

AGENDA

TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 21

Tuesday, March 26, 2018

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

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Conference Room – 1st Floor, west side

1. 2:30 Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. March 13, 2018 Meeting Summary
4. 2:35 Discussion on Regional Share criteria: Board discussion follow-up
(Attachment A) Todd Cottrell
5. 3:30 Discussion on Regional Share project review panel and scoring
(Attachment B) Todd Cottrell
6. 4:25 Other Matters
 - TIP Topics and Schedule as of March 26, 2018
(Attachment C)
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.



ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg. 20 Tuesday, March 13, 2018

PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Kent Moorman	Adams County, City of Thornton
Bryan Weimer	Arapahoe County
Tom Schomer	Broomfield, City and County
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
Ted Heyd	TDM Non-motor

Others present: Aaron Bustow, FHWA; JoAnn Mattson, CDOT Region 1; Tom Reiff, Castle Rock; Daniel Hutton, Denver South TMA

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Flo Raitano, Brad Calvert, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Doug Rex called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

February 13 and 26, 2018 Meeting Summaries

The summaries were accepted.

Discussion on Regional Share Framework – evaluation criteria and scoring examples

Todd Cottrell reviewed updates to the evaluation criteria, including simplification to language in the project calculations part, and adding a section for applicants to note if non-weekdays or frequent special events would have distinctly greater benefits.

Doug Rex said general Regional framework concepts (not scoring) will be brought next week to the March Board for discussion. Then, with input/direction from the March Board, it will go for further discussion to the Board Work Session in April, and for action at the April Board meeting.

Mr. Rex asked the work group for input on changing the order of the evaluation criteria sections. The work group agreed to switch Part 2 (Project Calculations) with Part 3 (Evaluation Criteria, Questions, and Scoring). The work group was also agreed to change the section title to Project Data/Estimates.

Comments

- Janice Finch suggested asking “what is the project readiness” and “what regional or local plan is this project in”. Staff said could ask sponsor to outline what the current status of the project is, then phasing.
- Janice Finch suggested encouraging applicants to make assumptions explicit. Staff noted it will be up to the project sponsor to provide assumptions in its narrative for the project.
- Bryan Weimer asked what the appeal process will be. Mr. Cottrell said the process can be built based on the current appeal policy.

- Steve Cook said to get a gauge of growth, Part 3 (Project data/estimates) will provide a location for 2020 and 2040 population/employment estimates.
- There was some discussion on how to handle scoring studies.
- The work group agreed to referring to “projects, programs, and studies” as “projects”, throughout the application.
- It was suggested to make clear there is only one project sponsor that is responsible for project. Multi-jurisdictional projects should score higher.
- Janice Finch suggested requesting an explicit schedule of funding request by year. Mr. Cottrell said staff could expand this out.

In Attachment B-2 (Scoring Method Summaries)

- In the #4 weighted option, Mac Callison noted a calculation error in the #3 option; the correct percentages should be Regional Significance-20%, TIP Focus Areas-35%, Metro Vision-35%, and Leveraging-10%.
- Bryan Weimer said, while the results of weighting may not be that different, the perception is. He recommended the following weighting: (Regional Significance-40%, TIP Focus Areas-30%, Metro Vision-20%, and Leveraging-10%), as more in line with the perception of what we are trying to accomplish.
- Janice Finch suggested using a range of 10 for the scoring. The work group agreed.
- Bryan Weimer asked if DRCOG will have some core criteria promulgated to the Subregions. Mr. Rex said it is likely.
- Janice Finch asked that an updated timeline of the TIP process be included in every TIP Policy Work Group meeting packet.
- Doug Rex said a formal DRCOG invitation on the Subregional Forum will be emailed out to Subregions in the near future.

The work group agreed on recommending to the March Board the following weighting option: Regional Significance-40%, TIP Focus Areas-30%, Metro Vision-20%, and Leveraging-10%.

Doug Rex informed the work group that Ron Papsdorf will start on March 15 as DRCOG’s new Transportation Director.

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m. The next scheduled meeting on March 26, 2018.

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 26, 2018	Action	4

SUBJECT

Regional Share policy topics.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

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

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

At the March 21 DRCOG Board meeting, directors discussed the Regional Share criteria. Attachment 1 contains the information presented to them, including one suggestion in track-changes identified in Part 1, #12. Any agreed upon adjustments to Attachment 1 will be brought to the April 4 Board Work Session for discussion, and presumably the April 18 Board meeting for action.

Discussion Item

The Board discussed the weighting given to the four evaluation criteria sections in Part 2. There was general agreement to the proposed weighting. A director requested the TPWG explore increasing the 20% weighting proposal for Part 2-C, *Consistency and Contributions to Transportation-focused Metro Vision Objectives*.

- If the weighting in Part 2-C was to increase from its current 20%, how should the other weightings be adjusted?

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[December 6, 2017](#)

[January 9, 2018](#)

[January 22, 2018](#)

[February 13, 2018](#)

[February 26, 2018](#)

[March 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.

