

AGENDA

TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 16

Tuesday, January 9, 2018

2:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Conference Room – 1st Floor, west side

1. 2:30 Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. December 6, 2017 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)
4. 2:35 Discussion on Regional Share Framework - evaluation criteria
(Attachment B) Todd Cottrell
5. 4:20 Other Matters
 - Updated 2020-2023 TIP Anticipated Schedule and Topics
(Attachment C)
 - Subregional Forum-Meeting Postings
6. 4:30 Adjournment

Persons in need of auxiliary aids or services, such as interpretation services or assisted listening devices, are asked to contact DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting by calling (303) 480-6744.



We make life better!



ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg. 15 Monday, December 6, 2017

PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve	Adams County
Kent Moorman	Adams County, City of Thornton
Bryan Weimer	Arapahoe County
Mac Callison	Arapahoe County, City of Aurora
George Gerstle (Chair)	Boulder County
Kathleen Bracke (<i>by phone</i>)	Boulder County, City of Boulder
Tom Schomer	Broomfield, City and County
Janice Finch/Justin Begley	Denver, City and County
David Gaspers	Denver, City and County
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Doug Rex	DRCOG
Art Griffith	Douglas County
John Cotten	Douglas County, City of Lone Tree
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Dave Baskett	Jefferson County, City of Lakewood
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motor

Others present: Aaron Bustow, Bill Haas, FHWA; Daniel Hutton, Denver South EDP (*by phone*)

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Jacob Riger, Flo Raitano, Mark Northrop, Emily Lindsey, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

November 27, 2017 Meeting Summary

The summary was accepted.

Comments on summary

Dave Baskett requested inclusion of the following statement to his comments on page 3: *If Subregional forums have not been created yet and there is no firm plan in place about how they will be created, it would surely guarantee the delay of the TIP process, because Subregions are the only ones submitting Regional projects.* It was noted Kent Moorman also commented on this on page 2 and George Gerstle on page 1.

George Gerstle felt the outcome of previous MRA discussion was that MRAs crossing county boundaries would be eligible.

Janice Finch requested including more detail of the studies discussion (*specifically, that sponsors can apply for study funding in the Regional Share for projects that are not currently in the FC-RTP, but are in the Metro Vision.*)

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

Discussion on Regional Share Framework - eligibility rules

There was discussion to reconsider several Regional Share eligibility topics previously recommended at the November 27 meeting.

Project caps

Doug Rex discussed ramifications of the last meeting's consensus of project caps (15% maximum request of total project cost, and a \$15 million maximum request). He reviewed three hypothetical project examples (Attachment 3) that may have demonstrated unintended consequences for mid-range projects.

Comments

- Jeanne Shreve said the work group's previous discussions had been 5-10%.
- Janice Finch noted concern, particularly for the up to \$100 million projects. She suggested considering using graduated project size percentages and caps.
- Dave Baskett said it doesn't make sense to cap a Regional project at \$15 million, noting the FasTracks' \$120 million TIP commitment.
- George Gerstle said the work group's previous discussions had been to not have hard caps, but to instead recommend the Board use the evaluation criteria (such as match and leveraging) to make their decision.
- Mr. Gerstle suggested not eliminating a potentially beneficial regional project based on hard funding criteria; it should only be one of the criteria used for decision-making by the Board.
- Kathleen Bracke agreed about encouraging the leveraging component and not having a hard cap; and to consider using a sliding scale.
- Jeanne Shreve said the intent of capping is to be able to fund as many projects as possible. She said the Board needs to be asked what they want to accomplish; do they want to invest in large transformative projects or do they want to provide more regional equity.
- Art Griffith said 15% is a good guideline, but to also consider having exceptions.
- Mac Callison said increasing the cap doesn't mean achieving better leverage. He was also concerned about inflating eligibility by including the MRAs at the expense of having a meaningful Subregional Share.
- Janice Finch noted projects on MRA's are historically matched somewhat higher (50/50) and said the percentages should be increased.
- Bryan Weimer asked what are we trying to accomplish with the Regional Share? He said it's difficult to compare the old TIP model to the new model. In the old model (current TIP), regional projects were only those taken typically off the top.
 - Doug Rex agreed and noted not everything would be eligible. If subregions are limited to a small number of submittals, each county will need to determine its priorities based on the given criteria.
- George Gerstle suggested focusing the discussion on what criteria the work group should recommend to the Board to use in its evaluation of submitted projects, but criteria should not arbitrarily exclude a project from Board consideration.
- Kent Moorman suggested taking two options to the Board, 1) does the Board want to have greater flexibility with no funding cap, or 2) be more restrictive. Present the pro/cons of each.
 - George Gerstle suggested the work group recommend the criteria to the Board.
- George Gerstle said setting an arbitrary dollar amount for a Regional project doesn't make sense. The Board should also be able to consider good projects that may not meet specific hard criteria.

