

AGENDA

TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 5

Monday, June 26, 2017

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. May 22, 2017 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)
3. 2:35 Discussion and recommendation on existing TIP set-asides
(Attachment B) Todd Cottrell and other DRCOG staff
4. 3:30 Discussion on Regional and Subregional Share funding targets / Regional definition
(Attachment C) Todd Cottrell
5. 4:15 Discussion on Subregional Share distribution formula / geography
(Attachment D) Todd Cottrell
6. 5:00 Adjournment

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



We make life better!



ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg. 4 Monday, May 22, 2017

PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve	Adams County
Kent Moorman	Adams County, City of Thornton
Bryan Weimer	Arapahoe County
Mac Callison	Arapahoe County, City of Aurora
George Gerstle (Chair)	Boulder County
Kathleen Bracke	Boulder County, City of Boulder
Tom Schomer	Broomfield, City and County
Steve Klausing	Business
Dan Herrmann	CDOT
Janice Finch	Denver, City and County
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Doug Rex	DRCOG
Art Griffith	Douglas County
John Cotten	Douglas County, City of Lone Tree
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Dave Baskett	Jefferson County, City of Lakewood
Ken Lloyd	RAQC
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motor
Janet Lundquist	Weld County

Others present: Aaron Bustow, FHWA; Steve McCannon, RAQC

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Jacob Riger, Greg MacKinnon, Brad Calvert, Matthew Helfant, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

April 24, 2017 Meeting Summary

The summary was accepted.

- Mac Callison asked for clarification of stand-alone funding on a Regional project. To clarify his meaning, Mr. Rex said Regional funding could be used for a project that does not have other funding partners.
- Jeanne Shreve noted two TDM partners voiced several concerns during last month's TDM set-aside program presentation; a cumbersome reimbursement process; a need for flexibility as each region is unique; and potential service area encroachment.

May 3 Board Work Session Outcomes

Doug Rex reviewed outcomes of the May 3 Board Work Session discussion.

- Focus Areas – Mr. Rex presented an introductory discussion on focus areas at the Work Session. Several more sessions on focus areas are anticipated prior to the August 25 Board Workshop. Board members attending the Workshop are expected to make a preliminary Focus Area recommendation to bring before the full Board in September.

- Survey - Work Session members want to do the Focus Area Survey (in what form, was not established).
- Regional – The Work Session was advised of the conceptual framework. Board members put an emphasis on the necessity to:
 - define Regional and transformative,
 - define and quantify benefits of Regional projects, and
 - come up with metrics to measure post-construction outcomes.
- ROI benefit - The Work Session suggested considering the total package benefit of all the selected projects versus individual projects.
- Some Board members are apprehensive about Dual Model approach; does it take away from concept of regional emphasis. Need to be able to show how this pilot program can lead to a better regional process in the selection of projects.

Continued discussion of existing TIP set-asides (RTO and AQ)

In March, the work group requested a review of all five existing TIP set-asides. Last month, three programs (Regional TDM, Way to Go, and STAMP/UC Plans) were reviewed. Staff from the remaining two regional set-asides presented program overviews:

1. Regional Transportation Operations – Greg MacKinnon, DRCOG
2. Air Quality – Ken Lloyd, Steve McCannon, RAQC

Set-asides will be further discussed at the next Work Group meeting, June 26, to form a recommendation to bring to a future Board Work Session.

- Chair Gerstle asked the Work Group to submit to staff any potential set-aside ideas or comments on the current structure before the next meeting.

Continued discussion on quantifying benefits of projects

Daniel Jerrett continued discussion on [potential methodologies](#) to quantify project benefits when using the dual model approach. He discussed a potential method (based on approaches used by Minnesota DOT, the Bay Area MPO, Smart Growth America, and Economic Planning Systems) to measure ROI for individual projects using a two-dimensional approach:

1. Approximating ROI by calculating the value of benefits across areas (such as economic, environmental, social, public health, and overall quality of life), then measuring benefits against each project's known costs to determine overall ROI.
2. Evaluating each project in relationship to adopted regional goals and outcomes (i.e., Metro Vision, MVRTP), which is more qualitative.