ATTACHMENT 1
DRAFT Regional Share Evaluation Criteria
(March 26, 2018)

Project/Program/Study Application and Evaluation Criteria Instructions

- Sponsors of applications must complete the *base information* (Part 1), provide responses to the *evaluation questions* (Part 2), and provide back-up *data calculation estimates* (Part 3).
- DRCOG staff will review submitted applications for eligibility. A project review panel will review and rank *projects/programs/studies* that request funding.
- Sponsors will be allowed to make presentations to the project review panel to assist in the final recommendation to the DRCOG Board.

Part 1: Base Information

(actual application form structure will look different)

All sponsors are required to submit foundational information for their *project/program/study* (**hereafter referred to as project**) including a problem statement, project description, and concurrence documentation from CDOT and/or RTD, if applicable. Each proposed project 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: _____
2. Project start and end points, or geographic area (include map):

3. Project Sponsor: _____
4. Facility Owner/Operator: _____
If Owner/Operator is different from project sponsor, attach applicable concurrence documentation.
5. What planning document(s) identifies this project: _____
6. Identify the project's key elements. Applicants will provide the benefit information in the evaluation 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)
 - Roadway Operational
 - Grade Separation
 - Roadway
 - Railway
 - Bicycle
 - Pedestrian
 - Roadway Pavement reconstruction/rehab
 - Bridge replace/reconstruct/rehab

ATTACHMENT 1
DRAFT Regional Share Evaluation Criteria
(March 26, 2018)

- ___ Study
- ___ Design
- ___ Other: _____

7. **Problem statement:** What specific Metro Vision-related regional problem or issue will the transportation project address? _____
8. Define the scope and **specific elements** of the project: _____
9. What is the current status of the proposed project? _____
10. 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: _____
11. Total amount of DRCOG Regional Share funding request: \$_____ (no greater than \$20 million and not to exceed 50% of the total project cost)
12. Total amount of funding provided by other **sources** funding partners (private, local, state, Subregion, or federal), with documentation. Please list each funding partner, contribution amount, and percent of each contribution to the overall total project cost: \$ _____
13. Total Project Cost: \$_____
14. Year by year breakdown of funding request and project phase to be initiated:

	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Total
DRCOG Request					
Match					
Total Funding					
Phase to be Initiated					

ATTACHMENT 1
DRAFT Regional Share Evaluation Criteria
(March 26, 2018)

Part 2: 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 using a scale of High-Medium-Low, as compared to other applications received. Each section is weighted as indicated.

A. Regional significance of proposed project (weight 40%)

Provide responses to the following questions:

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

7. Describe funding and/or project **partnerships** established in association with this project:

High: The project will significantly address a clearly demonstrated major regional problem and benefit people and businesses from multiple subregions.

Medium: The project will either moderately address a major problem or significantly address a moderate level regional problem.

Low: The project will address a minor regional problem.

ATTACHMENT 1
DRAFT Regional Share Evaluation Criteria
(March 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 3) responses to the following items:

1. Describe how the project 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 3): _____

2. Describe how the project will **increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network**. Provide quantitative evidence of benefits.

a. Description:

b. Quantified Benefits (e.g., reference Part 3): _____

3. Describe how the project will **improve transportation safety and security**. Provide quantitative evidence of benefits.

a. Description:

b. Quantified Benefits (e.g., reference Part 3): _____

GUIDANCE: Applicants must provide current-condition data and after-project estimates based on the applicable elements of the project from Part 3 to clearly show quantifiable benefits and a positive return on investment. DRCOG staff can provide assistance.

High: The project will 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: The project will 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: The project will 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 1
DRAFT Regional Share Evaluation Criteria
(March 26, 2018)

C. Consistency and Contributions to Transportation-focused Metro Vision Objectives
(weight 20%)

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 3) responses to the following items on how the proposed project contributes to transportation-focused objectives in the adopted Metro Vision plan.

1. Describe how the project 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 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 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 **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 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 1
DRAFT Regional Share Evaluation Criteria
(March 26, 2018)

6. Describe how the project 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 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 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 3 to clearly show quantifiable benefits and a positive return on investment. DRCOG staff can provide assistance.

High: The project will significantly address Metro Vision transportation-related objectives and is determined to be in the top third of applications based on the magnitude of benefits.

Medium: The project will moderately address Metro Vision transportation-related objectives and is determined to be in the middle third of applications based on the magnitude of benefits.

Low: The project will slightly or not at all address 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 1
DRAFT Regional Share Evaluation Criteria
 (March 26, 2018)

Part 3: Project Data – Calculations and Estimates (not scored)

(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 2. The quantitative outcomes in Part 3 can be used in the narrative responses of Part 2. Part 3 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 regionwide growth rate is anticipated. All assumptions must be explicit and documented by the applicant.