- George Gerstle summarized that the Board could consider either using recommended criteria (to have flexibility to consider a unique project) or using hard % requirements (to have certainty on what type project can be submitted).
 - Janice Finch said the flexibility of having no caps gives the Board more opportunity to look at Focus Areas and other criteria, and is more collaborative, while the formal process seemed relatively arbitrary. She suggested a third option to present both options to the Board.
- Doug Rex said the criteria should also ask if the project is scalable.
- Janice Finch felt 20% is too low for smaller projects; suggested 50% with a \$20 million cap.
- John Cotton said originally the work group talked about funding large regional projects in a small way and asked how a \$5 million project could be considered regionally transformative.
 - Doug Rex said he agreed that there should be enough funding in the Regional Share to have the discussion on those very large kinds of Regional projects, but said the concern is also for those (smaller) regionally-significant projects, such as the \$30 million US-85 project (that DRCOG funded 50%). He noted, if MRAs are not eligible, this type of project would not be eligible for the Regional share, and would not likely be funded in Subregional either.
- George Gerstle suggested recommending to the Board to use the criteria as guidance (at whatever percentage or amount) and not to constrain a project from being submitted, even if the project can't meet hard criteria.
 - Art Griffith suggested for smaller projects costing up to \$10 million, up to 50% of project cost could be requested; over \$10 million up to 20%; and with a \$20 million funding maximum.
 - George Gerstle suggested 50% for up to a \$15 million project; and for over \$15 million up to 20%; with a \$20 million funding maximum.
 - Bryan Weimer asked why even set a cap.
 - Dave Baskett noted we are not replacing CDOT or RTD funding; DRCOG funding is the last money in to show regional commitment.
- Doug Rex noted there is only about \$40-50 million in the Regional pot, so why have a max cap. Ted Heyd suggested, as the Regional pot is limited, to just recommend the criteria-based approach instead of caps.
- Art Griffith said project scalability needs to be carefully considered.

After discussion, George Gerstle summarized that the consensus is to recommend presenting the following options to the Board for consideration:

- Use only the evaluation criteria (do not set funding request caps)
- Using a request cap of 50% of the project cost, with a maximum award of \$20 million (with no stair-stepping)

Bicycle Corridor map

Steve Cook continued the discussion and asked if the work group would consider not limiting bicycle projects to either those on either the old MVRTP Regional Bicycle Corridor Map or on a to-be-created map for the new Action Transportation Plan.

After discussion, George Gerstle summarized that the consensus is a bicycle project needs to be either consistent with the bicycle corridor map or on an adopted local plan (with no extra points given for being on bicycle map).

Discussion on Regional Share Framework - evaluation criteria

Doug Rex asked for feedback on the draft evaluation criteria to incorporate into the draft 2020-2023 TIP Policy document.

Comments:

- Ted Heyd said the overall concept is good, but questioned how high, medium, and low thresholds would be quantified.
- Mac Callison asked for more detailed description of what “reliability” would be (in Part 2, B-ii.).
- Janice Finch questioned why even have a screening form, if staff is already pre-screening for eligibility, and maps are used to determine eligibility.
 - Steve Cook said the Part 1 section would also have information on project scaling and scope, etc. Staff will provide a draft version of what the form will contain. The work group was asked to submit any further suggestions to staff on the evaluation criteria and performance measures.
- Mac Callison asked if the regional model will be available for sponsors to request model runs. Steve Cook said it will be available to specific types of projects.
- Art Griffith suggested using 5-year instead of 3-year crash data.
- Dave Baskett asked that the formation of the Subregion Forums be indicated on the update to the timeline.
- Janice Finch asked for a listing of this meeting’s outcomes to be emailed to the committee prior to the Board meeting on December 20.

The meeting adjourned at 3:57 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for December 18, 2017.

