the CAMP, CMAQ, and TAP programs would directly assist with subsidizing basic operations micromobility providers currently already do on a day to day basis. Additionally, these three programs could prioritize expansions of current low-income micromobility programs, increasing deployment of micromobility devices to support fleet needs, or improving shared micromobility operations so users can reliably access and use shared micromobility properly. Governments or micromobility providers could also use funds to support educational programming like, coaching/training for residents on how to use micromobility safely, scouting safe routes to important destinations, and other useful information. Transit agencies and state governments can also support and partner with shared micromobility providers to help improve operational services and funding opportunities. In other cities in the United States, transit agencies have assisted micromobility providers through co-location, trip-planning integration, payment integration, service coordination, and direct funding. This report recommends the City of Denver or micromobility providers apply for implementation funding through the Colorado Energy Office CAMP to secure initial funding for micromobility programs and projects.

Future Stakeholders and Responsibilities

The primary stakeholders moving forward for this Micromobility Action Plan are the City of Denver and the micromobility providers based in the Denver region (currently Lime and Bird). These two stakeholders currently negotiate and provide the regulations (webpage) of the micromobility devices that are placed and operated for Denver. With

potential implementation of this Micromobility Action Plan, the City of Denver's main responsibility would be to subsidize a low-income micromobility program through the City budget, or look to identify and secure funding from an outside agency to fill in the funding gap. The main responsibility of micromobility providers would be to administer the program by operating and maintaining the micromobility devices to the standards identified in this report or ones identified by the City. Both stakeholders would also adopt and track key performance indicators and report back to other stakeholders and the public on the efficacy of a future Micromobility Action Plan.

Other stakeholders for this Action Plan include the Colorado Energy Office, unhoused service providers, and the DSP. The Colorado Energy Office could fill the responsibility of partially funding the micromobility subsidy through the CAMP program. Unhoused service providers and the DSP could assist with low-income program outreach and awareness, as well as continued engagement with unhoused community members to address continued concerns that arise from micromobility usage.

Plan Targets, Metrics, and Key Performance Indicators

With adoption of the Micromobility Action Plan, the City and micromobility providers should establish several key goals, performance indicators, and metrics to track program progress. The main target of the Micromobility Action Plan is to increase usage of shared micromobility among low-income populations. Tracking overall usage through metrics like sign-ups for the low-income program, miles traveled on micromobility devices, and number of trips taken per low-income program user can help meet the three major key performance indicators identified below.

- Increase sign-ups for low-income micromobility program by 25%
- Increase miles traveled by low-income micromobility program participants by 10%
- Increase trips taken by low-income micromobility program participants by 10%

Other metrics should be compiled by identified stakeholders to assess program efficacy and progress year-after year, such as overall percentage of trips that are low-income users, micromobility trips per week, average length of a micromobility trip, number of new sign ups to the low-income program, and number of maintenance requests are all useful metrics to measure the success of the overall program. Other location-based metrics like major pick up and drop off locations and high usage travel corridors among low-income users will help influence micromobility operations decision making to increase availability to low-income users. Lastly, there are environmental and personal health benefits stakeholders can track to showcase positive externalities related to micromobility. These include reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, number of vehicle trips reduced, noise pollution reduction, and personal health metrics of users (obesity rates, weight loss, blood pressure rates, etc.) can all be tracked as a part of the Micromobility Action Plan.

Projection of Micromobility Plan Benefits

Developing a sustainable funding and subsidy model to support a low-income micromobility program in Denver would drastically benefit micromobility users and the general public. Providing micromobility to more low-income users can increase access to important destinations like healthcare, employment and housing opportunities, grocery stores, and other essential services people rely on. Specifically, for unhoused community members, an improved micromobility program can increase the probability of community members resolving their homelessness as they can rely on micromobility to access places of employment, important appointments or other aforementioned services. Aside from social benefits gained from low-income and unhoused community members, increased micromobility also provides health and environmental benefits. Increased usage of micromobility can increase personal health outcomes and

utilizing micromobility, specifically to replace car trips, reduces harmful externalities caused by motor vehicles, like carbon emissions.

Conclusion

Public funding, at the local, regional, and state level, is vital for the growth and sustainability of Denver's micromobility programs. Investing public funds into shared micromobility is necessary if we want to continue and expand the benefits of micromobility, especially for unhoused community members in our region.

