

Bob Roth, Chair  
Herb Atchison, Vice Chair  
Bob Fifer, Secretary  
John Diak, Treasurer  
Elise Jones, Immediate Past Chair  
Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director

## AGENDA

### TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 18

Tuesday, February 13, 2018

2:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Conference Room – 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, west side

1. 2:30 Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. January 22, 2018 Meeting Summary  
(Attachment A)
4. 2:45 Discussion on Subregional Forums  
(Attachment B) Doug Rex
5. 4:00 Discussion on Regional Share Framework – evaluation criteria  
(Attachment C) Todd Cottrell
6. 4:25 Other Matters
7. 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!**



# ATTACH A

## ATTACHMENT A

### MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg. 17 Monday, January 22, 2018

#### 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	Boulder County, City of Boulder
Tom Schomer	Broomfield, City and County
Danny Herrmann	CDOT
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: Bill Haas, FHWA; Daniel Hutton, Denver South EDP

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

#### Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

#### Public Comment

There was no public comment.

#### December 6, 2017 Meeting Summary

The summary was accepted.

#### **Update on January 17 DRCOG Board discussions and action**

Doug Rex updated the work group on the January 17 Board's action on the Regional Share Framework (project/program eligibility) and funding allocation. A summary of what was approved includes:

- a maximum number of Regional Share project submissions of up to three projects per Subregion and up to two projects each for CDOT and RTD,
- awarding up to \$20 million, 50% of total cost maximums for Regional Share project funding requests, and
- a funding share allocation of 80% Subregional and 20% Regional.

Mr. Rex said DRCOG staff will begin to formalize the Subregional Forums over the next few weeks. He noted \$280 million in total funding is an estimate; CDOT is working on providing the FY2020-2023 TIP allocation amount.

## **Discussion on Regional Share Framework - evaluation criteria**

Todd Cottrell presented further refinements to the draft evaluation criteria form, per comments from previous discussions.

### **Part 1: Base Information**

#### **Evaluation Criteria instructions box**

- Janice Finch suggested providing more details about the makeup of the review panel and what they will be considering, and to clarify the last sentence in the box about other factors the scoring review panel may use.
- Ms. Finch suggested having project presentations to the review panel to get a short list of projects for presentation to the Board.

#### **Part 1, #5 (key elements list)**

- Ted Heyd suggested removing 'features' in "Pedestrian facility/features".
- Art Griffith suggested adding "Safety Improvement" in list.
- There was discussion on whether to have a 'primary focus' list or keep as is (multi-options):
  - Mac Callison suggested sponsors check-off only a few key elements to provide more focus of what project is, rather than checking off all applicable.
  - Jeanne Shreve agreed and suggested separating into two parts, i.e., 5A: *What are 1 or 2 key elements* (the applicant would describe); and 5B: *What are the yielded benefits* (applicant would then check off all using the full list). She said there needs to show more connection between the base information in Part 1 and other parts (focus areas, etc.).
  - Dave Baskett said shouldn't limit; shows a project is more than a single element.
  - Steve Cook said the intent of the #5 (key element list) is to tie-in to Part 2, not to score; staff will revise to make the tie-in more explicit.

#### **Part 1, #6 (problem statement)**

- Kathleen Bracke suggested rewording to "*What specific regional problem will the project/program address, related to the Metro Vision goals or focus areas?*"
- Kent Moorman suggested stating as regional 'issue/s', instead of 'problem', saying it may be an issue today that the sponsor is trying to solve *before* it becomes a problem.

#### **Part 1: #8 (Is the project/program scalable)**

- There was discussion on defining scalability:
  - Chris Quinn said to rephrase the question more as, "*how the project could be scalable*", so a review panel is aware of what scope elements could be removed if necessary. Staff will review language used in TIGER grant.
  - Steve Cook said there could be a question on "how much funding request flexibility the project has" and "are they willing to accept less funding?"
  - George Gerstle summarized that more guidance on scalability and funding flexibility should be added, noting a project still needs to show how it remains consistent with the original intent of the project.