ATTACH B

ATTACHMENT B

To: TIP Policy Work Group
From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner
303 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcoq.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
January 9, 2018	Discussion	4

SUBJECT

Regional Share policy topics.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion on evaluation criteria for Regional Share projects/programs to incorporate into the draft 2020-2023 TIP Policy document.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

This agenda item is a follow up to a discussion at the December 6 Work Group meeting. Updated Regional Share framework documents for evaluating project/program applications are attached for review and discussion. As a reminder, the proposed framework is based on:

- 1) criteria associated with types of benefits to be obtained from a project/program, not by the type of project; and
- 2) a scoring panel (yet to be defined) would judge the applications and provide specific point scores.

Attachment B-1 contains updated draft application instructions, foundational questions, evaluation criteria, and proposed point structures. Changes from the framework presented at the previous work group meeting include:

- Addition of foundational questions and project information requirements—to be reflected on an application form
- Linkages between specific criteria and associated variables to be quantified.
- Addition of point value ranges

Attachment B-2 describes methods and resources for quantifying existing conditions and post-project benefits, as applicable to beneficial elements of the project/program.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

1. Regional Share Framework - Evaluation Criteria
2. Quantifying Benefits of Proposed Projects/Programs

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, at 303-480-6737 or tcottrell@drcoq.org.

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT for Discussion Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 3, 2018)

Project/Program Application and Evaluation Criteria Instructions

The regional evaluation criteria provide a basis for members of a “project review panel” (to be determined) to review and score all project and programs that apply for Regional Share funding against one another. Project points will be assigned to rating levels of high, medium, and low for the four criterion categories in Part 2 below. Points will be based on the number and magnitude of benefits. The highest possible total score is 100 points.

Part 1: Project Information (actual application form will look different)

All sponsors are required to submit foundational project/program information including a problem statement, project description, and concurrence documentation. Each proposed project/program will be reviewed to determine eligibility under federal requirements and consistency with regional policies prior to being considered for Regional Share funding.

1. Name of Project/Program: _____
2. Project start and end points, or geographic area: _____
3. Project Sponsor/Requestor: _____
4. Facility Owner/Operator: _____
If Owner/Operator is different from project sponsor/requestor, attach applicable concurrence documentation.
5. Identify the type of project and its key elements (check all that apply):
 - Roadway Capacity or Managed Lanes (2040 RTP)
 - Rapid Transit Capacity (2040 RTP)
 - Roadway Operational
 - Roadway/Railroad Grade Separation
 - Transit other: _____
 - Bicycle facility
 - Pedestrian facility / features
 - Study / Design
 - Other: _____
6. What specific **existing PROBLEM** will the project/program address? _____
7. Define the scope and **specific elements** of the project/program: _____
8. Is the project/program **scalable**? _____
If yes, define smaller meaningful limits: _____
9. Amount of DRCOG Regional Share Funding Request: \$ _____
10. Amount provided by other local, state, or federal sources (with commitment documentation): \$ _____
11. Total Project Cost: \$ _____

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT for Discussion Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 3, 2018)

Part 2: Evaluation Criteria and Questions (actual application form will look different)

A. Regional significance of proposed project/program (25 points max)

1. Describe how the proposed project/program will address the specific transportation problem described in the problem statement submitted in Part 1? _____
2. Describe how the proposed project/program will support new jobs or the retention of existing jobs? _____
3. Describe how the connectivity to different travel modes will be improved by the proposed project/program? _____
4. Does the proposed project/program cross multiple jurisdictions or counties? _____
5. Describe established partnerships associated with this project. _____
6. Why is this project/program regionally important? _____

High: A project/program will receive a high rating if it would significantly address a clearly demonstrated major regional problem. (16-25 points)

Medium: A project/program will receive a medium rating if it would either moderately address a major problem or significantly address a moderate level regional problem. (10-15 points)

Low: A project/program will receive a low rating if it would address a minor regional problem. (0-9 points)

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT for Discussion Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 3, 2018)

B. Board-approved TIP Focus Areas (25 points max)

1. Describe and provide quantitative evidence (e.g., number of persons by applicable category in service area, and number expected to use services) for how the project or program will **improve mobility infrastructure and services for vulnerable populations (including improved transportation access to health services)**.
 - a. Description (i.e., qualitative): _____
 - b. Current Data: _____
 - c. After-Project Data Estimates: _____
2. Describe and provide quantitative evidence (e.g. vehicle and person travel delay, bridge or pavement condition) for how elements of the proposed project or program will **increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network**.
 - a. Description (i.e., qualitative): _____
 - b. Current Data: _____
 - c. After-Project Data Estimates: _____
3. Describe and provide quantitative evidence (e.g. crash reduction) for how the proposed project or program will **improve transportation safety and security**.
 - a. Description (i.e., qualitative): _____
 - b. Current Data: _____
 - c. After-Project Data Estimates: _____

GUIDANCE: Applicants must provide current-condition data and after-project estimates based on the applicable elements of the project to clearly show quantifiable benefits and a positive return on investment. Please refer to Attachment B-2 to assist in the calculation of quantitative benefits. DRCOG staff can provide assistance.

