

AGENDA

TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 17

Tuesday, January 22, 2018

1:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Conference Room – 1st Floor, west side

1. 1:30 Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. January 9, 2018 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)
4. Update on January 17 DRCOG Board discussions and action
Doug Rex
5. 1:45 Action on Regional Share Framework - evaluation criteria
(Attachment B) Todd Cottrell
6. 3:00 Discussion on Subregional Forum formation
(Attachment C) Todd Cottrell
7. 3:55 Other Matters
8. 4:00 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.



ATTACH A

ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg. 16 Monday, January 9, 2018

PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Kent Moorman	Adams County, City of Thornton
Kathleen Bracke	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
Ken Lloyd	Regional Air Quality Council
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motor

Others present: Aaron Bustow, Bill Haas, FHWA; Tom Reiff, Town of Castle Rock

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Flo Raitano, Mark Northrop, Andy Taylor, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Doug Rex called the meeting to order at 2:39 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

December 6, 2017 Meeting Summary

The summary was accepted.

Summary of December 20 Board meeting

Doug Rex updated the work group on the December Board's informational briefing about Regional Framework eligibility and funding split. Staff noted the Board discussed, but made no decision on these topics. The Board agreed to not continue discussion at the next Board Work Session, but bring action on this item to the January 17 Board.

Mr. Rex said there was also Board discussion in December on increasing the maximum number of Regional project submittals by Subregions to up to three projects, instead of two. After discussion by those TPWG members present, **the work group agreed to recommend the Board consider increasing the maximum number of projects to up to three projects per Subregion.**

The work group discussed whether to keep the current recommendation of a 50% cap or increase to 80% of total cost. It was noted the percentage cap is suggested only for Regional projects; the Subregions may do differently. After TPWG discussion, **the work group was in consensus to not change the current Board recommendation of \$20 million, 50% of total cost for Regional Share submittals.**

Regarding studies for projects eligible for DRCOG funds, after TPWG discussion, **the work group was in consensus that all studies are eligible.**

Regarding Bike/Ped project eligibility, after TPWG discussion, **the work group was in consensus to keep the current eligibility recommendation that bicycle projects must either be on the Bicycle Corridors map or from any adopted local plan.**

Discussion on Regional Share Framework - evaluation criteria

Todd Cottrell presented updated Regional Share Framework documents for: 1) evaluation criteria and 2) methods/resources for quantifying existing conditions and post-project benefits.

Comments on Framework (Attachment B-1) Part 1-Project Information

- Janice Finch suggested adding Bridge or Grade Separation Structure to #5 (types of projects)
- Kent Moorman suggested adding dollar amount of request to #8.
- Tom Schomer suggested defining specifically what scalable means; maybe use another word.
- Art Griffith suggested asking if a project be phased.
- John Cotten suggested including both scalable and phased
- Ted Heyd suggested requesting sponsors to include a project map in #2 and spell out acronyms, such as Regional Transportation Plan and Fiscally Constrained.

Comments on Framework (Attachment B-1) Part 2-Evaluation Criteria and Questions

Section A (Regional significance of proposed project/program):

- Janice Finch questioned having #2 (how project will support new jobs or retention of existing jobs) and how it would be quantified. She suggested instead using the urban center concept. Kent Moorman noted urban centers are more Part C (Metro Vision). Staff will revise the question.
- Kent Moorman said question #6 (why is this project/program regionally important?) should be placed #1.
- There was discussion on prioritizing/weighting #4 (does project cross multiple jurisdictions or counties). It was noted the Board strongly felt a project that crosses subregions should be given some type of priority. Kent Moorman noted there is a difference in a project crossing several jurisdictional boundaries versus a project serving multiple jurisdictions.

Section B (Board-approved TIP Focus Areas):

- Art Griffith asked for more clarification of current data and after-project data. Sponsors are asked to provide base quantifiable descriptions. DRCOG can provide some data or access to geographical files.