### **Part 2: Project Benefit Calculations**

Steve Cook explained this section is quantitative information (not raw scoring) that will be used by the review panel in the analysis of Part 3. After discussion, it was noted staff will beef up the language in the introduction to better interrelate how sections tie together.

#### **Part 2, #1. Transit Use Benefits**

- In 1-b, Kathleen Bracke suggested increasing transit "Population/Employment within ½ mile" to within 1 mile. (e.g., First/Final Mile)

- Art Griffith asked if headways and meeting demand will be evaluated. Need to better define what the time period of the forecast is. Steve Cook said historically, it's short-range (time of the TIP).
- Art Griffith said 1-f (*calculate VMT reduced*) should be clarified as being a one-way trip.
- George Gerstle asked that average trip lengths in 1-f (*calculate VMT reduced*) be differentiated between regional transit or local transit.
- George Gerstle asked that 1-d (*number previously on transit*) be clarified; staff will reword.

#### Part 2, #2. Bicycle Use Benefits

- In 2-b, Ted Heyd suggested increasing bicycle "Population/Employment within ½ mile" to within 1 mile. Art Griffith and George Gerstle questioned why limit the distance. Steve Cook noted this calculation is for comparative purposes among projects.
- Janice Finch suggested having facility condition for each mode.
- For bicycle and pedestrian items, Mac Callison suggested trying to capture an emphasis on having higher safety, lower stress facilities, particularly for high volume areas (i.e., having separated bike lanes, etc.)
- Art Griffith said 2-g (*VMT reduced*) should be clarified as a one-way trip.
- Janice Finch asked, in 2-h (*Bicycle GHG reduction*) and in #3-h (*Pedestrian GHG reduction*), what if a project increases GHG. Should also be considering GHG in the roadway mode as well. George Gerstle agreed. Doug Rex and Steve Cook questioned the sensitivity of the DRCOG model to do this.

#### Part 2, #3. Pedestrian Use Benefits

- Change language in parenthesis to pedestrian, instead of bicycle.

#### Part 2, #4 Vulnerable Population Benefits

- Ted Heyd suggested adding 'households below poverty line'.
- Kathleen Bracke asked if all questions are limited to ½ mile radius.
  - George Gerstle said radius should not be constrained and suggested leaving it to the applicant.
- George Gerstle asked for more clarification of 'linguistically-challenged'. Staff noted this is the same as limited English proficiency.
- Janice Finch asked if 'transit dependent' or 'zero car' could be used. Doug Rex said identifying transit dependent as a vulnerable population would be difficult to determine.
- Mac Callison suggested adding 'children' (school age through driving age).

#### Part 2, #5. Travel Delay Benefits

- Mac Callison suggested, with projects spanning over 8 years, to consider the continued congestion increase and do a comparison of build/no-build, or implement/no-implement. Don't just look at benefits within the timeframe of the TIP, look beyond.
- Kathleen Bracke said person travel delay should be a separate measure. She questioned why measure by vehicle delay (using 1.4 persons per vehicle) if goal is to address person capacity (versus vehicle capacity). How does this calculate how a transit project could carry more people through a corridor; she suggested using transit forecasting.
  - Steve Cook said 1.4 is base information; if sponsor has more specific valid data, that data could be used.
- George Gerstle questioned measuring transit by how it reduces congestion for vehicles. Could we have a person travel delay measure that is not congestion, citing the T-Rex model.

Mac Callison mentioned the isochronal travel time approach. George Gerstle suggested using raw transit ridership data.

#### Part 2, #6. Traffic Crash Reduction Benefits:

- Kathleen Bracke suggested specifically stating crash data involves all modes.
- Kent Moorman suggested tying back to the federal-required Safety measures recently adopted by DRCOG.
- Tom Schomer questioned serious crashes versus injury crashes. Steve Cook noted it is tied to federal safety target definitions.
- Art Griffith suggested changing #6a (*Current total fatal crashes annualized*) to a 5-year period (from 3-year).