High: A project/program will receive a high rating if it would significantly improve the safety and/or security, significantly increase the reliability of the transportation network and would benefit a large number and variety of users (including vulnerable populations*). (25 points)

Medium: A project/program will receive a medium rating if it would moderately improve the safety and/or security, moderately increase the reliability of the transportation network and would benefit a moderate number and variety of users (including vulnerable populations*). (15 points)

Low: A project/program will receive a low rating if it would minimally improve the safety and/or security, minimally increase the reliability of the transportation network and would benefit a limited number and variety of users (including vulnerable populations*). (10 points)

**Vulnerable populations include: Individuals with disabilities, persons over age 65, and low-income, minority, or linguistically-challenged persons.*

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT for Discussion Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 3, 2018)

C. Consistency with Metro Vision and the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (30 points max)

1. Metro Vision Measures (25 points):

As applicable, describe and provide quantified current data and after-project estimates on how any of the eight Metro Vision transportation-related performance measures will be addressed by elements of the proposed project or program? See schematic table:

	Transportation-related Metro Vision Performance Measures	Does Project Address Measure?		Current Data and After-Project Estimates	
		Check if yes	Describe How?	Current Data	After-Project Estimates
1	Increase the non-single-occupant-vehicle (non-SOV) mode share to work				
2	Decrease vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita				
3	Decrease traffic congestion - average travel time variation (peak vs. off-peak)				
4	Reduce daily person delay per capita				
5	Reduce the number of traffic fatalities				
6	Reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per capita				
7	Increase the share of the region's population living in areas with housing and transportation costs affordable to the typical household in the region				
8	Increase the share of the region's housing and employment near high-frequency transit				

GUIDANCE: Applicants must provide existing-condition data and after-project estimates of level of benefits associated with each applicable measure to clearly show quantifiable benefits and a positive return on investment. Please refer to Attachment B-2 to assist in the calculation of quantitative benefits. DRCOG staff can provide assistance.

High: A project/program will receive a high rating if it addresses five or **more** of the Metro Vision 2040 transportation-related performance measures. Points will be assigned by magnitude of benefits (15-25 points).

Medium: A project/program will receive a medium rating if it addresses **three or four** of the Metro Vision 2040 transportation-related performance measures. Points will be assigned by magnitude of benefits (10-20 points).

Low: A project/program will receive a low rating if it addresses two or **less** of the Metro Vision 2040 transportation-related performance measures. Points will be assigned by magnitude of benefits (0-15 points).

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT for Discussion Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 3, 2018)

2. Other Metro Vision Objectives (5 points):

Will the project/program address other objectives of Metro Vision? (e.g., efficiency of freight and goods movement, open space access, healthy and active choices, and others): _____

D. Funding effectiveness (20 points max)

Measure is calculated as follows: The sum of points received above in Sections A-C of Part 2, divided by the total DRCOG federal funding request. Point allocation ranges to be determined.

Quantifying Benefits of Proposed Projects/Programs (Regional Share)

Metro Vision Focus Areas and Transportation Performance Measures

(January 3, 2018)

There are several types of variables for which current data and after-project/program benefits can be obtained or estimated to derive values indicating a project benefit. Most variables relate to either:

- **Use** of a facility or service
 - e.g., transit ridership, traffic volumes, bicycle/pedestrian users
- **Operational** outcomes of the facility or service
 - e.g., crashes, fatalities, serious injuries, incidents, travel delay, pavement/bridge condition, SOV/VMT/GHG reduction
- **Socioeconomic/Land Use**
 - e.g., households, employment, density, accessibility, environmental justice, demographic characteristics

The applicant must provide current data and after-project/program estimates for those benefits expected to be obtained. Current data should be obtained by the applicant, from the facility “owner” or service operator (e.g., CDOT, RTD, local government) or from recent studies (e.g., PELs or NEPA). After-data can be calculated with established engineering techniques or estimated with clearly defined methodology and assumptions. Upon request, DRCOG staff can use the regional travel model to develop estimates for certain types of large-scale projects.