Section C (Consistency with Metro Vision and the 2040 MVRTP)

- Tom Schomer asked if #6 (reduce GHG per capita) data will be provided by DRCOG. Steve Cook said GHG is based directly on VMT.
- Mr. Schomer asked how to quantify #7 (increase share of populations living in affordable housing/transportation). Andy Taylor explained, as an example, increasing the mix of housing/jobs can impact the Housing Transportation (H&T) Index. DRCOG will provide more details.
- Janice Finch noted concern that #7 is not tied to project, but to area. Need to reword #7 and said this could be where the urban center concept could be placed.
- Ted Heyd said #5 (reducing number of traffic fatalities) doesn't include injuries. It was noted this fatality measure comes directly from Metro Vision.
- Art Griffith felt #7 (increase share of affordable housing/transportation) would be difficult to quantify. Andy Taylor said this could be calculated with the H+T Index data. DRCOG Regional Planning Development staff will work on methods to provide this data to sponsors.

- Kent Moorman asked how the Board wanted to look at Person Miles Traveled versus Vehicle Miles Traveled. Steve Cook noted Person Miles Traveled is demonstrated in Section B, #2. It was noted #2 (VMT) is the specific performance measure in Metro Vision.
- Janice Finch asked if 'transit dependent or zero-car' is considered a vulnerable population. Steve Cook said this is not for EJ purposes, but could be part of telling how the project will serve these vulnerable populations.
- Kathleen Bracke said the urban center concept needs to be called out earlier in the document, and not within "Other Metro Vision Objectives".

Section D (Funding effectiveness)

There was discussion on the cost-effectiveness formula. Staff will revise further.

- Art Griffith and Kent Moorman felt leveraging is important; should receive more scoring points.

Point ranges in boxes

- Art Griffith asked for more discussion on quantifying the point ranges (high, medium, low)
- Janice Finch felt it could become too subjective if the scale of "significantly, moderately, etc. categories is not defined.
- Doug Rex said staff has reached out to Puget Sound to get more insight into their scale definitions.

Update of TPWG Anticipated Schedule and Topics

An updated proposed timeline (Attachment C) was provided in the agenda. Steve Cook said the formation of the Subregional Forum and initial meetings was added to the timeline, as well as the Subregion presentations to the Board. In this timeline, the proposed Regional Call for Projects is scheduled for May 2018 and the proposed Subregional Call for Projects is September/October 2018.

- Janice Finch noted several timeline items:
 - Regional project presentations to the Board should be listed in timeline.
 - the listing of having Board action on the Subregional criteria in February 2018 is incorrect. Staff will revise to a later date.
 - staff should list a Board workshop discussion before a Board decision in August 2018, as well as for all the Board decision items in 2019.
- Art Griffith felt the May 2018 schedule (Regional call) is too aggressive and should be pushed out at least a month, more towards end of June 2018.

Subregional Forums

There was discussion on the role of DRCOG starting the formation of Subregions.

- Dave Baskett said counties have not been empowered formally by DRCOG to form Subregions. He said, in Jefferson County, IGAs will be needed as jurisdictions won't proceed until the structure is formally agreed-upon. He said he is limited by not having target dates.
- Doug Rex noted most Subregions have already been informally meeting. Mr. Rex asked what could be provided to help Jefferson County along (perhaps providing the revised TIP Policy document).
- Kent Moorman noted Adams County officials have put the Subregional process on hold until they heard from the DRCOG Board. He suggested the DRCOG Board needs to have a formal action item or a recommendation to form the Subregions.
- Mr. Rex noted the Board has given direction to pursue the dual model, but staff can advise the Board that the Subregions will be formed.
- Dave Baskett said DRCOG should be the entity to convene the first official meeting of a Subregion with its respective communities. Mr. Rex agreed that could be done.