#### Part 2, #8. Bridge Improvement Benefits:

- Art Griffith said we need to look to rehabilitation versus replacement.
- Janice Finch asked how we can get at the multimodal capacity/safety of a bridge structure versus the actual structural condition (example: 38<sup>th</sup> St. bridge)
- Steve Cook suggested in Part 2, #7 (*Pavement Condition Benefits*) and #8 (*Bridge Improvement Benefits*) having a separate line each for Description and General Facility Condition.
  - Bryan Weimer asked do we want to fund structurally obsolete.
  - Art Griffith said focus on structurally deficient.
  - Janice Finch said if it's being multimodal connective, could include functionally obsolete.

### **Part 3: Evaluation Criteria, Questions, and Scoring**

#### Part 3, Section A. Regional significance of proposed project/program

- In #A-2 (*Does the proposed project/program cross multiple jurisdictions or counties?*)
  - Dave Baskett suggested changing 'cross' to 'benefit'.
  - Doug Rex said Board discussions were in favor of more points/priority for projects and programs benefiting multiple jurisdictions.
  - George Gerstle suggested adding "*as relates Metro Vision policies*"
  - Ted Heyd suggested changing 'jurisdictions' to "cities or counties".
  - Dave Baskett suggested: "*What is the overall benefit of the project?*"
- Kathleen Bracke said Board discussion was to encourage the Subregions to collaborate. She suggested adding a separate question: "How does the project/program foster regional collaboration?"
- Art Griffith suggested rewording #A-6 (*Have partnerships been established in association with this project?*) as: *Explain what financial partnerships have been established associated with this project?* Staff said this can tie back to Part 1, #10 (*Amount provided by other local, state, or federal sources*)
- Janice Finch questioned how a sponsor would show a partnership if it's based on speculation, as the Subregional Forums prioritize their projects after the Regional call. Steve Cook said partnerships would be described in Part 1, #10.
- In #A-4 (*How will the completed project/program support new jobs*)
  - Art Griffith suggested rewording to: "How will.....support new jobs or the retention of existing jobs...."
  - Art Griffith suggested changing questions to ask more "how", rather than yes or no.
  - Kathleen Bracke suggested "how will.....support job access"

- There was discussion on how scoring points would be determined. Staff noted the Review Panel will be deciding the high/medium/low ranges.
  - Ted Heyd said, like the TDM selection process, the process is not a scientific process and will be subjective.
  - Art Griffith said this application form is to justify the merit of the project, and suggested not scoring.
  - Dave Baskett questioned the subjectivity of a review panel and said the Board will still have to horse-trade.
  - Kathleen Bracke said it is important to have a qualitative review (like a college application).
  - Kent Moorman noted the funding amount is only around \$20 million, and the process should be more the RFP-type, rather than strictly quantitative.
  - Art Griffith suggested scoring using graphics of a blank circle, a half-filled circle, or full-circle, like a NEPA screening. He suggested using a bell curve.
  - George Gerstle suggested keeping qualitative; using circle graphics.
  - Bill Haas agreed with keeping more general, qualitative.

George Gerstle summarized, while quantification in Part 2 is important, the intent is to be more qualitative to get the top projects for the Board's review and selection.

#### Part 3, Section C. (Consistency with MV and the 2040 MVRTP)

- Bryan Weimer said there needs to be a quantification of the degree to which the project addresses a measure; there should be more detail than just a yes or no.
- Kathleen Bracke suggested calling out urban centers (currently in Section C (*Other Metro Vision Measures, #2*)) by including as a separate question under Section A (*Regional significance of proposed project/program*).
  - After discussion on how to do so, staff will consider how to incorporate Question 2 (*Other Metro Vision objectives*) into #9 in the Section C table of performance measures.

#### Part 3, Sections A, B, C, D, and E

- Steve Cook asked if high/medium/low ratings should still be used in Sections A through E.
  - George Gerstle said E. (*Funding Request Benefit Value*) is not useful, and is beyond measuring accuracy.

**As more refinements are needed, no action was taken** on evaluation criteria at this meeting.

#### Discussion on Subregional Forum formation

Doug Rex said the Board was informed at the January Board meeting that DRCOG is starting to formalize Subregional Forum formation.

#### Letter to Subregions

Staff is preparing a letter to be sent out to all the Board members.

