

AGENDA

TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 20

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

2:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Monarch Pass Conference Room – 1st Floor, east side

1. 2:30 Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. February 13 and 26, 2018 Meeting Summaries
(Attachment A)
4. 2:35 Discussion on Regional Share Framework – evaluation criteria and scoring examples
(Attachment B) Todd Cottrell
5. 4:25 Other Matters
6. 4:30 Adjournment

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



We make life better!



ATTACH A

ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg. 18 Tuesday, February 13, 2018

PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve	Adams County
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	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

Others present: Bill Haas, Aaron Bustow, FHWA; Stephanie Holden, CDOT Region 1; Justin Begley, Denver; Tom Reiff, Castle Rock

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Mark Northrop, Brad Calvert, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

January 22, 2017 Meeting Summary

The summary was accepted.

Discussion on Subregional Forums Formation

Doug Rex reviewed the outcomes of the draft foundational governance concepts for Subregional Forum formation presented at the Board Work Session (BWS) on February 7. He noted the directors asked for more clarification from the work group on several subjects:

1. the definition of forum eligibility for a governmental entity that simply owns property within a county; and
2. whether guidelines should be formalized when two or more subregions submit a project crossing subregional boundaries?

Subregional Forum Comments

A. Subregional Forum Membership/Decision-making process

- The work group was in consensus to keep the proposed definition as “*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.*”
- Janice Finch asked for more clarification on allowing other regional stakeholders (i.e., universities, TMAs, etc.) to be eligible for Subregional Forum membership. Doug Rex noted

the intent is to provide flexibility for the Subregions; it is up to each Subregion to decide its own membership.

- George Gerstle asked if there are legal ramifications to having different kinds of membership criteria for each of the Subregions. He felt only DRCOG members should be allowed to vote and any others would be non-voting members.
- George Gerstle suggested stating as: If a DRCOG member, you shall be invited as a voting member; beyond that, it's up to each Subregion Forum to decide level of participation.
- It was noted that if a Subregion desired, CDOT and RTD could each be invited to participate on the Forum as a voting member.
- Janice Finch said to have consistency in all Subregions, other invited entities should not be allowed to vote, with the exceptions of CDOT and RTD.
- Bryan Weimer noted Arapahoe County is structuring its Subregional Forum to invite all municipalities, and if the municipality signs the IGA, it can be a voting member.
- Doug Rex said the only requirement for all Subregional Forums is that DRCOG member entities be voting members.
- There was consensus that voting be structured as 1 member-1 vote; not weighted voting. Each forum needs to determine what it's quorum is, and what will carry an action.
- Doug Rex summarized as: All DRCOG member communities are invited to participate as voting members, and other non-DRCOG member governments may be invited to participate at the discretion of the subregion.

B. Subregional Forum Formation

- Doug Rex noted DRCOG staff will attend all Subregional Forums, and if any Subregion would like DRCOG to have a larger role, DRCOG would entertain it.
- George Gerstle and Steve Durian suggested DRCOG play a role at Forums as an independent evaluator to avoid an appearance of conflict of interest for entities that are both submitting a project as well as voting on projects.

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

- Staff will add "...through the Subregional Forum" to this Section title.
- It was noted the RAQC can apply for projects in any Subregion. Doug Rex said RAQC would be added to the list of examples in Part C (in 3rd bullet).

D. Agenda Posting and Notification

- In 3rd bullet, staff will clarify that all local governments within the Subregion, whether they are DRCOG members or not, must receive notification of call for projects and meetings.
- Janice Finch suggested Subregional Forum be capitalized when referring to the main meeting entity, (i.e., Jefferson County Subregional Forum, etc.)
- Bryan Weimer asked if there will be a requirement to have an 'authority signature' to sign off on all projects. Staff will keep this in the TIP Policy document.
- Staff will revise the public posting period for the Subregional Forums to 48 hours in advance instead of 24 hours.
 - Kathleen Bracke suggested requiring more time for public vetting of potential projects.
 - Doug Rex said it is up to each Subregion to decide its process, noting projects are just a recommendation at this stage of the TIP process. A formal public comment period for all projects will be held once all Subregions submit their recommendations to the DRCOG Board for approval.

