

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

## AGENDA

### TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 19

Tuesday, February 26, 2018

2:30 p.m. (or immediately following TAC)

1290 Broadway

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

1. 2:30 Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. February 13, 2018 Meeting Summary  
(To be handed out during meeting)
4. 2:35 Update on February 21 Board discussion and action on Subregional forum formation  
Doug Rex
5. 2:45 Discussion on Regional Share Framework – evaluation criteria  
(Attachment A) 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!



## ATTACHMENT A

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
February 26, 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 previous discussions at 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.

Attachment A-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 February 13 meeting include:

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

- Slight revision of project/program key elements

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

- Added location to provide estimated values for 2040

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

- Replaced previous Part 3.C with new 3.C *Consistency with Metro Vision and the 2040 MVRTP*, based on discussions last meeting.

As requested at the last meeting, staff is in the process of using the framework (Attachment A-1) to prepare example applications for projects submitted over the last couple of TIP cycles. These projects would have been eligible for Regional Share funding per the Board-adopted rules. These example applications will be filled-in with very rough responses in able to depict how the draft criteria works and can be scored. The applications will be handed out during the meeting, and include the following project types examples:

- Capacity project on a freeway
- Operational project (MRA/MRA intersection)
- Operational project (MRA, with bicycle/pedestrian element)
- Bicycle/pedestrian project
- Regional study

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[December 6, 2017](#)

[January 9, 2018](#)

[January 22, 2018](#)

[February 13, 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.

ATTACHMENT

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](mailto:tcottrell@drcog.org).

**ATTACHMENT A-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 26, 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
  - Safety improvements
  - Roadway Capacity or Managed Lanes (2040 FC RTP)

**ATTACHMENT A-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 26, 2018)

- Roadway Operational
- ~~Roadway/Railroad~~ Grade Separation
  - Roadway
  - Railway
  - Bicycle
  - Pedestrian
- 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 of funding provided by other sources, with documentation (private, local, state, Subregion, or federal) ~~sources (with commitment documentation)~~: \$\_\_\_\_\_
11. Total Project Cost: \$\_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENT A-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 26, 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 usage or 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. Results should be provided for the opening year (full completion or operation) and estimated for the year 2040.

The ~~benefit~~ sections below relate to either:

<b>Use</b> of a facility or service	e.g., transit ridership, traffic volumes, bicycle/pedestrian users
<b>Operational outcomes</b> 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
<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; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_
- f) x 9 miles = \_\_\_\_ **VMT reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_ *(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; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_

**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: \_\_\_\_\_ ; **2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_
- d) number previously using other non-SOV modes: \_\_ (e.g., 50% HOV, walk, bicycle, transit)
- e) c – d = \_\_\_\_ **SOV trips reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENT A-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 26, 2018)

- f) X percentage replacing an SOV trip: \_\_\_\_ (e.g., 30%) = \_\_\_\_ **SOV trips reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_
- g) x 2 miles = \_\_\_\_  **VMT reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_ (Values other than defaults must be justified by sponsor)
- h) x 0.95 lbs. = \_\_\_\_  **pounds GHG emissions reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_

**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: \_\_\_\_\_; **2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_
- d) number previously using other non-SOV modes: \_\_ (e.g., 50% HOV, walk, bicycle, transit)
- e) c – d = \_\_\_\_ **SOV trips reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_
- f) X percentage replacing an SOV trip: \_\_\_\_ (e.g., 30%) = \_\_\_\_ **SOV trips reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_
- g) x 0.4 miles = \_\_\_\_  **VMT reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_ (Values other than defaults must be justified by sponsor)
- h) x 0.95 lbs. = \_\_\_\_  **pounds GHG emissions reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_

**4. Vulnerable Populations 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: \_\_\_\_\_; **2040 weekday estimate:** \_\_\_\_\_
- 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 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 transit passengers, freight, and service equipment carried by vehicles): \_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENT A-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 26, 2018)

**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 crashes involving motor vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians) for:

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

=====

- 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 Improvements ~~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? \_\_\_\_\_Y/N? If yes, describe scale of expected increase: \_\_\_\_\_
- b) Negative impact on vulnerable populations: \_\_\_\_\_
- c) \_\_\_\_\_



ATTACHMENT A-1  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 26, 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 A-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 26, 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 A-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 26, 2018)

**C. Consistency and Contributions to Transportation-focused Metro Vision Objectives**  
**(weight 30%)**

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 the proposed project/program 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 A-1**  
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –**  
**Evaluation Criteria** (February 26, 2018)

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: \_\_\_\_\_

**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 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 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 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: <b>High</b>
60-79%: <b>Medium</b>
59% and below: <b>Low</b>