

AGENDA

TIP Review Work Group – Mtg. 11

Thursday, June 30, 2016

1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Monarch Pass Conference Room – 1st floor, East side

1. Call to Order
2. May 13, 2016 - Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)
3. Discussion on setting future meeting dates.
(Attachment B)
4. Discussion on regional funding allocation process follow-up.
(Attachment C)
5. Discussion on guidelines for subregional funding allocation process.
(Attachment D)
6. Adjournment

Upcoming meeting dates

To be determined

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 REVIEW WORK GROUP – Mtg. 10 Wednesday, May 13, 2016 - 9:00 a.m.

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
Steve Klausing	Business
Danny Herrmann	CO Dept. of Transportation
Janice Finch	Denver, City and County
David Gaspers	Denver, City and County
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Mike Salisbury	Environmental
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Dave Baskett	Jefferson County, City of Lakewood
Ken Lloyd	RAQC

Others Present: Bill Haas, Aaron Bustow, FHWA

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Will Soper, Brad Calvert, Casey Collins

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

April 15, 2016 Summary

The summary was accepted as written.

Discussion on guidelines for the regional funding allocation process.

Todd Cottrell presented five questions on the regional funding allocation process. The general takeaways of the work group's discussion are summarized as follows:

Question 1 – What is purpose of the regional funding allocation?

- Regional projects should have a “systems” approach.
 - Benefitting a regional system is a key criterion. A critical step is to identify what system the proposed project benefits.
 - A key component is the need to incorporate the magnitude of regional trips and people served by any project. Tie it back to activity, and employment and residential centers.
- Purpose of the regional pot should be to focus funding on regional connections, regardless of mode.
 - Projects should have these characteristics: connectivity, integration, be a catalyst.

Question 2 - How should eligible regional projects/programs be defined?

- The regional call for projects should have a focus area(s) and/or address an established “problem statement”.
 - Recommend the Board identify a TIP Focus area(s)/theme(s). Identify major issue(s)/challenge(s) to be addressed in the TIP; should be consistent with MV or RTP.
 - Establish “problem statement” before deciding what types of projects are eligible for regional pot.
- For every project application, need to present the problem being addressed (which is different from the quantitative criteria) to provide context.
- Funds may leverage larger CDOT/RTD projects.
 - Use funds to leverage dollars to create regional benefit.
- Need to measure ROI (e.g. mobility, congestion, safety, air quality, travel time, economic development, quantitative and qualitative).
 - Board identification of a “problem statement” may guide how the ROI is calculated. Identify ROI as quantitatively as possible.
 - It was noted an ROI is already built into applications for FASTER, TIGER, PELs, etc., and indirectly in current TIP process.

Staff action items:

- Staff will develop a draft definition of “regional” projects.
- Staff will provide a list of ROI concepts.

Question 3 – What types of projects/programs should be eligible for the regional allocation?

The Work Group decided to forego this discussion for now since there is not a clear need to pre-define eligible types until the Board gives guidance on the TIP Focus area(s)/theme(s) and “problem statement”.

Question 4 - What type of evaluation criteria should be used for final selection?

- Level of direction from “problem statement” will guide the level of detail needed for the evaluation criteria.
- Criteria should be quantitative; measure a goal from a “problem statement”.
 - Need to develop strict criteria with clear methodology to quantitatively measure effectiveness; be reproducible (i.e., have clear definitions up front); and have reliability.
 - It was noted staff is not establishing the evaluation criteria; this will be established by a committee or ad hoc group to be determined by the Board.

Question 5 – How should the application process happen?

1. The Board should first provide guidance on if they want to have a TIP Focus area(s)/theme(s) before developing application process. When asking the Board, could give them examples of what TIP Focus area(s)/theme(s) might look like, to broaden their ideas of potential themes.
2. Should smaller projects be considered?
3. Consideration will need to be given on how to handle “off-TIP cycle” major project requests.

Discussion meeting dates

The meeting adjourned at 10:47 a.m. A Doodle poll will be emailed to the committee to determine the next meeting in June.

ATTACHMENT B

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
June 30, 2016	Discussion	3

SUBJECT

Discussion on meeting dates for the TIP Review Work Group.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

At the June meeting, the Work Group will be asked to establish a standing time and date for future meetings. Please bring your calendars.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[April 15, 2016](#) and [May 13, 2016](#) TIP Review Work Group

PROPOSED MOTION

At the discretion of the Work Group.

ATTACHMENT

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT C

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
June 30, 2016	Discussion	4

SUBJECT

Follow-up discussion on considerations and guidelines for the regional funding allocation component of the Dual Model.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

At the May 13, 2016 meeting, the Work Group discussed the regional funding allocation process related to the Dual TIP Project Selection Model. Attachment C-1 was presented last month for discussion and is provided for information.

The June 30 discussion will focus on two follow-up topics that were identified; 1) a definition for “regional” projects and 2) return-on-investment (ROI) concepts for projects.

1) Regional Project Definition

During discussions, staff was asked to develop and bring back to the work group a sentence or two that summarized the discussion that took place. Staff offers the following:

Selected regional TIP projects should directly address a Board-adopted TIP problem statement through a beneficial, systems-approach focused on regional connections, regardless of travel mode. Regional projects should connect communities, improve personal and freight mobility while providing a high return on investment to the region.