He asked for further Work Group guidance on 1. defining what a project is; 2. defining benefit/cost thresholds; and 3. how to map primary measures to Metro Vision goals.

Mr. Jerrett said this approach will be tested over the next few weeks by the DRCOG economics team using several existing or previous projects, and examples will be brought to the Work Group for comment. He anticipates developing a refined recommendation on the evaluation approach by late summer/fall.

- Steve Klausung said we need to ask if all goals are equal. How do you relatively weigh costs/benefits, as some goals may have more costs? Does the Economic factor inherently include access to housing and employment—it needs to be broken out separately.

- Doug Rex said he agreed with the idea of weighting goals; need to determine how goals/objectives would be weighted. He agreed there should be more discussion on model sensitivity.
- Dave Baskett said the evaluation approach needs to be simple and transparent and felt this approach doesn't seem simple.
 - Janice Finch agreed it needs to be simple. The key threshold question is if this truly is a regional project; does this take preference with what's happening in the region right now? She cautioned not to overburden the evaluation process; the Board in the past has felt the process was too complex; felt less is more.
 - Mr. Rex agreed the process should be simple and transparent. It should be thought of as a piece of information for the Board to consider (High, Medium, Low benefit cost) that allows comparison of different project types.
- George Gerstle noted:
 - Timely identification of Focus Areas by the Board will allow determination of goal choices to use.
 - This approach is for evaluating a plan, not for comparing specific individual projects.
 - There should be consideration of timeframe (short-term vs. long-term) in the evaluation.
 - Some benefits may address one goal but will not be good for another, how to balance this.
- Mr. Jerrett said the evaluation is an informational tool and is not to be considered a conclusive analysis of a project.
- Steve Durian agreed with consideration of timeframe (short-term vs. long-term). He agreed the approach should stay with the High, Medium, Low concept.

Kick-off discussion on Regional and Subregional Share funding targets

Todd Cottrell presented results of a Work Group poll on a preferred Regional/ Subregional Share percentage split. Poll results were:

% split Reg/Subreg	Scoring Results
20/80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Was the highest in raw votes cast
30/70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Median (midpoint; all responses evenly divided above or below)
40/60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Was the weighted average (largest avg. ranking receives highest score) ● Mean (average of all responses)

The Work Group was asked for comment on Attachment 2 (examples of past and present projects that could be potentially considered "Regional" projects.)

- Kathleen Bracke said Regional projects should be multi-agency projects; noting most on the list are single agency.

After discussion, the work group requested a straw poll be taken to determine a minimum Subregional Share percentage from the top 3 alternatives noted in the survey. Straw poll results were:

- 80% minimum—five members approved
- 70% minimum—seven members approved
- 60% minimum—four members approved

Following discussion, the work group consensus was that the Subregional Share should be within the range of 60%-80%, with the majority of the work group present recommending 70% as a minimum funding split.

- Doug Rex said he will convey this recommendation to the Board Work Session.
- Mac Callison said the Board should be made aware there was still a lot of divergence in opinion within the Work Group.

Kick-off discussion on Subregional distribution formula/geography

Due to time constraint, this agenda item was not discussed. Doug Rex asked members to contact staff if there are any questions on the item.

- Kent Moorman suggested the growth rate through 2025 be part of the formula (as discussed at NATA). George Gerstle commented cities that measure differently would disagree.
- Jeanne Shreve suggested having growth rate data for next five years available at the next meeting.

Next meeting

- George Gerstle reminded the Work Group to bring ideas on new set-aside programs and feedback on the magnitude of the different programs.

The meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

ATTACHMENT B

To: TIP Policy Work Group

From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner
303 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
June 26, 2017	Action	3

SUBJECT

Discuss existing TIP set-asides from the 2016-2021 TIP Policy to incorporate into the draft 2020-2023 TIP Policy document.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation on existing TIP set-asides from the 2016-2021 TIP Policy to incorporate into the draft 2020-2023 TIP Policy document.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The [2016-2021 TIP Policy](#) document outlines five off-the-top set-asides, along with the yearly federal funding allocation. Over the last three meetings, the workgroup had discussions and presentations to determine those that will continue, and set the amount each set-aside will receive over FY2020-2023. Any new proposed set-asides will be discussed and recommended as part of today's meeting.

Below is a listing of each of the existing set-asides and the staff recommendation, followed by a brief write-up for each.

Existing Set-Asides	Existing Federal Funding Allocations Per Year in FYs 2016-2019	Proposed Set-Asides	Proposed Federal Funding Allocations Per Year in <u>FYs 2020-2023</u>
Station Area Master Plans/ Urban Center Planning Studies	<p style="text-align: center;">\$600,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Center or Station Area Master Plan • Next step studies • Corridor-wide studies • Area planning and implementation activities 	Community Mobility Planning and Implementation	<p style="text-align: center;">\$2,000,000</p> <p><i>(The STAMP/UC Set-Aside is proposed to continue, though integrated into the new Community Mobility Planning and Implementation Set-Aside)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$500,000 per year for STAMP/UC planning studies <i>(shifted from STAMP/UC Set-Aside)</i> • \$1,500,000 per year for small infrastructure projects to implement planning studies • Includes first/last mile-type projects
Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	<p style="text-align: center;">\$1,600,000</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$560,000 per year is allocated for regional partnership TMAs (7 partnerships @ \$80,000/year) • \$640,000 per year for traditional TDM marketing projects • \$400,000 per year for TDM infrastructure projects 		

Existing Set-Asides	Existing Federal Funding Allocations Per Year in FYs 2016-2019	Proposed Set-Asides	Proposed Federal Funding Allocations Per Year in FYs 2020-2023
Way to Go Program	\$1,800,000	Way to Go Program	\$3,100,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$2,200,000 per year for the Way to Go program • \$700,000 per year is allocated for regional partnership TMAs (7 partnerships @ \$100,000/year) <i>(shifted from TDM Set-Aside)</i> • \$200,000 per year for TMA Market Research <i>(shifted from TDM Set-Aside for marketing projects)</i>
Regional Transportation Operations (traffic signals and ITS)	\$4,200,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately a third of the annual amount is used for DRCOG staff 	Regional Transportation Operations and Technology (traffic signals and ITS)	\$4,200,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately a third of the annual amount is used for DRCOG staff • Includes advanced emerging technology projects
Air Quality Improvements	\$1,800,000 Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC) receives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$720,000 in FY16 and \$1,200,000 per year for the remaining 3 years for vehicle fleet technology • \$400,000 per year for the Ozone Aware Outreach Program • \$200,000 per year to allocate and administer to local projects (e.g., PM-10 sweeper, de-icer projects) • \$480,000 in FY16 for an ozone SIP modeling study 	Air Quality Improvements	\$1,800,000 Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC) would receive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1,200,000 per year for the vehicle fleet technology • \$450,000 per year for the Ozone Aware Outreach Program • \$600,000 in FY20 for an ozone SIP modeling study

Station Area Master Plans/Urban Center Studies (STAMP/UC) Set-Aside

- Eliminate and integrate into the new TDM Set-Aside replacement, Community Mobility Planning and Implementation Set-Aside.
- Funding levels will stay approximately the same.

Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Set-Aside

- Remove funding allocated to the TMA partnerships and shift under the Way to Go Program, as Way to Go already manages these contracts.
- Remove funding allocated towards traditional TDM marketing projects and increase the Way to Go Program funding to conduct these types of projects. This will continue to strengthen the branding between the Way to Go Program and the local TMAs.
- Add funding for STAMP/UC studies/projects. This will allow the small infrastructure TDM projects to implement the STAMP/UC study outcomes.
- First/Last Mile-type projects (see information below and Attachment 1) would be allowable and encouraged as part of this program.