- At a minimum, all DRCOG member local governments will be invited to serve/govern on the Subregional Forum. But a Subregion can, if it chooses, invite non-members of DRCOG to serve on its Forum.
- Any local government in the county is eligible to submit projects (including non-members of DRCOG).

#### Discussion on using IGAs:

- Doug Rex said an IGA is not required, but Subregions can each determine if they would like to require an IGA.

- Bryan Weimer asked if a Subregional can stipulate that an invited municipality must sign an IGA to be a voting member on the Forum.
- Art Griffith said Douglas County is doing a coalition rather than an IGA.
- George Gerstle said, while an IGA is not needed, FHWA does require the Subregions document their decision-making process. He asked if the signature of everybody participating is required. Doug Rex said it isn't. Mr. Gerstle asked how FHWA would know everyone agrees with the Forum's decision-making process. Bill Haas said ultimately, it is important the DRCOG Board be satisfied that participants of the Subregional Forum were supportive of the process. The process needs to pass the requirements of the Board, as the Board is ultimately responsible for the entire process.

#### Subregional Meeting Posting

- Art Griffith asked for clarification of posting notice of meetings and what expectations are for the number of meetings to be held. He said Douglas County expects to hold only a few—the initial meeting and the final recommendation meeting.
- Doug Rex said the number of meetings held is up to the Subregion and when Forum meetings are held, they need to be publicly posted per the hosting jurisdiction's policy and posted by DRCOG as well.
- There was a question on Subregions having a public comment period. Doug Rex said, for consistency, Subregional public comment periods are required to be the same as DRCOG.
- The DRCOG point person for the Subregional Forum meeting postings is Mark Northrop, [mnorthrop@drcog.or](mailto:mnorthrop@drcog.or) or 303 480-6771.

#### General comments

- Staff will be calling Puget Sound staff next week (February 1) to ask questions on how they handled their process. Todd Cottrell showed a copy of Puget Sound's written policy on their basic county processes (which have been in place for 15-20 years). He will email a copy to the work group.
- Janice Finch noted Denver and Broomfield (both are city/county governments) will have unique processes. Doug Rex said staff will meet with Denver and Broomfield to discuss.
- George Gerstle asked if any financial assistance could be made available to the counties for staffing for this process.
- Bryan Weimer asked if DRCOG staff will observe Subregional Forum meetings. Doug Rex said, once Forums are formalized, staff will attend. Staff could also attend pre-formalized meetings, if invited. Mr. Rex reminded that if three or more Board members are attending a meeting, meetings must be posted.

The meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m. Doug Rex noted the next Board Work Session (February 7) will be discussing concepts of the Subregional Forums. The next TIP Policy Work Group meeting is scheduled for February 13, 2018.

**ATTACH B**

## ATTACHMENT B

To: TIP Policy Work Group  
From: Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director  
303 480-6701 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
February 13, 2018	Action	4

### SUBJECT

Discussion on TIP Subregional Share Forum formation.

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation on foundational governance concepts for subregional forum formation.

### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

### SUMMARY

At the February 7 Board Work Session, directors discussed subregional share forum formation. Below are foundational governance concepts presented to them, including follow-up items they asked the TPWG to discuss.

#### A. Subregional Forum Membership/Decision-making Process

- Since subregional forums are an extension of DRCOG governance, all DRCOG member municipal and county government entities within each subregion shall be invited to participate in the project/program prioritization process, though individual entity participation is optional.
- Each entity who elects to participate shall designate an elected official or designee as their representative.
- Each forum member entity will have a vote. The voting/decision-making structure will be determined by each subregion.
- RTD and CDOT shall be invited as non-voting members.
- Other regional stakeholders may be invited to participate as a member of the subregional forum at the discretion of each subregion (e.g., non-DRCOG members, transportation management associations, chambers of commerce, universities, etc.).