2) ROI Concepts for Projects

During the meeting, staff was asked to bring back a list of potential ROI concepts that may be used to gauge project benefit and/or performance. Many types of variables can be used in technical calculations of ROI for projects (i.e., existing TIP applications). However, final ROI measures should be statistically reliable and align with the adopted Metro Vision. Knowing ROI can be both quantitative and qualitative, staff has identified the following:

- Generally reliable (i.e., existing data):
 - Existing “users” of a facility or service
 - Passengers, vehicles, riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, etc.
 - Freight, cargo
 - Location traits
 - Population, jobs, businesses in the vicinity of project
 - Neighborhood socio-economic traits (e.g., environmental justice)
 - Average trip lengths

- Magnitude of existing problem
 - Crashes, serious injuries, fatalities
 - Person and vehicle delay (traffic congestion)
 - Pedestrian/bicycle diversion length (e.g., to bypass a major barrier)
- Moderately reliable (i.e., predictions)
 - New predicted “users” or beneficiaries of a facility or service
 - Predictions of direct benefits
 - Reduction in person and vehicle delay
 - Reduction of crashes
 - Reduction of VMT, GHGs, pollutant emissions and other environmental variables
- Less reliable (i.e., more qualitative)
 - Predictions of indirect benefits
 - Public health improvements
 - Economic development

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[May 13, 2016](#) TIP Work Group

PROPOSED MOTION

At the Work Group’s discretion.

ATTACHMENT

C-1 Dual TIP Selection Model Discussion (as presented at the May 13, 2016 Work Group)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT C-1

Regional Funding Allocation Process Discussion

(May 13, 2016)

Regional Funding Allocation

1. What is the purpose of the regional funding allocation?
2. How should eligible regional projects/programs be defined?
 - a. Should a definition be established up front? “Regional projects/programs are ... that accomplish ... or do ... or touch... or include...”
 - b. What is the regional value/benefit of a proposed project/program?
 - c. Additional considerations:
 - i. Facility type **hierarchy** high to low (freeways → major regional arterials → principal arterial?) (rail transit → BRT → regional routes → etc.)
 - ii. **Size** (width: X number of lanes or lane miles; length: facility is X miles long)
 - iii. **Volume** (# of vehicles, persons, users, etc.)
 - iv. **Cost** (projects over \$xx million?)
 - v. **“Regional”** (Project crosses more than one county? Other measurable methods)
3. What types of projects/programs should be eligible for the regional allocation?
 - a. Roadways: Capacity projects?; Large reconstruction?; Operational?
 - i. Assume ALL will have multimodal elements
 - b. Transit: Physical facilities – stations and travelways? Rolling stock? Operations?
 - c. Bicycle facilities: Serve defined “priority” corridors? Serve “regional” attraction/facility?
 - d. Pedestrian facilities: Regionwide/county/citywide defined efforts – e.g., ADA? Missing sidewalks? Serve a “regional” attraction/facility?
 - e. Other? (regional pavement maintenance, asset management program, others?) Set-aside “pool” vs. funding out of regional allocation
4. What type of evaluation criteria should be used for final selection?
 - a. Rigorous/Detailed criteria - similar to current TIP?
 - b. Broad/Simple criteria (yes/no, essay, high-medium-low)?
 - c. Something in the middle?
 - d. None? Talley votes or sum of individual rankings? Other methods?
5. How should the application process happen?
 - a. Timing with sub-regional allocation selections?

ATTACHMENT D

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
June 30, 2016	Discussion	5

SUBJECT

Discussion on considerations and guidelines for the subregional funding allocation component of the Dual Model.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

At the April 15, 2016 meeting, staff presented background information and conceptual topics related to the Dual TIP Project Selection Model for allocating DRCOG's federal transportation funds. The Dual Model topics fell into three general categories: the overall dual model process, the regional funding allocation, and the subregional funding allocation.

The May 13 meeting was dedicated to discussions on the regional funding allocation process. Additional follow-up to that discussion is presented in Attachment C.

The June 30 discussion will focus on the subregional funding allocation process. Attachment D-1 can be used as a guide for workgroup's discussion.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

D-1 Subregional Funding Allocation Process Discussion

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT D-1

Subregional Funding Allocation Process Discussion

(June 30, 2016)

Sub-Regional Funding Allocation

1. How should the subregional geographic areas be defined?
 - a. By county?
 - b. By logical subarea using specific factors (population, travel patterns, etc)?

2. How should funding allocations to sub-regions be calculated?
 - a. i.e., population, employment, VMT, othera combination of variables?

3. What guidelines should be established for the subregional forums? (“forums” will be responsible for recommending projects to the DRCOG Board)
 - a. Participation/membership structure
 - i. All local governments invited to participate on forum
 - ii. Other eligible entities?
 - iii. Should regional agencies (CDOT, RTD, RAQC) be involved in the governance?
 - b. Forum procedures (e.g., public comment/participation, consensus/voting)
 - c. Level of DRCOG staff involvement

4. Project/Program eligibility
 - a. Project/programs eligible in DRCOG’s current TIP?
 - b. Anything that’s federally eligible?

5. Project selection procedures
 - a. Competitive process
 - i. Specific core criteria to be used by all subregions (e.g. Metro Vision, environmental justice, ADA)?
 - ii. Technical evaluations?
 1. Problem definition (volume, congestion, connectivity, filling gaps, etc.)
 2. Likely benefits (usage, ridership, delay reduction, crash reduction, etc.)
 3. Other related beneficial elements: (multimodal components, connections to transit, etc.)
 - iii. Subregional-specific criteria (beyond core criteria)?
 - b. Eligible entities (e.g. local governments, state, and regional agencies)?

6. How to incorporate (or not) project type targets (x% to capacity, x% to bike/ped, etc...)?

7. How to incorporate consideration of funding program types (CMAQ, TAP, and STP-Metro)?