- Bill Haas, FHWA, encouraged subregions having meaningful information about projects in the Subregional Forum agenda packets, so that public comment can be given at the Subregional Forums.
- George Gerstle suggested having some requirement / minimum guidelines for meaningful public involvement, and will be up to the Subregion to decide. Doug Rex said high level concepts can be referenced in the TIP Policy document.
- Kathleen Bracke asked that extra time for public comment be factored into the Timeline Schedule.

George Gerstle asked for clarification on the discussion question: *should guidelines be formalized for when two or more Subregions agree to submit a project that crosses subregional boundaries?* Doug Rex noted it would be difficult to write guidelines for every potential scenario.

- Art Griffith said, for Regional projects, all the involved multi-jurisdictions don't have to each take it as one of their three allotted projects, just the project sponsor.
- George Gerstle said it's up to the Subregions each to figure out.
- Bryan Weimer felt a jurisdiction could show meaningful support by providing match, if not taking it as one of its three allotted projects.
- Kathleen Bracke said not only should these types of interjurisdictional projects be encouraged, they should be incentivized.

After discussion, staff will come up with some concepts for the Work Group to consider.

Discussion on Regional Share Framework – evaluation criteria

Todd Cottrell reviewed revisions made since the last meeting.

Evaluation Criteria Comments

- George Gerstle asked if subregion funds could be used as local (“non-regional share”) match towards a Regional project. Steve Cook affirmed yes.

Part 1, # 5 (Identify project/program's key elements)

- Art Griffith and Doug Rex suggested changing header to “Grade Separations”, and listing variables (i.e., bike, ped, railroad, roadway, etc.) under header.

Part 1, #10 (Amount provided by other local, state, Subregion, or federal sources (with commitment))

- Art Griffith suggested adding ‘amount provided by other sources’.
- Replace ‘with commitment’ to “with documentation”.

Part 2, in #1 (transit) #2 (bicycle) #3 (pedestrian) benefits

- Need to look at both short- and long-term timeframes; i.e., add reference to opening day and 2040 future forecast year.

Part 2, #4 Vulnerable Populations Benefits

- George Gerstle noted quantifying proximity (i.e., within 1 mile) may not necessarily be a good indicator. He suggested changing to “impact” in title, instead of “benefit”.
- Doug Rex suggested removing “benefits” from the title of all numbered items (i.e., 1. Transit Use Benefits, 2. Bicycle Use Benefits, etc.)

Part 2, # 5 Travel Delay

- George Gerstle said this section still measures car congestion delay and should address person delay.
- In f) *peak hour congested travel time reduction per vehicle*, Kathleen Bracke suggested adding 'transit'.
 - Steve Cook said could add 'transit time savings' and George Gerstle suggested adding something that identifies the benefits of a dedicated transit way.

Part 2, #6 Traffic Crash Reduction

- Kathleen Bracke suggested specifically noting crash data is for all modes (drivers, occupants, pedestrians, and bicycles)

Part 2, #8 Bridge Improvements

- Art Griffith suggested differentiating as "Is it due to being structurally deficient or functionally obsolete and why? Todd Cottrell noted the "whys" are addressed in the Part 3 narrative.

Part 2, #10 Disbenefits or negative impacts...

- In bullet a) George Gerstle said there is need to quantify, not just be a yes/no question. He suggested adding a measure of the expected increase to show disbenefit.
- Kathleen Bracke said need to show a project's net benefit overall, to show how the project incentivizes additional trips / VMT changes.
- Dave Baskett suggested moving the disbenefits section (#10) after travel delay.

Part 3, C (Table-Consistency with Metro Vision and the 2040 MVRTP)

- Doug Rex noted this table (on page 8 of 9) will be replaced with Alternative C-2 (*Project or Program Contributions to Transportation-focused Metro Vision Objectives*).