Appendix

Focus Group Protocol and Survey

Thanks to all of you for volunteering to sit down and share your experiences regarding transportation safety around your community. We're looking forward to hearing your feedback so that we can work with our partners to improve transportation access for you and your neighbors.

This conversation will last 45-60 minutes. Our team will ask the group a series of discussion questions. Please feel free to share as much as you feel comfortable. If everyone agrees to it, we would like to record our conversation today so that we can refer to your recommendations later. We will not be sharing the recording with anyone. It is just for our own notetaking, so we don't miss anything you share today.

Are there any questions before we get started?

Let's start by talking about what's working well regarding transportation in and around this community. When we talk about transportation, we mean any way you get around--walking, biking, scooting, taking transit, driving, and using ride shares. We want to understand your experiences about what helps you get around.

- How do you typically get around?
- What transportation service(s) is most useful or supportive of your needs?
 - Would you say you have a favorite or preferred way to get around?
Explain.
 - How does having access to these transportation services positively impact you?

- What are some of the most important destinations that you need to travel to?

- o And maybe for what purpose?
 - o What do you need transportation?
- What's working well for you?
 - o Cost
 - o Reliability
 - o Level of service
- Explain the process for you to find reliable transportation options
- What else would you like to share about what's going well regarding transportation?

Now that we've discussed what's working well, let's talk about what's not working well regarding transportation in and around this community. Again, we mean any way you get around-- walking, biking, scooting, taking transit, driving, and using ride shares.

- Regarding transportation, what's not working well for you?
 - o What are some of the biggest challenges or concerns when getting around?
 - o How do you navigate these transportation challenges?
 - o How do these transportation challenges negatively impact you?
- What transportation services are missing in this area?
 - o What transportation services or resources do you wish you had?
- What else would you like to share about what's not going well regarding transportation?
- What happens when transportation services aren't available or you can't get where you need to go? How does that impact your daily life?
- Are you aware of anyone or yourself who has been hit by a car?

Lastly, we'd like to discuss possible ideas to address some of the concerns our team has heard about in our conversations with community members and community leaders at this site.

- What are your thoughts about ____ (potential solutions)?
 - What do you like about this potential opportunity?
 - What impact do you think it could have?
 - What are you unsure of or what do you dislike about this potential opportunity?
 - How might you want us to address those concerns?
- What are your thoughts about shared scooters and bikes?
- What are the positives & negatives of those mobility options?
- What are the major barriers to accessing these bikes & scooters?
- What would you need to access these mobility options?
 - Phone
 - Monetary support
 - Access to a program
 - Communication about the program?
- Do you think that e-bikes, shared mobility, etc. could potentially become a replacement for transit?

Those are all the questions we have for you today. Is there anything we didn't address that you'd like to share? Do you have any questions for us?

Do you currently own a bike or e-bike?

- Yes
- No

Do you need assistance with bike security or maintenance tools? Example: access to a bike lock, bike tools, air pump etc.

- Yes
- No

Have you heard about the City of Denver's e-bike rebate program? And Is it something you're interested in?

- Yes, I've heard of the program
- No, I have not heard of the program
- Yes, I'm interested in the program
- No, I'm not interested in the program

Have you ever used Lyft or Lime/Uber? If so for what services?

- Lyft – For Bike/Scooters
- Lyft – For car rides
- Lime – For Bike/Scooters
- Lime/Uber – For car rides

List/explain some of the services you have to reduce price/fees for transportation services (example: free RTD tickets from housing provider, etc)

Please note how often you use each form of transportation to access employment, appointments, and other everyday locations.

Drive

- Every day
- Once a week
- Few times a week
- Few times a month

- Never

Bike or Scooter

- Every day
- Once a week
- Few times a week
- Few times a month
- Never

Call a Ride Services

- Every day
- Once a week
- Few times a week
- Few times a month
- Never

Take Transit (RTD or other transit services)

- Every day
- Once a week
- Few times a week
- Few times a month
- Never

Walk

- Every day
- Once a week
- Few times a week
- Few times a month
- Never

Other Services (write in)

- Every day
- Once a week
- Few times a week
- Few times a month
- Never