Below are examples of specific variables which can have an impact on the Metro Vision Focus Areas and/or Metro Vision Performance Measures. Not all variables will apply to every project.

- **Transit Ridership** on transit facility or using a new service (average daily).
- **Bicycle** usage (average daily).
- **Pedestrian** usage, including wheelchairs and any non-pedaled devices (average daily).
- **SOV** (Single Occupant Vehicle) trip reduction (average daily) — Based on taking the estimated increase in Non-SOV users from previous variables (e.g., transit, bicycle, pedestrian) and factoring for those who previously would have made an SOV trip. For example:
 - Increase of one-way transit trips = 1,000 per day
 - Less 20% for those who shifted from another transit route = 800
 - X 50% for those who previously drove alone as SOV = 400 decrease in SOV trips
- **VMT** reduction (average daily) — Multiply the SOV reduction calculated previously by the applicable mode average trip length (e.g., 1 mile for pedestrian, 3 miles for bicycle, and 9 miles for transit).
- **GHG** emissions — Determined from estimated VMT reduction for most projects. Applicant must justify procedures if not based on VMT reduction (e.g., alternative fuel vehicle projects).
- **Vulnerable** populations — Number of people in service area, increase in trips provided, accessibility improvement to health facilities (Populations include: Individuals with disabilities, persons over age 65, and low-income, minority, or linguistically-challenged persons.)
- **Traffic Congestion** — Vehicle and person hours of delay (peak periods or daily) based on existing and after-project traffic volumes. Calculated with industry standard HCM-based

Quantifying Benefits of Proposed Projects/Programs (Regional Share)

Metro Vision Focus Areas and Transportation Performance Measures

(January 3, 2018)

software programs and procedures (e.g., Synchro). Adjust to person hours of delay based on average auto occupancy factor (e.g., 1.4) and observed bus ridership.

- **Crashes** — Total, Fatal, and Serious Injuries (Before-data: annual average based on at least 3 years of data; After-data: based on industry accepted crash reduction factor (CRF) or accident modification factor (AMF) practices (e.g., NCHRP Project 17-25 or NCHRP Report 617, DiExSys methodology).
- **Pavement** condition — Obtain condition rating from the facility owner’s pavement management system and convert to a 10-point scale.
- **Bridge** condition rating — Obtain from CDOT bridge structure database.
- **Housing and Employment** near high-frequency transit — Sponsor calculate households and employment within 1/3 mile of such new service.

Other beneficial variables as identified by the applicant and applicable to the proposed project:

- _____
- _____

DRCOG staff can provide assistance as requested.

ATTACH C

ATTACHMENT C

2020-2023 TIP Policy Document Anticipated Schedule and Topics

Updated January 2, 2018

TIP Policy Work Group Activity	2017												2018												2019				
	May	Jun	July		Aug		Sept		Oct	Nov		Dec	Jan	Feb		Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	
			Mtg 1	Mtg 2	Mtg 1	Mtg 2	Mtg 1	Mtg 2		Mtg 1	Mtg 2		Mtg 1	Mtg 2	Mtg 1	Mtg 2													
General Policy Topics																													
TIP Focus Areas	X						X	O																					
Set-Asides					X	O																							
Quantifying Benefits		X																											
Regional and Subregional Funding Split Targets	X	X			X	X				X	X/O																		
Regional Share Policy Topics																													
Regional Definition/Project Eligibility	X				X	X				X	X/O																		
Regional Project/Program Evaluation Criteria	X											X	O																
Subregional Share Policy Topics																													
Subregional Distribution Formula/Geography					X																								
Formation of Subregional Forums / Initial Mtgs.																													
Subregional Project/Program Framework & Criteria														X	O														
TIP Policy Adoption and Calls for Projects																													
TIP Policy Draft Discussion and Action																X/O													
Regional Share Call for Projects																													
Regional Share Review of Applications																													
Board Action to Recommend Regional Share Projects																													
Subregional Share Call for Projects																													
Subregional Project Review & Recommendations																													
Subregion Presentations to Board																													
Board Action - Subregional Projects & Draft 20-23 TIP																													
Draft 2020-2023 TIP - Public Hearing																													
Final 2020-2023 TIP Action																													

- Board Work Session Discussion **X**
- Board Action/Direction **O**
- TIP Policy Work Group Discussion
- Other Ongoing Activities