Part 3, C-2 (Project or Program Contributions to Transportation-focused Metro Vision Objectives

- Art Griffith agreed with replacing table with C-2 revision, but suggested combining #5 and #7
- Mac Callison asked about showing ROI benefits. Doug Rex noted that sensitivity and the ability to show benefit is difficult at the individual project level, particularly on smaller projects. ROI is better demonstrated in a package of projects.

Next Steps

- Doug Rex said he will bring work group feedback on Subregional Forum formation to the February 21 Board.
- Doug Rex said staff will provide sample project applications using the draft evaluation criteria for discussion at the next TIP Policy Work Group meeting (Feb. 26).
- Doug Rex said the expectation is to have all first formal meetings of the Subregional Forums in the latter half of March.
 - Bryan Weimer said it's premature to formalize the Forum until a Subregion knows the Subregional criteria (TIP Policy document).
 - Mr. Rex said there is value in getting the governance aspect set up as soon as possible.
 - Dave Baskett suggested a Subregion could do a general IGA and voting structure, but state that a Subregion would finalize based on receiving Board direction.
 - Jeanne Shreve noted it is most beneficial to have a formalized process before the Regional call for projects.

- Jeanne Shreve asked for clarification on the Subregional Share funding allocation for each funding program category (CMAQ, TAP, STP-Metro). Staff clarified that each Subregion will be advised of the amount once the control totals are known and the amount will be proportionally allocated among the Subregions.

The meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m. The next meeting is to be scheduled for Monday, February 26, 2018.

ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg. 19 Tuesday, February 26, 2018

PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve	Adams County
Kent Moorman	Adams County, City of Thornton
Bryan Weimer	Arapahoe County
George Gerstle (Chair)	Boulder County
Kathleen Bracke	Boulder County, City of Boulder
Tom Schomer	Broomfield, City and County
Danny Herrmann	CDOT
Janice Finch	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 Basket	Jefferson County, City of Lakewood
Ken Lloyd	RAQC

Others present: Aaron Bustow, FHWA; Stephanie Holden, CDOT Region 1; Justin Begley, Denver; Tom Reiff, Castle Rock

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

Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

February 13, 2017 Meeting Summary

The summary was not available at meeting time.

Update on February 21 Board discussion/action on Subregional forum formation

Doug Rex reviewed the February 21 Board discussion and noted the Board approved the Subregional Forum formation agenda items brought forward in the agenda. The Board also requested Subregional Forum agendas be formally posted by the meeting host community and the County, as well as posted by DRCOG.

- George Gerstle and Bryan Weimer said having meetings just at the County location could simplify the process.
- Jeanne Shreve suggested having a Subregional forum posting requirement: i.e., the Thursday before the week of the meeting, the agenda packet will be posted to the respective County website and linked from County website to all local jurisdictions, and provided to DRCOG for posting.
 - Doug Rex said it could be addressed in the draft TIP Policy document. Ms. Shreve suggested sooner for forum consistency.
 - Mr. Rex said more discussion is also needed on how much time is needed for public notification, as posting only 48 hours ahead of a meeting with an action item may not be sufficient time.

Discussion on Regional Share Framework – evaluation criteria

Todd Cottrell reviewed updates made since the last meeting, including in Part 1-key elements (#5), Part 2-showing results in opening year and in 2040 estimates, and replacing the table in Part 3.C.

Comments:

- George Gerstle suggested having some way to reflect for weekend traffic in special circumstances, particularly in tourist areas, so these areas are not precluded from competing (but noted a recurring continual pattern is different than a one-time event.)
- Bryan Weimer felt it would be challenging to use this evaluation criteria on studies. Doug Rex said there will be further discussion on studies and whether to score them separately.
- Doug Rex noted the Regional criteria is being developed with the concept in mind that the Subregions are welcome to use these criteria if they choose.

Comments on the examples of applications using draft Regional evaluation criteria

Staff distributed examples of previous TIP projects scored by staff using the draft Regional evaluation criteria, noting the scorings are very rough.

