

## Transportation Advisory Committee

Meeting date: April 20, 2026

Agenda Item #: 6 (Attachment D)

### **2029-2032 Transportation Improvement Program Regional Share Process – Discussions to Date**

Agenda item type: Informational briefing

#### **Summary**

Continued discussion on the current Transportation Improvement Program, or TIP, Regional Share process, and concepts to possibly adjust for the new Fiscal Years 2029-2032 TIP.

#### **Background**

Since the initial 2029-2032 TIP process discussions at the January TAC meeting, staff have formed the TIP Subcommittee, made up of TAC members and alternates, and held two discussions on the possible adjustments to the Regional Share process. The conversation today will be a recap of those discussions, with the intent to initiate these discussions and concepts with the Board.

#### Current Regional Share process

Per the adopted [Policies for TIP Program Development](#), the current intent of the Regional Share is to “...achieve the regional outcomes and objectives of Metro Vision and the regionally funded projects and program investment priorities set by the Regional Transportation Plan.” Sponsors can submit either a project or program.

After funding the TIP set-asides, 20% of the remaining funds are available for the Regional Share call for projects. Each county transportation forum is allowed to submit up to three applications, in addition to CDOT and RTD submitting up to two each. After the applications are submitted, a team of DRCOG staff score the projects, and then turn those scores over to a panel consisting of one technical member of each county transportation forum, in addition to others from CDOT, RTD and subject matter experts. After discussing, the panel then recommends a slate of projects to be funded and a ranked wait list to the TAC for recommendation, and eventually the Regional Transportation Committee and Board of Directors.

#### Acknowledged trends from previous calls for projects

Since the development of the Dual Model process leading up to the Fiscal Year 2020-2023 TIP cycle, Regional Share calls for projects have been conducted three times. Over those calls, staff have noted the following:

- No applicant has submitted a “program” for consideration, most likely due to no single jurisdiction covering the entire metropolitan planning organization, or MPO, planning area, apart from CDOT.



- Submitted applications are usually for a single location and don't align with other submitted applications to address regional goals in a coordinated way.
- The same application criteria are used for both the Regional and Subregional Share.
- The Regional Share is hard to describe and not easily defined. Outside of the written Policy document text, it's been said Regional Share applications are described as "we'll know it when we see it," which is not effective for applicants in the eligibility and criteria when preparing applications. This also creates difficulty for the review panel, committees and Board when considering and evaluating the regional nature of submitted applications.

### Concepts to improve the process

Staff have been working on, and have shared with the TIP Subcommittee, potential adjustments to the Regional Share process to encourage future projects to be more regional in nature. Generally, these adjustments fall into four categories. Below is an outline of the discussions to date on each of these categories.

#### *Alignment to Regional Transportation Plan, or RTP, goal(s)*

Those polled at the TIP Subcommittee were generally satisfied with the current process, though support exists to adjust it to further strengthen ties with the RTP in the form of connecting the Regional Share to making progress towards or achieving an explicit regional goal(s), specifically one or more of the investment priorities outlined in the RTP.

- After one or more goal(s) is identified, using a "tiered" system to conceptualize the level of detail to be captured by the project applications is necessary.
  - A simplistic example is as follows: Tier One is just the goal(s) (RTP investment priority), Tier Two is mid-level (such as adding a specific improvement type) and Tier Three would provide additional detail (such as adding specific locations).
- Without selecting the overall goal(s), those polled felt that Tier Two (mid-level detail) might be the best fit for the Regional Share.

#### *Application process*

Currently, the applications used for both the Regional Share and Subregional Share are identical. After polling the subcommittee, they felt if the Regional Share process remains generally the same (no goal(s) are used), the application should then also generally remain the same. However, if one or more RTP goals are used in the Regional Share, the application should then be adjusted and simplified to focus on the goal(s).

The TIP Subcommittee also was asked if a "two-step" application process could be introduced. This process is used in most of the TIP set-aside calls for projects and consists of applicants first submitting a letter of interest to be reviewed and discussed, before some, but potentially not all, are invited to submit full applications. If this process is eventually used, discussions will be needed to provide additional details.

#### *Submittal process*

The Subcommittee discussed the submittal process for applications and the roles the county transportation forums play. Overall, they felt the role the forums play was critical in maintaining the buy-in the forums have in the process and felt they were the perfect "pre-screening" step at



identifying Regional Share submittals. They strongly supported keeping the submittal process the same, regardless of any policy changes proposed for this TIP.

#### *General eligibility/other*

The TIP Subcommittee was polled, and then discussed, on other eligibility criteria, with the following results:

- The current minimum DRCOG funding request in the Regional Share an applicant can request is \$100,000, with a \$20,000,000 maximum. After being polled and discussed, a majority stated it was too early in the discussion process and not enough information is known at this time if any adjustments are warranted. Staff mentioned they will bring this topic back later in the process.
- Staff asked if the Regional Share does align with a goal(s), would that restrict project type eligibility. For example, if active transportation is the goal, would a roadway operational project be eligible if it had an active transportation component? The subcommittee overwhelmingly responded by stating project type eligibility would not be restricted if a goal(s) is used in the Regional Share.
- Finally, the subcommittee was asked if the Regional Share name was adjusted to “Regional Priority”, would that assist in clarifying the intent of the Regional Share. After polling, the reaction was mixed (3.4 out of 5) but did lean towards there being some benefit in adjusting the name. Staff mentioned that this topic would also be brought back later in the process once additional policy details are known.

#### Identifying the path forward

After reviewing all the previous discussions to date, staff have identified two options to move forward.

##### *Keep the Regional Share as is, but with small adjustments.*

- Staff will continue reviewing and suggest adjustments to the application and application questions. Staff have already been planning to bring these items to the TIP Subcommittee later this summer, regardless of any previous discussions.
- Staff will not plan on holding any future discussions regarding aligning the share to an RTP goal(s) and possibly using a two-step application process.
- Staff will bring forth and plan future discussions on funding minimums and maximums and possibly renaming the Regional Share to Regional Priority until later this fall after additional information is known about the overall changes to the TIP Policy document.

##### *Adjust the Regional Share to include a goal(s).*

- After gathering Board input on the discussions to date, and if the Board agrees on this path forward, begin working with TAC, and eventually the Board, to identify a goal(s) and what level of detail (tier) is necessary.
- Staff will continue reviewing and suggest adjustments to the application and application questions but will also draft additional questions specific to the goal(s) identified.



- Staff will discuss and provide additional details on how the two-step application process could work.
- Staff will identify the proper time and then re-introduce any discussions on funding minimums and maximums and renaming the Regional Share to Regional Priority.

#### Next steps

Staff intend to have a similar discussion with the Board to gather input. Regardless of the outcomes of both this discussion with TAC and Board members, staff will continue to have discussions with both TAC and the TIP Subcommittee on other policy items including, but not limited to, the TIP set-asides, the draft application questions and the Subregional Share criteria.

#### **Action by others**

None.

#### **Previous discussion/action**

[January 26, 2026](#) – Transportation Advisory Committee

[February 12, 2026](#) – Transportation Improvement Program Subcommittee

[February 23, 2026](#) – Transportation Advisory Committee

[March 12, 2026](#) – Transportation Improvement Program Subcommittee

#### **Recommendation**

None.

#### **Attachment(s)**

Staff Presentation.

#### **For more information**

If you need additional information, please contact Todd Cottrell, Programming and Project Delivery Program Manager, Transportation Planning and Operations, at 303-480-6737 or [tcottrell@drcog.org](mailto:tcottrell@drcog.org).