- There was a question of whether formal IGAs are even a necessity for the Subregions. Staff will ask Puget Sound for guidance on the way they structured. Janice Finch suggested a partnering charter could be established, as it's really a planning-level recommendation and is not binding to jurisdictions or to DRCOG.
- Art Griffith agreed the Board should formally convene the Subregions within the next month. He said a Subregion doesn't need to form an IGA. The process is just submitting a set of priority projects at a Subregional level, and selecting a representative to present the projects.

As the next Board agenda packet deadline is tomorrow, Doug Rex said, instead of seeking a formal Board motion to recommend convening the Subregions, he would inform the January Board that DRCOG will reach out to each Subregion to formally establish the Subregions.

- Mr. Rex said DRCOG will provide background on the dual model process at formal introductory meetings for each of the Subregions.

Subregional Forum-Meeting Postings

Regarding informal Subregional meetings already being held, Mr. Rex reminded the work group of DRCOG policy that if three or more elected officials (Board members) meet, the meeting must be publicly posted.

The meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January 22, 2018.

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 22, 2018	Action	5

SUBJECT

Regional Share policy topics.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 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 discussions at the December 6 and January 9 Work Group meetings.

An updated Regional Share framework for evaluating project/program applications are attached for final review and discussion. To continue a path to adopt a TIP policy, staff asks for action to incorporate this evaluation framework into the draft TIP Policy document.

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 project scoring panel (yet to be defined) would review and discuss the applications and provide updated specific point scores based on all the eligible applications received.

Attachment B-1 contains the draft Regional Share application instructions, foundational questions, evaluation criteria, and proposed point structures. Key changes from the document presented at the January 9 meeting include:

- Reorganization of the document:
 - Part 1: Project Information
 - Part 2: Project Benefit Calculations (moved up from “appendix” to lay out the benefits prior to the scoring section.)
 - Part 3: Evaluation Criteria, Questions, and Scoring
- Added roadway/railroad grade separation project element
- Addition of specific data and formulas to the benefit calculation sections of Part 2
- Addition of a criterion (D.) in Part 3 to evaluate the leveraging of non-Regional Share funds.

Further discussion is required on how to handle studies submitted for funding.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[December 6, 2017](#)

[January 9, 2018](#)

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the Board of Directors evaluation criteria for Regional Share projects/programs to incorporate into the draft 2020-2023 TIP Policy document.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Regional Share Framework - Evaluation Criteria

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 22, 2018)

Project/Program Application and Evaluation Criteria Instructions

Sponsors of applications must complete the base information (Part 1), benefits calculations (Part 2), and provide responses to the evaluation questions (Part 3). A Regional Share “project review panel” will use the responses as a basis for reviewing projects/programs that request funding.

Point values will be assigned by the project review panel in the five criterion categories of Part 3 (A - E) below. Points will be based on the criteria addressed and the magnitude of benefits. The highest possible total score is 100 points.

DRCOG staff will review submitted applications for eligibility and complete an initial review of the base information and benefit calculations. The applications will then be provided to the project review panel for final review, scoring, and recommendations. The score may not necessarily be the one and only factor considered by the panel as it develops project selection recommendations.

Part 1: Base 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 from CDOT and/or RTD, if applicable. 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/Program start and end points, or geographic area (include map):

3. Project/Program Sponsor: _____
4. Facility Owner/Operator: _____
If Owner/Operator is different from project sponsor, attach applicable concurrence documentation.
5. Identify the project/program’s key elements (check all that apply):
 - Rapid Transit Capacity (2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan)
 - Transit other: _____
 - Bicycle facility
 - Pedestrian facility / features
 - Roadway Capacity or Managed Lanes (2040 FC RTP)
 - Roadway Operational
 - Roadway/Railroad Grade Separation
 - Roadway Pavement reconstruction/rehab
 - Bridge replace/reconstruct/rehab
 - Study
 - Design
 - Other: _____

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 22, 2018)

6. What specific **existing REGIONAL 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, phases, scopes, and cost for each:

9. Amount of DRCOG Regional Share Funding Request (not to exceed 50% of total project cost): \$_____ (no greater than \$20 million)
10. Amount provided by other local, state, or federal sources (with commitment documentation):
\$_____
11. Total Project Cost: \$_____

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 22, 2018)

Part 2: Project Benefit Calculations

(actual application form will look different)

There are several types of variables for which current data and after-project/program benefits can be obtained or estimated to indicate benefits. 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, reduction of trips by single occupant vehicle (SOV) vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions
- **Socioeconomic/Land Use**
 - e.g., households, population, employment, density, accessibility, vulnerable populations

The applicant must provide current data and after-project/program estimates for those benefits expected to be obtained – based on the key elements identified in Part 1. 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). Upon request, DRCOG staff can use the regional travel model to develop estimates for certain types of large-scale projects, and can also provide other assistance. Complete the appropriate sections below in Part 2 to derive benefit values for use in the evaluation criteria of Part 3, Sections B and C.

1. Transit Use Benefits: *(DRCOG will provide table of current RTD route ridership & station boardings for reference)*

- a) Current ridership weekday boardings: _____
- b) Population within ½ mile _____ + Employment within ½ mile _____ = _____
 = = = = =
- c) Estimated additional daily transit boardings: ____ *(provide support documentation, e.g. from RTD)*
- d) number previously on transit: ____ (e.g., use 25%)
- e) number previously on other non-SOV modes: ____ (e.g., 25% HOV, walk, bicycle)
- c – d – e = ____ **SOV trips reduced**
- f) x 9 miles = ____ **VMT reduced** *(Values other than defaults must be justified by sponsor)*
- g) x 0.95 lbs. = ____ **pounds GHG emissions reduced**

2. Bicycle Use Benefits: *(DRCOG will provide table of current example bicycle use on facilities for reference)*

- a) Current weekday bicyclists: _____
- b) Population within ½ mile _____ + Employment within ½ mile _____ = _____
 = = = = =
- c) Estimated additional weekday bicycle trips: _____
- d) number previously on other non-SOV modes: ____ (e.g., 50% HOV, walk, bicycle, transit)
- e) c – d = ____ **SOV trips reduced**
- f) X percentage replacing an SOV trip: ____ (e.g., 30%) = ____ **SOV trips reduced**
- g) x 2 miles = ____ **VMT reduced** *(Values other than defaults must be justified by sponsor)*
- h) x 0.95 lbs. = ____ **pounds GHG emissions reduced**

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 22, 2018)

3. Pedestrian Use Benefits: *(DRCOG will provide table of current example bicycle use on facilities for reference)*

- a) Current weekday pedestrians (include users of all non-pedaled devices): _____
- b) Population within ½ mile _____ + Employment within ½ mile _____ = _____
 = = = = =
- c) Estimated additional weekday pedestrian trips: _____
- d) number previously on other non-SOV modes: ___ (e.g., 50% HOV, walk, bicycle, transit)
- e) c – d = ___ **SOV trips reduced**
- f) X percentage replacing an SOV trip: _____ (e.g., 30%) = _____ **SOV trips reduced**
- g) x 0.4 miles = _____ **VMT reduced** *(Values other than defaults must be justified by sponsor)*
- h) x 0.95 lbs. = _____ **pounds GHG emissions reduced**

4. Vulnerable Population Benefits:

- a) Persons over age 65 within ½ mile: ___; # Estimated to be served per day: ___
- b) Minority persons within ½ mile: ___; # Estimated to be served per day: ___
- c) Linguistically-challenged persons within ½ mile: ___; # Estimated to be served per day: ___
- d) Individuals with disabilities: # Estimated to be served per day: ___
- e) Health service facilities served by project: _____

5. Travel Delay (Congestion Reduction) Benefits:

Sponsor must use industry standard Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) based software programs and procedures to calculate estimated weekday travel delay benefits. DRCOG staff may be able to use the regional travel model to develop estimates for certain types of large-scale projects.