- Kathleen Bracke suggested when scoring evaluation is being done, evaluators should score the first time around on a common base, and then go back and compare the top ones with each other. She questioned how this scoring will identify more regional significance.
- Kent Moorman suggested having instructions that inform you the scoring starts at a common starting point, such as '3' of a 1 through 5 range.
- Kathleen Bracke asked how would we differentiate projects that serve multi-jurisdictions, saying the Board has asked how we would prioritize these.
 - Doug Rex said it could be weighted differently (i.e., score from a '4' instead of '3'.)
 - George Gerstle said it will be important to have the criteria identified (for instance, if more than one region provides local match; or if it benefits multiple communities, etc.)
 - Kent Moorman said this is more of a Subregional question, but was in favor of recommending an amount of weighting to the Board.
- John Cotten suggested having a first-step process to determine if a project is Regional. Art Griffith and Kent Moorman agreed. Mr. Moorman said Part 3, A. (*Regional significance of proposed project/program*) could be a stand-alone initial screening, then if a project meets the threshold, it could continue in the process.
- George Gerstle said there should be some quantitative measure for comparison of 'what is Regional', as there could be a lot of difference in subjective opinion.
- Jeanne Shreve suggested weighting based on the amount of leveraging a project has.
- George Gerstle said projects should first have an objective quantitative scoring of projects and then the Board would make the policy decision on applying weighting.
- Dave Baskett noted changing the weighting from 25% to 30% doesn't change the scoring. It was noted the weighting sensitivity needs to be considered before presenting to Board.
- George Gerstle said this is a multi-step screening process: of first importance is to determine whether a project is regionally significant, then how does it relate to the other three criteria. He asked, "How do you evaluate the relative regional significance of different projects?"
 - Todd Cottrell noted a multi-step process may not be necessary, as low-scoring projects will typically not make it through.
 - John Cotton agreed, but noted the issue is not with the high- or low-scored projects, but with the middle-scored projects.
- Art Griffith suggested having targets, saying it provides guidance.

- Kathleen Bracke said the evaluation process is both science and art, and this process is about creating a package of projects containing a good mix of all types of projects. She said it's a good thing having projects come forward from the Subregions, as they have gone through the initial level of screening.
- George Gerstle reiterated the first level of evaluation should be the Regional nature of a project, and suggested measures of being Regional could be:
 - if a project gets financial support from various jurisdictions; and
 - the geographic nature of the benefit—is it focused in one area or broad (i.e., should look at the benefit, not the location).
- Steve Cook said staff could generate a poll showing results of variance in weighting.
 - Art Griffith felt leveraging should be weighted higher.
 - George Gerstle said it doesn't benefit to have a Regional project that doesn't accomplish Focus Areas or Metro Vision goals.
 - Dave Baskett noted weighting may not be relevant overall. Kent Moorman said if the sensitivity isn't there, just don't do it.
 - Steve Cook said the level of sensitivity would be better for the new projects than what is shown in examples using previous TIP projects.
 - Dave Baskett said increasing weighting for leveraging could make it unfair for mid-sized and lower communities not able to financially compete against larger communities.
 - Janice Finch suggested ranking projects first and then weighting.
- Jeanne Shreve said the objective is to build out a multimodal trunk system. She suggested, after first determining a project is regionally significant, then sub-screening projects by asking if a project addresses building-out the system. Steve Cook felt it could potentially immediately eliminate projects.

George Gerstle summarized discussion so far:

- The quantitative nature of Part 2 is critical. The work group needs to give good guidance that all elements of Part 2 contribute to the evaluation of all the other criteria.
- It will be up to the Evaluation Panel to look at all this data and decide how these projects fit all the four evaluation criteria parts (Regional Significance, TIP Focus Areas, Metro Vision, and Leveraging). The challenge is how staff will guide the Panel on this.
- John Cotten said the struggle is in identifying regional projects that aren't immediately self-evident as being regional.
 - Kathleen Bracke said it gets back to having a blended package of regional projects that builds a variety of projects, not just a single type.
- George Gerstle asked if there was agreement that the Board should provide weighting guidance to the Evaluation Panel on what the relative importance is for the four evaluation criteria parts (Regional Significance, TIP Focus Areas, Metro Vision and Leveraging).
 - He noted staff will provide the quantitative information of Part 2 to the Evaluation Panel from the applications received, who then make the recommendation to the DRCOG Board.
 - Kent Moorman asked if it's significant if it's weighted or not, or is the outcome going to be the same on the scoring. Mr. Gerstle said it's unknown as we don't know the projects.