#### B. Subregional Forum Formation

- DRCOG staff will initiate the formal establishment of the eight subregional forums by invitation to all DRCOG member governments. DRCOG staff expects to send out invitations in February for possible meetings in March.
- A formal governance structure document or agreement (IGA, MOU/MOA, etc.) is optional. It is up to each individual subregional forum to adopt such governance agreements or less formal “partnerships charters” or “project recommendation coalitions”, if they desire. All actions taken by subregional forums are ultimately a recommendation back to the DRCOG Board for its consideration.
- It is anticipated that DRCOG staff will attend all subregional forum meetings. Apart from the initial meeting that will be staffed by DRCOG, all further participation by DRCOG staff will be at the level requested by each subregional forum.

### **C. Entities eligible to submit Subregional Share TIP projects/programs**

- DRCOG member local governments within the subregion (regardless of whether it decided to participate as a formal member of the subregional forum).
- Local governments within the subarea that are not DRCOG members.
- Other state and regional agencies eligible for the direct receipt of federal TIP funding and permitted to administer and implement such projects/programs (examples include state universities and Transportation Demand Management agencies).

### **D. Agenda Posting and Notification**

- Subregional forum meetings shall:
  - follow the compliance requirements for posting meetings for the forum host agency and of DRCOG.
    - DRCOG's requirements include posting the agenda in the official DRCOG public meeting binder in the DRCOG reception area no less than twenty-four hours prior to the meeting. Meetings will also be posted on the DRCOG website.
  - be open to the public
  - contain a period for public comment.
- Any subcommittees formally established by the subregional forum (regardless of the make-up) must follow the subregional forum meetings requirements.
- All local governments within the subregion regardless of whether they are subregional forum members or not, must be notified of all subregional forum meetings.

### **E. 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.*"

Documentation may include:

- subregional forum member entities and designated representatives,
- other entities invited to attend subregional forum meetings,
- if applicable, any subregional forum formation governance agreements or documents,
- if applicable, membership of any formal subcommittees, and
- officially established procedures.

Each subregional forum shall maintain summaries of all actions and attendance.

### **Discussion Items**

- As currently proposed, in order for a governmental entity to be invited to participate on a subregional forum, its corporate limits must be physically located within the

respective county. If a governmental entity simply owns property within the county, it would not be eligible to serve on the subregional forum. Does this definition need to be revised?

- Should guidelines be formalized for when two or more subregions agree to submit a project that crosses subregional boundaries?

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
------------------------------

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
-----------------

Move to recommend to the Board of Directors foundational governance concepts for subregional forum formation.

ATTACHMENTS
-------------

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
------------------------

If you need additional information please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org).

**ATTACH C**

## ATTACHMENT C

To: TIP Policy Work Group  
From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner  
303 480-6737 or [tcottrell@drcog.org](mailto:tcottrell@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
February 13, 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, January 9 and January 22 Work Group meetings.

An updated Regional Share framework for evaluating project/program applications is attached for review and discussion. To continue towards recommending a draft TIP Policy to the Board, staff asks for action to incorporate this evaluation framework into the draft TIP Policy document.

As a reminder, the proposed framework is based on:

- Criteria associated with types of benefits to be obtained from a project/program, not by the type of project; and
- A project scoring panel (yet to be defined) would review, discuss, and prioritize the applications and provide a recommendation to the Board.

Attachment B-1 contains the draft Regional Share Framework. It encompasses the application instructions, foundational questions, evaluation criteria, and proposed score structure. Key changes from the document presented at the January 22 meeting include:

- Beginning instructions:
  - o Addition of an example scoring matrix
- Part 3: Evaluation Criteria, Questions, and Scoring:
  - o Removed reference of points to the scoring instructions.
  - o The previous maximum points available for each section have been replaced with a weight for each section.
  - o Funding request benefit value (D) has been removed.
  - o Part 3.C, *Consistency with Metro Vision and the 2040 MVRTP*, currently asks sponsors to respond on how their proposal relates to transportation-related Metro Vision performance measures.

**Staff requests discussion from the work group on the merits of changing this to *Metro Vision Transportation-Related Objectives*, as outlined in Attachment C-2.**

#### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[December 6, 2017](#)

[January 9, 2018](#)

[January 22, 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
2. Draft Transportation-Related Metro Vision Objectives (Framework Part 3-B Potential Replacement)

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

**ATTACHMENT C-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 7, 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). DRCOG staff will review submitted applications for eligibility and score the applications. A “project review panel” will use the scores as a basis for ranking projects/programs that request funding. The score may not necessarily be the only factor considered by the panel as it develops project selection recommendations, as the panel may identify other factors to be used.