- Rebrand the set-aside as the *Community Mobility Planning and Implementation Set-Aside* and increase funding.

Way to Go Program

- Increase funding for the current program.
- Add funding to replace the TDM marketing projects selected from the existing TDM Set-Aside.
- Shift ownership of the TDM Partnerships over from the TDM Set-Aside (already managed by the Way to Go Program)

Regional Transportation Operations

- No proposed changes, though add "...and Technology" to the program name to re-emphasize that technology, including emerging technology (autonomous/connected vehicles), are part of the program.

Air Quality Improvements

- Minor funding adjustments were received from the RAQC.
- Staff proposes to eliminate the local agency call for projects as part of the RAQC allocation based on the call not returning a significant number nor quality projects. If local governments want to submit projects like these, they can do so under the subregional call.

Proposed New Set-Sides

Prior to the meeting, staff received one suggestion from workgroup member Ted Heyd for the creation of a First/Last Mile project set-aside (see Attachment 1). DRCOG staff has reviewed, and concluded projects similar to these will be available to submit under the proposed *Community Mobility Planning and Implementation Set-Aside* (former TDM Set-Aside).

Staff is proposing the following set-asides for your consideration and your discussion.

Regional Infrastructure Asset Inventory Set-Aside

- The proposed *Regional Infrastructure Asset Inventory Set-Aside* would build on the work of DRCOG and our nearly 30 partners to create and maintain a digital data set that includes critical transportation infrastructure like roadway edge of pavement, sidewalk centerlines, ramp locations, etc.
- An additional investment through a TIP set-aside would leverage and expand the foundation already built, and gather additional asset features such as manhole covers, poles, signs, fire hydrants and pavement markings. The final determination of the features to inventory and map would be made by DRCOG and our partners, most of which are local governments. The set-aside would ensure these features are regularly inventoried and mapped to agreed-upon collection standards.

- This investment would ensure the majority of the region’s communities would have access to frequently updated data on transportation assets they manage. In addition to providing high quality data throughout the region, this project would reduce costly local agency site visits and field work to collect data.
- For this set-aside effort, DRCOG, on behalf of our many partners, would request \$800,000 over the course of the FY2020-2023 TIP (two \$400,000 installments).

Community Investment Accelerator Fund Set-Aside

- The proposed *Community Investment Accelerator Fund Set-Aside* would strategically invest funds in public and/or private development projects that create opportunities for low- and moderate-income individuals and families across the Denver region.
- Many public and private development projects that aim to increase access to opportunity “get stuck” in the predevelopment phase of the project—the numerous activities between land acquisition and vertical construction. Predevelopment obstacles can be difficult to overcome because these projects are often extremely complex and mission driven developers, unlike traditional market rate developers, do not have ready access to funding needed to complete these activities, nor can they significantly raise rents to cover expenditures associated with escalating upfront costs.
- The proposed set-aside would target nonprofit and mission-oriented for profit developers; community-based organizations; public sector agencies; and potentially small businesses rooted in low- and moderate income neighborhoods. In cases where a public-sector entity is not directly involved, applicants could be required to inform and receive some level of endorsement from the impacted local jurisdiction.
- Ideally the *Community Investment Accelerator Fund Set-Aside* would be co-administered by DRCOG and a third-party, likely one or more Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) with proven track records of underwriting these types of loans for community development projects. Importantly, the Accelerator Fund could be designed to be self-replenishing, versus one-time grants.
- For this set-aside effort, DRCOG would request \$500,000 annually in the FY2020-2023 TIP. DRCOG’s investment could potentially leverage additional private capital available through community development finance institutions; not only increasing the overall amount of funding available, but also creating opportunities to offer lower interest rates on loans.