- Art Griffith felt the TIP Focus Areas should be higher than the general Metro Vision, as it was specifically picked by the Board.
- Art Griffith felt, instead of making the Board work on this, the Work Group should make a weighting recommendation to the Board and then the Board can massage or reject it.
- Mr. Gerstle reiterated that if Studies are regionally eligible, they should have a significant element of regional benefit; this needs to be written into the TIP policy.
- Based on today's discussions, Doug Rex said the February 7 Board Work Session may be canceled. He asked if the Work Group would consider having the next Work Group meeting (scheduled for March 13) at an earlier date, so that recommendations would have enough turnaround to be included in the March Board agenda packet (which is sent out on March 14).
- Janice Finch noted the timeline schedule denotes the Work Group discussion in March will be on the Subregional criteria. She said there needs to be Board guidance on what specific evaluation criteria from the Regional requirement will apply to the Subregions. Mr. Rex said the Board hasn't seen any of the Regional evaluation criteria yet, so a Board discussion to decide Subregional at this time may be premature.

The meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m. Staff will email a Doodle poll to the Work Group to try to determine an earlier meeting date than the next scheduled meeting on March 13. (After polling, the Work Group meeting remained March 13).

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 #
March 13, 2018	Action	4

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

An updated Regional Share framework (Attachment 1) is attached for review and discussion. Changes were made in *Part 2: Project Calculations* from the document presented at the February 26 meeting. Key modifications include: 1) rewording of some statements to add clarity, and 2) added sections for applicants to denote if non-weekdays or frequent special events would have distinctly greater benefits.

Attachment 2 contains results associated with the example applications handed out at the February 26 meeting. The scoring method summaries include:

- two example methods shown previously (#1 and #2);
- a third method that expands detail for the TIP Focus Areas (#3); and
- a table (#4) showing how different weights on the raw score impact the overall scores (per the detailed method scores).

As a reminder, Attachment 2 reflects former TIP projects that would be eligible for Regional Share funding per the Board-adopted rules and is filled in with very rough responses to depict how the draft criteria process could work. Included are a roadway capacity project on a freeway, two roadway operational projects (MRA/MRA intersection and MRA with bicycle/pedestrian element), a bicycle/pedestrian project, and a regional study.

To continue progress towards recommending a full draft TIP Policy to the Board, aspects of the framework will be presented at the March 21 Board meeting for discussion purposes.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[December 6, 2017](#)

[January 9, 2018](#)

[January 22, 2018](#)

[February 13, 2018](#)

[February 26, 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. Scoring Method Summaries

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (March 13, 2018)

Project/Program Application and Evaluation Criteria Instructions

Sponsors of applications must complete the base information (Part 1), project 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		
Weight	30%	30%	30%	10%		100%
Project A	H	M	H	L		H
Project B	M	L	M	H		M
Project C	L	H	L	M		L

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 B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (March 13, 2018)

- Roadway Operational
- 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): \$_____
11. Total Project Cost: \$_____

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (March 13, 2018)

Part 2: Project 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 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, if significant growth above the nationwide growth rate is anticipated.