Scoring values of High, Medium, and Low will be assigned by the project review panel in the four criterion categories of Part 3 (A - D) below, each carrying a score weight. Scores will be based on the criteria addressed and the magnitude of benefits. Sponsors will be allowed to make presentations to the project review panel to assist in the final recommendation to the DRCOG Board.

	Part 3-A	Part 3-B	Part 3-C	Part 3-D	Other Factors	Total Score
	Regional Significance	TIP Focus Areas	Metro Vision	Leveraging		
<b>Weight</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>10%</b>		<b>100%</b>
Project A	H	M	H	L		<b>H</b>
Project B	M	L	M	H		<b>M</b>
Project C	L	H	L	M		<b>L</b>

**Part 1: Base Information**

*(actual application form structure 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. Part 1 is not given a score.

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. Applicants will provide the benefit information in Part 3 in relation to the key elements checked. (check all that apply):
  - Rapid Transit Capacity (2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan)
  - Transit other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Bicycle facility
  - Pedestrian facility

**ATTACHMENT C-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 7, 2018)

- Safety improvements
- 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: \_\_\_\_\_

6. **Problem statement:** What specific Metro Vision-related regional problem or issue will the transportation project/program address? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Define the scope and **specific elements** of the project/program: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Would a smaller funding amount than requested be acceptable, while maintaining the original intent of the project?) \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, define smaller meaningful limits, size, service level, phases, or scopes, along with the 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, Subregion, or federal sources (with commitment documentation): \$\_\_\_\_\_
11. Total Project Cost: \$\_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENT C-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 7, 2018)

**Part 2: Project Benefit Calculations**

*(actual application form structure will look different)*

Based on the key elements identified in Part 1, complete the appropriate sections below to estimate the benefit values for consideration in the evaluation criteria of Part 3. The quantitative outcomes in Part 2 can be used in the narrative responses of Part 3. Part 2 is not scored. Additional benefit calculations can be included in #9 below.

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.

The benefit sections below relate to either:

<b>Use of a facility or service</b>	e.g., transit ridership, traffic volumes, bicycle/pedestrian users
<b>Operational outcomes of the facility or service</b>	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
<b>Socioeconomic/Land Use</b>	e.g., households, population, employment, density, accessibility, vulnerable populations

**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 1 mile \_\_\_\_\_ + Employment within 1 mile \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_  
 =====
- c) Estimated additional daily transit boardings: \_\_\_\_ *(provide support documentation, e.g. from RTD)*
- d) number of those transit boardings previously using transit: \_\_ *(e.g., use 25%)*
- e) number of those transit boardings previously using other non-SOV modes: \_\_ *(e.g., 25% HOV, walk, bicycle)*
- c – d – e = \_\_\_\_ **SOV one-way trips reduced**
- f) x 9 miles = \_\_\_\_ **VMT reduced** *(Values other than defaults must be justified by sponsor. E.g. 15 miles for regional service or 6 miles for local service)*
- 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 1 mile \_\_\_\_\_ + Employment within 1 mile \_\_\_\_\_ = \_\_\_\_\_  
 =====
- c) Estimated additional weekday one-way bicycle trips: \_\_\_\_\_
- d) number previously using 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 C-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 7, 2018)

**3. Pedestrian Use Benefits:** *(DRCOG will provide table of current example pedestrian 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 one-way trips: \_\_\_\_\_
- d) number previously using 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 1 mile: \_\_
- b) Minority persons within 1 mile: \_\_
- c) Low-Income households within 1 mile: \_
- d) Linguistically-challenged persons within 1 mile: \_\_
- e) Individuals with disabilities within 1 mile: \_\_
- f) Households without a motor vehicle within 1 mile: \_\_
- g) Children ages 6-17 within 1 mile: \_\_\_\_\_
- h) Health service facilities served by project: \_\_\_\_\_