- a) Current ADT (average daily traffic volume) on applicable segments: _____
- b) Current weekday vehicle hours of delay (VHD): _____
 = = = = =
- c) Calculated future (after project) weekday vehicle hours of delay: _____
- d) b - c = Reduced VHD: ___
- e) d x 1.4 = **Reduced person hours of delay:** ___ *(Value other than 1.4 must be proven by sponsor)*
- f) After project **peak hour congested travel time reduction** per vehicle: _____

6. Traffic Crash Reduction Benefits:

Sponsor must use industry accepted crash reduction factor (CRF) or accident modification factor (AMF) practices (e.g., NCHRP Project 17-25, NCHRP Report 617, or DiExSys methodology)

- a) Current (most recent 3-year period annualized) total fatal crashes: ___
- b) Current total serious injury crashes: _____
- c) Current total property damage only crashes: _____
 = = = = =
- d) Estimated reduction in annual crashes applicable to the project scope:
 - **Fatal crashes reduced:** ___
 - Serious injury crashes reduced: ___
 - Property damage only crashes reduced: ___

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 22, 2018)

7. Pavement Condition Benefits:

Sponsor must use current industry accepted pavement condition methods, calculate the average condition across all sections of pavement being replaced or modified, and convert to a 10-point scale.

- a) Current pavement condition: _____
- b) Average Daily Traffic Volume: _____ ADT

8. Bridge Improvement Benefits:

- a) Current bridge condition (from CDOT): _____
- b) Average Daily Traffic Volume: _____ ADT

9. Other beneficial variables identified for specific types of projects and calculated by the sponsor:

- a) _____
- b) _____

ATTACHMENT B-1
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria** (January 22, 2018)

Part 3: Evaluation Criteria, Questions, and Scoring

(actual application form will look different)

This part includes five sections (A - E) for the applicant to provide qualitative and quantitative responses for the project review panel to use for scoring projects.

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

Provide responses to the following qualitative questions:

1. Why is this project/program **regionally important**? _____
2. Does the proposed project/program **cross multiple jurisdictions or counties**? _____
3. How will the proposed project/program address the **specific transportation problem** described in the problem statement submitted in Part 1? _____
4. Will the completed project/program **support new jobs** or the retention of existing jobs?

5. How will connectivity to **different travel modes** be improved by the proposed project/program? _____
6. Have **partnerships** been established in association with this project? _____

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 Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 22, 2018)

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

The DRCOG Board of Directors approved three Focus Areas for the 2020-2023 TIP to address. Provide qualitative and quantitative (derived from Part 2) responses to the following items:

1. Describe how the project or program will **improve mobility infrastructure and services for vulnerable populations (including improved transportation access to health services)**. Provide quantitative evidence of benefits.
 - a. Description:

 - b. Quantified Benefits (e.g., reference Part 2): _____

2. Describe how the project or program will **increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network**. Provide quantitative evidence of benefits.
 - a. Description:

 - b. Quantified Benefits (e.g., reference Part 2): _____

3. Describe how the project or program will **improve transportation safety and security**. Provide quantitative evidence of benefits.
 - a. Description:

 - b. Quantified Benefits (e.g., reference Part 2): _____

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. Use results calculated in Part 2. 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 Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 22, 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 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?		Relevant Data and After-Project Benefits From Part 2.	
		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			n/a	n/a
8	Increase the share of the region's housing and employment near high-frequency transit			n/a	n/a

GUIDANCE: Applicants must provide existing-condition data and after-project estimates (from Part 2) of level of benefits associated with each applicable measure to clearly show quantifiable benefits and a positive return on investment. 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 Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (January 22, 2018)

2. Other Metro Vision Objectives (5 points):

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

Section A-C subtotal points: ____ (80 points max)

D. Leveraging of non-Regional Share funds (“overmatch”) (15 points max)

Projects/programs with outside funding sources (non-Regional Share) representing 50% of the total project cost will receive one point. Projects/programs with outside funding sources representing 90% or more of the total project cost will receive 15 points.