The sections below 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

1. Transit Use: *(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 the ese additional transit boardings previously using a different transit route:
 ____ (e.g., use 25%)
- e) number of the additional ese 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: _____**
- h) If values would be distinctly greater for non-weekdays, describe the magnitude of difference:

2. Bicycle Use: *(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: _____**

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (March 13, 2018)

- d) number diverting from a different bicycling route~~previously using other non-SOV modes:~~
 ___ (e.g., 50% ~~HOV, walk, bicycle, transit~~)
- e) $c - d =$ ___ Initial SOV trips reduced; 2040 weekday estimate: _____
- f) X percentage of initial trips reduced replacing an SOV trip: ___ (e.g., 30%) = ___ **SOV trips reduced; 2040 weekday estimate: _____**
- g) $x 2 \text{ miles} =$ ___ **VMT reduced; 2040 weekday estimate: _____** (Values other than defaults must be justified by sponsor)
- h) $x 0.95 \text{ lbs.} =$ ___ **pounds GHG emissions reduced; 2040 weekday estimate: _____**
- i) If values would be distinctly greater for non-weekdays, describe the magnitude of difference:

3. Pedestrian Use: (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 1/2 mile _____ + Employment within 1/2 mile _____ = _____
 = = = = =
- c) Estimated additional weekday pedestrian one-way trips: _____; 2040 weekday estimate: _____
- d) number diverting from a different walking route~~previously using other non-SOV modes:~~
 ___ (e.g., 50% ~~HOV, walk, bicycle, transit~~)
- e) $c - d =$ ___ Initial SOV trips reduced; 2040 weekday estimate: _____
- f) X percentage of initial trips -replacing an SOV trip: ___ (e.g., 30%) = ___ **SOV trips reduced; 2040 weekday estimate: _____**
- g) $x 0.4 \text{ miles} =$ ___ **VMT reduced; 2040 weekday estimate: _____** (Values other than defaults must be justified by sponsor)
- h) $x 0.95 \text{ lbs.} =$ ___ **pounds GHG emissions reduced; 2040 weekday estimate: _____**
- i) If values would be distinctly greater for non-weekdays, describe the magnitude of difference:

4. Vulnerable Populations (use current Census data):

- 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):

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): _____

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (March 13, 2018)

=====

- 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 average travel time reduction** per vehicle (includes persons, transit passengers, freight, and service equipment carried by vehicles): ____ If applicable, denote unique travel time reduction for certain types of vehicles:
- g) If values would be distinctly different for weekend days or special events, describe the magnitude of difference:

6. Traffic Crash Reduction:

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:

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:

- 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: _____

ATTACHMENT B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (March 13, 2018)

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

- a) _____
- b) _____

10. Disbenefits 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 B-1
**DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria** (March 13, 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 and benefit people and businesses from multiple subregions.

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 B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (March 13, 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 B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (March 13, 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 B-1
DRAFT Regional Share Framework –
Evaluation Criteria (March 13, 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: **High**

60-79%: **Medium**

59% and below: **Low**

ATTACHMENT B-2

Scoring Method Summaries (by DRCOG Staff)

Method #1: Basic (Three Levels: H, M, L)

Example Projects	Part 3-A	Part 3-B	Part 3-C	Part 3-D	Other Factors	Total Score
	Regional Significance	TIP Focus Areas	Metro Vision	Leveraging		
Weight	30%	30%	30%	10%		100%
1. Capacity Project on a Freeway	H	M	M	L	(As determined by the scoring review panel)	M
2. MRA/MRA Intersection Operations	L	M	M	L	(As determined by the scoring review panel)	M
3. MRA Roadway Operational	M	H	M	L	(As determined by the scoring review panel)	M
4. Bicycle/Ped	M	M	H	L	(As determined by the scoring review panel)	M
5. Study	H	H	H	M	(As determined by the scoring review panel)	H

Method #2: Detailed (Five Levels: 5, 4, 3, 2, 1)

Example Projects		1. Capacity	2. Intersection Ops	3. Operations	4. Bicycle/Ped	5. Study
Rating Criteria	Weight					
Regional Significance (Part 3-A): The proposed project/program is regionally important.	30%	4	2	4	3	5
TIP Focus Areas (Part 3-B): The proposed project/program addresses the Board-approved focus areas.	30%	3	3	5	4	5
Metro Vision (Part 3-C): The proposed project/program contributes to the transportation-focused objectives in Metro Vision.	30%	3	3	4	5	5
Leveraging (Part 3-D): The proposed project/program has a high amount of outside funding sources.	10%	1	1	2	2	4
Weighted Score (1-5)	100%	3.1	2.5	4.1	3.8	4.9