**5. Travel Delay (Operational and Congestion Reduction) Benefits:**

Sponsor must use industry standard Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) based software programs and procedures as a basis 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)  $d \times 1.4 =$  **Reduced person hours of delay:** \_\_\_\_\_ *(Value higher than 1.4 due to high transit ridership must be justified by sponsor)*
- f) After project **peak hour congested travel time reduction** per vehicle (including persons, freight, and service equipment carried by vehicles): \_\_\_\_\_

**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).

Provide the current (most recent 5-year period of data) for:

- a) Fatal crashes: \_\_
- b) serious injury crashes: \_\_\_\_\_
- c) minor injury crashes: \_\_
- d) property damage only crashes: \_\_\_\_\_  
=====

**ATTACHMENT C-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 7, 2018)

- e) Estimated reduction in crashes per five-year period applicable to the project scope:
- **Fatal crashes reduced:** \_\_\_
  - Serious injury crashes reduced: \_\_\_
  - Other injury crashes reduced: \_\_\_
  - Property damage only crashes reduced: \_\_\_

**7. Facility Condition Benefits:**

Sponsor must use a current industry-accepted pavement condition method or system and calculate the average condition across all sections of pavement being replaced or modified. Applicants will score with “excellent”, “good”, “fair”, and “poor”.

Roadway Pavement:

- a) Current roadway pavement condition: \_\_\_\_\_; Describe current pavement issues and how the project will address them: \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Average Daily User Volume: \_\_\_\_\_

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Other Facility:

- a) Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them: \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Average Daily User Volume: \_\_\_\_\_

**8. Bridge Improvement Benefits:**

- a) Current bridge structural condition (from CDOT): \_\_\_\_\_; Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them: \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Other functional obsolescence issues to be addressed by project: \_\_\_\_\_
- c) Average Daily User Volume: \_\_\_\_\_

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

- a) \_\_\_\_\_
- b) \_\_\_\_\_

**10. Dis-benefits or negative impacts identified for specific types of projects:**

- a) Increase in VMT? \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Negative impact on vulnerable populations: \_\_\_\_\_
- c) \_\_\_\_\_

ATTACHMENT C-1  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –  
Evaluation Criteria** (February 7, 2018)

**Part 3: Evaluation Criteria, Questions, and Scoring**

*(actual application form structure will look different)*

This part includes four sections (A-D) for the applicant to provide qualitative and quantitative responses for the project review panel to use for scoring projects. Each section will be scored with a high, medium, or low, as compared to other applications received. Each section is weighted against the final score as indicated.

**A. Regional significance of proposed project/program (weight 30%)**

Provide responses to the following qualitative questions:

1. Why is this project/program **regionally important**? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Does the proposed project/program **cross and/or benefit multiple municipalities**? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Does the proposed project/program cross and benefit another subregion? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How will the proposed project/program address the **specific transportation problem** described in the problem statement submitted in Part 1# 6? \_\_\_\_\_
5. One foundation of a sustainable and resilient economy is physical infrastructure and transportation. How will the completed project/program allow people and businesses to thrive and prosper??  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. How will connectivity to **different travel modes** be improved by the proposed project/program? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Describe funding and/or project **partnerships** 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.

**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.

**Low:** A project/program will receive a low rating if it would address a minor regional problem.

**ATTACHMENT C-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 7, 2018)

**B. Board-approved TIP Focus Areas (weight 30%)**

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 from Part 2 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 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\*).

**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\*).

**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\*).

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

**ATTACHMENT C-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 7, 2018)

**C. Consistency with Metro Vision and the 2040 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (weight 30%)**

**\*\*\*Please see Attachment B-2 for an alternative Section C\*\*\***

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

	Transportation-related Metro Vision Performance Measures and Objectives	Does Project Address measure or objective?		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 ( <b>non-SOV</b> ) mode share to work				
2	Decrease vehicle miles traveled ( <b>VMT</b> ) per capita				
3	Decrease traffic <b>congestion</b> - average travel time variation (peak vs. off-peak)				
4	Reduce daily person <b>delay</b> per capita				
5	Reduce the number of traffic <b>fatalities</b>				
6	Reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas ( <b>GHG</b> ) emissions per capita				
7	Increase the share of the region's population living in areas with housing and transportation costs <b>affordable</b> 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
9	Other Metro Vision objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban Centers</li> <li>• Freight and Goods Movement</li> <li>• Open Space Access</li> <li>• Healthy and Active Choices</li> <li>• Others</li> </ul>				