Example:

90%+ outside funding: 15 points

85-89% : 13 pts

80-84% : 11 pts

75-79% : 9 pts

70-74% : 7 pts

65-69% : 5 pts

60-64% : 3 pts

50-59% : 1 pt.

E. Funding Request Benefit Value (5 points max)

Points per \$million requested is calculated as follows: The subtotal of points (maximum 80) received above in Sections A-C of Part 3, divided by the total DRCOG federal funding request (in millions).

Examples:

Project A: Benefit Points in Sections A-C = 60; Funding request in millions = \$10 million
 $60 / \$10 = 6.0$ benefit value (pts./\$million)

Project B: Benefit Points in Sections A-C = 50; Funding request in millions = \$3 million
 $50 / \$3 = 15.0$ benefit value (pts./\$million)

Example, if Benefit Value =

12.0+ : 5 points

10.0-11.9 : 4 pts

8.0-9.9 : 3 pts

6.0-7.9 : 2 pts

4.0-5.9 : 1 pt.

ATTACH C

ATTACHMENT C

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 22, 2018	Discussion	6

SUBJECT

Subregional Share forum formation topics.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

This agenda item is to discuss the requirements and guidelines associated with the formation and conduct of Subregional Forums. Topic areas derived from the February 2017 TIP Review Work Group report, [Recommended Funding and Project Selection Framework](#), and from previous discussions include:

Forum Formation:

- No formal governance structure document or agreement (IGA, MOU/MOA, etc.) is required. It is up to each individual Subregional Forum to adopt such governance agreements or less formal “partnerships charters” if they wish. All actions taken by forums are ultimately a recommendation back to the DRCOG Board.
- DRCOG staff can participate and assist in the initial formation meetings at the level requested by each Subregional Forum.

Forum Membership/Decision-Making:

- Since the subregional forums are an extension of DRCOG governance, all DRCOG member municipal and county government entities within each Subregion must be invited to join, though participation is optional. Each entity will designate an elected official or designee as the representative. Each forum member entity will have a vote, with the voting/decision-making structure to be determined by each Subregion.

Discussion: Should only DRCOG member governments or dues-paying DRCOG participants (i.e., Weld County) be required invitees?

- RTD and CDOT will be invited as non-voting members.
- Other members are allowed at the discretion of each Subregion.

Discussion: Is there any unique guidance to provide the City and County of Denver and Broomfield, considering they do not have multiple local governments associated with their forums?

Other Forum Invitees:

- The following additional entities (eligible to submit projects/programs for TIP funding) should be invited to attend forum meetings:

- Incorporated jurisdictions within the subarea that are not DRCOG members.
- State/regional/other agencies eligible for the direct receipt of federal TIP funding and permitted to administer and implement such projects/programs.
- Other forum participants/attendees at the discretion of each forum.

Posting and Conduct of Meetings

- Official Subregional Forum meetings must:
 - follow the compliance requirements of both the meeting host agency and of DRCOG (post agenda to DRCOG website and in the official public meeting binder in the DRCOG reception area, no less than twenty-four hours prior to the meeting).
 - be open to public and contain a period for public comment.
- Subcommittees formally established by the Subregional Forum must follow the meeting requirements above.
- Any informal “sub-group” meetings involving three or more DRCOG Board Directors must follow the requirements for Subregional Forum meetings above.

Initial Duties/Documented Process:

- Per FHWA’s letter to DRCOG in February 2017, “*Subgeographical units will provide DRCOG with their documented process prior to commencement, ensuring that the local entities are engaging in an equal process and a competitive environment for all stakeholders and project sponsors.*”
 - Documented procedures should include at a minimum: forum invitees, member entities and designated representatives, other invited participants/attendees, formation and role of formal sub-committees, and any other officially established procedures.
 - Summaries of actions and attendance at Forum meetings should be maintained.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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