Human Service Transportation Set-Aside

- The purpose of the *Human Service Transportation Set-Aside* would be to provide a dedicated funding source to improve mobility for vulnerable populations (older adults, low-income individuals, veterans, and individuals with disabilities). This includes funding to address identified gaps such as the following:
 - Underfunded/Underserved Trips - Currently underfunded/underserved trips include those to religious institutions, family, and urgent, after-hours, and weekend trips.
 - Rolling stock expansion - The older adult population in the Denver region is growing and additional vehicles will be needed to keep up with increasing demand. Currently, expansion vehicles are underfunded through existing funding sources.

- The funding would be allocated to DRCOG, which would work with Area Agencies on Aging and transportation providers to fund the services and capital projects on an as needed basis. This funding would complement FTA 5310 and Older Americans/ Coloradans Act funding by funding identified needs that are underfunded/ underserved by those sources. This dedicated funding source would be coordinated with other funding sources to reduce duplication (clients whose trips are paid for with different funds riding on the same bus rather than separate vehicles) and provide more trips. The funding would also be leveraged with the ones previously stated plus potentially others like Medicaid, Social Security, and Temporary Aid for Needy Families (TANF) to create an integrated and coordinated pot of funding dedicated to human service transportation.
- For this set-aside effort, DRCOG would request \$1,000,000 per year for FY2020-2023.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[March 27, 2017](#)

[April 24, 2017](#)

[May 22, 2017](#)

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to incorporate staff's recommendation for set-asides into the draft FY2020-2023 TIP Policy document.

ATTACHMENT

1. Ted Heyd email regarding proposal for a First/Last Mile project set-aside

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT 1

Todd Cottrell

Subject: Set Aside Suggestion - First & Last Mile

From: Ted Heyd [<mailto:ted@bicyclecolorado.org>]

Sent: Thursday, June 08, 2017 3:35 PM

To: Doug Rex <DRex@drcog.org>; Steve Cook <SCook@drcog.org>; Jacob Riger <JRiger@drcog.org>

Subject: Set Aside Suggestion - First & Last Mile

Hi Doug / Steve / Jacob -

Building on our last TIP Policy Working Group meeting, thanks for encouraging members to present ideas on refined or new 'set asides' or 'off the top' pools.

Stemming from several comments made in the prior TIP Working Group & more recently the Policy Work Group, I'd like to propose the group discuss and decide yes or no (on a recommendation to the Board) on a **First / Last Mile Project Pool**. Some details on the concept:

1. The purpose of pool is to fund small but critical infrastructure projects that would have a regional benefit. While any given project is likely to be located within one jurisdiction, it would be a regionally beneficial program because projects would connect to regional transportation facilities (commuter rail, light rail, high frequency bus [Front Range Flyer / Bus Tang], etc).
2. Projects will have to be located **within a mile** of light rail, commuter rail, high frequency bus stops.
3. Permanent or pilot (test) improvements will be eligible but pool is largely intended for comparatively lower cost projects (i.e. up to but not exceeding \$50,000 with a match requirement). Scale and cost of projects would be such that it wouldn't be worth going after TIP money through the main call for projects.
4. Support for project from elected officials and staff will have to be demonstrated in application.
5. If a pilot project is applied for, some level of commitment to pursue and implement permanent improvements is required (i.e. a recommendation in an adopted master plan, a letter of support from public works / planning staff).
6. Population density, household income, origins & destinations, crash data, and existing infrastructure will all be important considerations in evaluating project applications.
7. For any **pilot** projects awarded funding, the projects will have to be in place for a minimum of 18 months so that its effectiveness can be evaluated (i.e. did walking or biking increase, did sidewalk riding go down, did crashes go down, was 85 percent speed closer to posted?) Evaluation metrics TBD and some flexibility will need to be built in. Important to note that evaluation will need to be simple enough such that doesn't chew up a lot of project budget.
8. Suggested set aside \$500,000 with approximately 10 projects selected.
9. Money would have to be defederalized b/c project budgets will be small and the project applications would need to be relatively simple to warrant pursuit of the funds. DRCOG or the RAQC would ideally administer the program (not CDOT or RTD).