**ATTACHMENT C-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 7, 2018)

**GUIDANCE:** Applicants must provide existing-condition data and after-project estimates of level of benefits associated with each applicable measure from Part 2 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 significantly addresses Metro Vision transportation-related performance measures and objectives and is determined to be in the top third of applications based on the magnitude of benefits.

**Medium:** A project/program will receive a medium rating if it moderately addresses Metro Vision transportation-related performance measures and objectives and is determined to be in the middle third of applications based on the magnitude of benefits.

**Low:** A project/program will receive a low rating if it slightly or not at all addresses Metro Vision transportation-related performance measures and objectives and is determined to be in the bottom third of applications based on the magnitude of benefits.

**D. Leveraging of non-Regional Share funds (“overmatch”) (weight 10%)**

Scores are assigned based on the percent of outside funding sources (non-Regional Share).

80%+ outside funding: **High**

60-79%: **Medium**

59% and below: **Low**

## ATTACHMENT C-2

### \*\*\*Alternative to Part 3-C of the Framework\*\*\*

#### Project or Program Contributions to Transportation-focused Metro Vision Objectives

Metro Vision guides DRCOG's work and establishes shared expectations with our region's many and various planning partners. The plan outlines broad outcomes, objectives, and initiatives established by the DRCOG Board to make life better for the region's residents. The degree to which the outcomes, objectives, and initiatives identified in Metro Vision apply in individual communities will vary. Metro Vision has historically informed other DRCOG planning processes such as the TIP.

Provide qualitative and quantitative (derived from Part 2) responses to the following items on how their proposal contributes to transportation-focused objectives in the adopted Metro Vision plan.

1. Describe how the project or program will help **contain urban development in locations designated for urban growth and services**. (see [MV objective 2](#))
  - a. Will it help focus and facilitate future growth in locations where urban-level infrastructure already exists or areas where plans for infrastructure and service expansion are in place? Y/N
  - b. Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Describe how the project or program will help **increase housing and employment in urban centers**. (see [MV objective 3](#))
  - a. Will it help establish a network of clear and direct multimodal connections within and between urban centers, or other key destinations? Y/N
  - b. Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Describe how the project or program will help **improve or expand the region's multimodal transportation system, services, and connections**. (see [MV objective 4](#))
  - a. Will it help increase mobility choices within and beyond the region for people, goods, or services? Y/N
  - b. Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Describe how the project or program **may help improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions**. (see [MV objective 6a](#))
  - a. Will it help reduce ground-level ozone, greenhouse gas emissions, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, or other air pollutants? Y/N
  - b. Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Describe how the project or program will help **connect people to natural resource or recreational areas**. (see [MV objective 7b](#))
  - a. Will it help complete missing links in the regional trail and greenways network or improve other multimodal connections that increase accessibility to our region's open space assets? Y/N
  - b. Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis: \_\_\_\_\_

## ATTACHMENT C-2

### \*\*\*Alternative to Part 3-C of the Framework\*\*\*

6. Describe how the project or program will help **increase access to amenities that support healthy, active choices**. (see [MV objective 10](#))
  - a. Will it expand opportunities for residents to lead healthy and active lifestyles? Y/N
  - b. Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis: \_\_\_\_\_
  
7. Describe how the project or program may help **improve access to opportunity**. (see [MV objective 13](#))
  - a. Will it help reduce critical health, education, income, and opportunity disparities by promoting reliable transportation connections to key destinations and other amenities? Y/N
  - b. Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis: \_\_\_\_\_
  
8. Describe how the project or program may help **improve the region's competitive position** (see [MV objective 14](#))
  - a. Will it help support and contribute to the growth of the region's economic health and vitality? Y/N
  - b. Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis: \_\_\_\_\_