ATTACHMENT B-2

Method #3: Extra Detail (added individual TIP Focus Areas)

Example Projects		1. Capacity	2. Intersection Ops	3. Operations	4. Bicycle/Ped	5. Study
Rating Criteria	Weight					
Regional Significance (Part 3-A): The proposed project/program is regionally important.	30%	4	2	4	3	5
TIP Focus Areas (Part 3-B): The proposed project/program addresses the Board-approved focus areas.	30%	3	3	5	4	5
<i>Improve mobility for vulnerable populations</i>		2	3	4	4	5
<i>Increase reliability of multimodal transportation</i>		3	3	5	5	5
<i>Improve safety and security</i>		4	4	5	4	4
Metro Vision (Part 3-C): The proposed project/program contributes to the transportation-focused objectives in Metro Vision.	30%	3	3	4	5	5
Leveraging (Part 3-D): The proposed project/program has a high amount of outside funding sources.	10%	1	1	2	2	4
Weighted Score (1-5)	100%	3.1	2.5	4.1	3.8	4.9

ATTACHMENT B-2

#4: Weighting Options Applied to Example Projects (per Detailed Method #2 scores)

Example Projects	Project 1 (Roadway Capacity)					Project 2 (Road Op.-Intersection)					Project 3 (Roadway Operational)				
Rating Criteria	Raw Score	Weighting Options				Raw Score	Weighting Options				Raw Score	Weighting Options			
		#1	#2	#3	#4		#1	#2	#3	#4		#1	#2	#3	#4
Regional Significance (Part 3-A)	4	30% 1.2	25% 1.0	20% 0.8	40% 1.6	2	30% 0.6	25% 1.0	20% 0.4	40% 0.8	4	30% 1.2	25% 1.0	20% 0.8	40% 1.6
TIP Focus Areas (Part 3-B)	3	30% 0.9	25% 0.8	30% 0.9	30% 0.9	3	30% 0.9	25% 0.8	30% 0.9	30% 0.9	5	30% 1.5	25% 1.3	30% 1.5	30% 1.5
Metro Vision (Part 3-C)	3	30% 0.9	25% 0.8	30% 0.9	20% 0.6	3	30% 0.9	25% 0.8	30% 0.9	20% 0.6	4	30% 1.2	25% 1.0	30% 1.2	20% 0.8
Leveraging (Part 3-D)	1	10% 0.1	25% 0.3	10% 0.1	10% 0.1	1	10% 0.1	25% 0.3	10% 0.1	10% 0.1	2	10% 0.2	25% 0.5	10% 0.2	10% 0.2
Weighted Score (1-5)		3.1	2.8	2.7	3.2		2.5	2.8	2.3	2.4		4.1	3.8	3.7	4.1

Example Projects	Project 4 (Bicycle/Pedestrian)					Project 5 (Regional Study)				
Rating Criteria	Raw Score	Weighting Options				Raw Score	Weighting Options			
		#1	#2	#3	#4		#1	#2	#3	#4
Regional Significance (Part 3-A)	3	30% 0.9	25% 1.0	20% 0.6	40% 1.2	5	30% 1.5	25% 1.0	20% 1.0	40% 2.0
TIP Focus Areas (Part 3-B)	4	30% 1.2	25% 1.0	30% 1.2	30% 1.2	5	30% 1.5	25% 1.3	30% 1.5	30% 1.5
Metro Vision (Part 3-C)	5	30% 1.5	25% 1.3	30% 1.5	20% 1.0	5	30% 1.5	25% 1.3	30% 1.5	20% 1.0
Leveraging (Part 3-D)	2	10% 0.2	25% 0.5	10% 0.2	10% 0.2	4	10% 0.4	25% 1.0	10% 0.4	10% 0.4
Weighted Score (1-5)		3.8	3.8	3.5	3.6		4.9	4.5	4.4	4.9