ATTACHMENT 1

Here's the rub. I will be away on the 26th and so can't speak to this when we reconvene. Shall I line someone up to be the messenger or is one of you willing and able to carry the ball to kick off the group's discussion of this?

Thanks in advance!

-Ted

--

Ted Heyd, AICP
Policy Director
Bicycle Colorado
1525 Market Street, Suite 100
Denver Colorado 80202

Ted@bicyclecolorado.org
Office: 303.417.1544 x 109
Cell: 510.919.8595
Fax: 303.825.1038



ATTACHMENT C

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
June 26, 2017	Discussion	4

SUBJECT

Discussion on the percentage split between the Regional Share and Subregional Share and the definition for Regional Projects.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

At the June TIP Policy Work Group meeting, the workgroup recommended conveying to the Board Work Session a Subregional Share target between 60-80%, with majority of those present feeling a minimum of 70% was the most appropriate.

Staff presented this information to the Board Work Session on June 7, in addition to asking for comments and thoughts on a Regional Project definition. The Board members present discussed the merits of a higher or lower Subregional Share.

Some key takeaways include:

Those supportive of a high Subregional Share:

- Regional projects should have a narrow focus.
- A high subregional share is needed to justify the establishment of a regional call.

Those supportive of a low Subregional Share:

- The need to solve large regional issues.
- The regional vision is important.

Regional definition:

- Regional projects should show benefits that are cross-jurisdictional.
- Regional projects should show benefits that are multi-subregional.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[May 22, 2017](#) – TIP Policy Work Group

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

1. Regional project examples

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT 1

Example DRCOG TIP Projects - Past and Present - Potentially "Regional"

	Year Selected (Appox.)	DRCOG \$ mils.	Share of project total cost:	Scored?	Notes
1. Probably Regional					
FasTracks 1st Commitment	2005	\$60	1%	no	
FasTracks 2nd Commitment	2008	\$60	1%	no	
I-70 East (Central 70)	2015	\$50	4%	no	
US-36 BRT/Road Capacity	2012	\$20	7%	yes	TIGER
North I-25 Managed Lane (Phase 1)	2012	\$5	10%	no	TIGER
Denver Union Station Purchase	2001	\$20	1%	no	

2. Other Types of TIP Projects - Scored Competitively and Funded Primarily by DRCOG

	Year Selected	RTP Designation
RTP Roadways:		
S. I-25 "Lane Balance" (Co. Line - RidgeGate)	2015	Freeway
Ken Pratt Blvd (SH 119) Bypass Longmont	2001	Major Regional Arterial (MRA)
Broomfield Interchange (Wads, 120th Ext.)	2003	MRA/Freeway
Colfax at I-225 Interchange	2007	MRA/Freeway
Santa Fe / C-470 flyover	2009	MRA/Freeway
Parker / Arapahoe interchange	2005	MRA/MRA
120th Ave. new road ext. over S. Platte River	2007	MRA
Wadsworth widening (Wheat Ridge)	2015	MRA
US-85 south, widening and ops, Douglas Co.	2015	MRA
MLK Boulevard Extension	2015	Principal Arterial
Regional BRT Study	2015	BRT
FLEX Bus Route Ext. (Ft. Collins to Boulder)	2012	Bus Transit
Ped / Bicycle:		
Highline Canal Trail underpass (Iliff)	2012	
Cherry Creek Trail access ramp at 12th Ave.	2007	
Colorado Center Station bridge over I-25	2012	
Broadway (Boulder) Euclid CU underpass	2008	
Defined in 2040 RTP (not yet in TIP):		
SH-119 BRT		BRT on MRA
East Colfax BRT		BRT on MRA
Pena Blvd widening		Freeway
104th Ave. w of US-85 widening		Principal Arterial