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) 2020 Population within 1 mile _____ + Employment within 1 mile _____ = _____
- c) 2040 Population within 1 mile _____ + Employment within 1 mile _____ = _____
- =====
- d) Estimated additional daily transit boardings (when completed): ____ *(provide support documentation, e.g. from RTD)*
- e) number of the additional transit boardings previously using a different transit route: ____ *(e.g., use 25% or other value if justified)*
- f) number of the additional transit boardings previously using other non-SOV modes (walk, bicycle, HOV): ____ *(e.g., 25% or other value if justified HOV, walk, bicycle)*
- d – e – f = ____ **SOV one-way trips reduced per day (year of opening);**
- g) x 9 miles = ____ **VMT reduced per day (year of opening); 2040 weekday estimate:** _____ *(Values other than the default 9 miles must be justified by sponsor. E.g. 15 miles for regional service or 6 miles for local service)*
- h) x 0.95 lbs. = ____ **pounds GHG emissions reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** _____
- i) If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, 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) 2020 Population within 1 mile _____ + Employment within 1 mile _____ = _____
- c) 2040 Population within 1 mile _____ + Employment within 1 mile _____ = _____
- =====
- d) Estimated additional weekday one-way bicycle trips (when completed): _____ ;

ATTACHMENT 1
DRAFT Regional Share Evaluation Criteria
(March 26, 2018)

- e) number diverting from a different bicycling route: ___ (e.g., 50% or other value if justified)
- f) $d - e =$ ___ Initial trips reduced;
- g) X percentage of initial trips reduced replacing an SOV trip: ___ (e.g., 30% or other value if justified) = ___ **SOV trips reduced per day** (year of opening);
- h) x 2 miles = ___ **VMT reduced per day; 2040 weekday estimate:** ___ (*Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor*)
- i) x 0.95 lbs. = ___ **pounds GHG emissions reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** ___
- j) If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, 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) 2020 Population within ½ mile _____ + Employment within ½ mile _____ = _____
- c) 2040 Population within 1 mile _____ + Employment within 1 mile _____ = _____
= = = = =
- d) Estimated additional weekday pedestrian one-way trips: _____; 2040 weekday estimate: _____
- e) number diverting from a different walking route: ___ (e.g., 50% or other value if justified)
- f) $d - e =$ ___ Initial trips reduced;
- g) X percentage of initial trips replacing an SOV trip: ___ (e.g., 30% or other value if justified) = ___ **SOV trips reduced per day**;
- h) x 0.4 miles = ___ **VMT reduced per day; 2040 weekday estimate:** ___ (*Values other than 0.4 miles must be justified by sponsor*)
- i) x 0.95 lbs. = ___ **pounds GHG emissions reduced; 2040 weekday estimate:** ___
- j) If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, 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: _____;
- b) 2040 ADT estimate: _____
- c) Current weekday vehicle hours of delay (VHD): _____
= = = = =
- d) Calculated future (after project) weekday vehicle hours of delay: _____
- e) $b - c =$ Reduced VHD: _____
- f) $d \times 1.4 =$ **Reduced person hours of delay:** _____ (*Value higher than 1.4 due to high transit ridership must be justified by sponsor*)

ATTACHMENT 1
DRAFT Regional Share Evaluation Criteria
(March 26, 2018)

- g) 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: _____
- h) 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: _____

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

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 26, 2018	Discussion	5

SUBJECT

Regional Share project review panel.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

Over the last few years, both DRCOG staff and the TIP Policy Work Group (TPWG) have mentioned the use of a “project review panel” or “board-led task force” in the Regional Share process. The notion of a panel is to have an impartial system in place to review, score, and recommend Regional Share projects to the DRCOG Board for inclusion into the draft TIP. The process must be viewed by Board Directors as authentic, objective, and having integrity so project recommendations considered by the DRCOG Board are the output of a bona fide process.

The TPWG will discuss how this panel should fit into the process and what its role would be. Possible approaches for the panel structure, scoring role, and project recommendations to the DRCOG Board, are described below. It is important to note the panel will have to conduct their evaluations and develop recommendations in a relatively short period of time (one month). Several meetings will be required.

Possible Panel Structure Options

- a. DRCOG staff
- b. Regional agency staff (CDOT, RTD, RAQC, chambers)
- c. Subset of the Board
- d. Private business interests
- e. A mixture of above

Possible Scoring Options

- a. Borrowing from the Puget Sound Regional Council, DRCOG staff from multiple divisions (transportation, regional planning, aging, communications, etc.) score each eligible application. Applications and scoring results are turned over to the panel to develop a final recommendation to the DRCOG Board.
- b. All panel members score applications.
- c. Only those panel members who didn't submit a project, score applications.
- d. An outside entity (public or private) assists the panel in scoring.

Possible Panel Recommendation Options

- a. The panel turns the scored applications over to DRCOG staff to make a final recommendation.
- b. Each panel member ranks their projects in order, for discussion.
- c. DRCOG Board members who did not submit a project will make a recommendation to the full Board.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENTS

N/A


ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

2020-2023 TIP Policy Document
Anticipated Schedule and Topics

Updated March 26, 2018

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

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