ATTACHMENT D

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
June 26, 2017	Discussion	5

SUBJECT

Discussion on the formula to distribute the Subregional Share target allocation and geography to define the subregions.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The [Recommended Funding and Project Selection Framework](#) outlines the results of the TIP Review Work Group's previous discussions for how to divide the available funding to subregions and what the subregional geography recommendation is. *This information was included within last month's agenda, but due to time limits, was not discussed.*

Subregional Funding Target Formula

The Work Group recommended funding targets for subregions be based on some combination of population, employment, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), or person miles traveled (PMT). During previous discussions in 2016, staff noted adding variables to the recommended formula would not substantially change the percentage outcome, and therefore available funding, targeted to each subregion.

Attachment 1 was created based on the recommendation contained within the adopted Framework Report, with a subregional share of 70%. Though no discussion took place last month, workgroup members expressed the ability to view projected population growth for 2025. This information has been included within the attachment and two average of factors have been calculated; one with, and one without, the 2025 population growth.

Subregional Geographic Areas

The adopted Framework Report also recommended using counties as the subregional geographic unit for funding recommendations. The report and previous discussions concluded the following reasons for the recommendation:

- Counties already exist and a comfortable working relationship is present among its jurisdictions.
- Counties are used for CDOT's hearing process, which may aid in better coordination on project applications.
- It would encourage cooperation and collaboration with neighboring counties on important cross-jurisdictional projects.

Based on the previous recommendation contained within the report and the fact the framework report itself was accepted by the Board in February 2017, staff recommends Subregional Share funding targets be based on the geographical unit of counties going forward, unless directed otherwise.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

1. Example Subregional Share funding targets

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 - Example Factors for Subregional Share Distributions

(June 27, 2017)

Revenue Factors	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Denver	Douglas	Jefferson	SW Weld	Total
Population (2015 DOLA)	490,829	630,564	319,177	64,788	683,096	322,017	565,230	66,483	3,142,184
% of Regional Total	15.62%	20.07%	10.16%	2.06%	21.74%	10.25%	17.99%	2.12%	100%
Population Estimate (2025 DOLA)	604,088	757,130	361,029	85,013	762,972	387,352	625,899	95,599	3,679,082
% of Regional Total	16.42%	20.58%	9.81%	2.31%	20.74%	10.53%	17.01%	2.60%	100%
Employment (2015 DOLA)	237,449	390,554	225,443	43,019	571,334	149,513	295,796	26,239	1,939,347
% of Regional Total	12.24%	20.14%	11.62%	2.22%	29.46%	7.71%	15.25%	1.35%	100%
PMT (2040 MVRTP 2016)	18,222,785	18,031,641	8,315,235	2,829,814	21,855,019	12,285,471	17,674,047	3,569,662	102,783,674
% of Regional Total	17.73%	17.54%	8.09%	2.75%	21.26%	11.95%	17.20%	3.47%	100%
Average of Factors with 2015 Population	15.20%	19.25%	9.96%	2.34%	24.15%	9.97%	16.81%	2.31%	100%
Average of Factors with 2025 Estimated Population	15.46%	19.42%	9.84%	2.43%	23.82%	10.06%	16.49%	2.47%	100%

Example County Allocations
(4-yr Total in thousands)

Average of Factors with 2015 Pop **Average of Factors with 2025 Est. Pop**

	%	\$	%	\$
Adams	15.20%	\$25,532	15.46%	\$25,980
Arapahoe	19.25%	\$32,340	19.42%	\$32,626
Boulder	9.96%	\$16,729	9.84%	\$16,536
Broomfield	2.34%	\$3,939	2.43%	\$4,078
Denver	24.15%	\$40,579	23.82%	\$40,018
Douglas	9.97%	\$16,750	10.06%	\$16,907
Jefferson	16.81%	\$28,244	16.49%	\$27,698
SW Weld	2.31%	\$3,887	2.47%	\$4,158
	100.0%	\$168,000	100.0%	\$168,000

Example Subregional Share Allocation

70% \$168,000,000