

AGENDA

TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 8

Tuesday, August 8, 2017

2:00 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Monarch Pass Conference Room – 1st Floor, east side

1. 2:00 Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. July 24, 2017 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)
4. 2:35 Board Work Session Debrief
5. 3:00 Discussion on TIP Subregional Share
(Attachment B) Todd Cottrell
6. 4:30 TIP Focus Area Discussion at August 26 Board Annual Workshop
(Attachment C) Doug Rex
7. 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.



ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg. 7 Monday, July 24, 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
Sarah Grant	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

Public: Myron Hora, WSP; Karen Schneiders, Lizzie Kemp, CDOT; Hank Bracksma, SRC; Sylvia Labrucherie, DRMAC

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Jacob Riger, Brad Calvert, Matthew Helfant, Steve Erickson, Jayla Sanchez-Warren, Flo Raitano, Mark Northrop, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Discussion and recommendation on TIP set-asides

Todd Cottrell continued discussion of set-aside recommendations. He reviewed staff's revisions to the set-aside table since the last meeting on June 26 (**as shown in the agenda memo**):

- Removed staff-proposed *Community Investor Accelerator Fund* from consideration as a set-aside. This proposal may be brought up later as a Regional Share program.
- Funding amounts reflect a 4-year total allocation, rather than 1-year.
- Added clarifying language in *Community Mobility Planning and Implementation*.
- Re-branded the *Way to Go* set-aside as *TDM Services and Marketing*.
- Increased the TDM marketing services allocation from \$800,000 to \$1 million and added clarifying language.
- Added clarifying language in *Regional Transportation Operations and Technology*.
- Added back in \$800,000 for local projects and clarifying language in *Air Quality Improvements*.
- No changes in the two staff-proposed set-asides, *Regional Infrastructure Asset Inventory* and *Human Service Transportation*.

The work group discussed each of the existing and proposed set-asides.

Community Mobility Planning & Implementation and TDM Services & Marketing

Steve Erickson, DRCOG, presented a Way to Go program budget overview to provide explanation for the proposed additional funding.

- Dave Baskett asked for more clarification on why TDM amounts were increased in the revised set-aside table. He suggested making it clearer for Board members. It was noted some TDM programs shifted into different set-aside categories. Mr. Baskett said discussion at the last meeting indicated the work group wanted more funding for the RTO program.
- Steve Klausung expressed concern the current TDM partnership project scope is too narrow. He suggested changing funding source (CMAQ to STP) to allow flexibility. Doug Rex noted a new TMA partnership MOU is under development. More discussions with FHWA and CDOT are expected to address this issue for these types of projects.
- Ken Lloyd questioned the proposed reduction of TDM marketing funding from \$2.56 to \$1 million. Doug Rex noted FHWA's concern about quantifying results for stand-alone marketing projects. Aaron Bustow said FHWA wants projects to be more performance-based, and noted administrative cost concerns.
- Bryan Weimer suggested having all TMA programs compete for funding, rather than each TMA receiving a set amount. Jeanne Shreve agreed, and felt all set-asides should be evaluated mid-TIP cycle to see if changes should be made.
- George Gerstle suggested: expanding the TDM marketing definition to "marketing and services"; holding the TDM dollar amount steady, rather than decreasing; and encouraged staff to pursue funding source flexibility.

Regional Transportation Operations & Technology

- Kent Moorman said RTOT funding should be increased as it is a successful regional program. He felt autonomous vehicle projects should compete as a Regional Share project and be 'proven', before becoming a set-aside.
- Jeanne Shreve agreed about increasing funding for backbone RTOT projects. She agreed new innovative technologies projects should compete as Regional Share projects and go through the TIP cycle to be proven.
- Janice Finch suggested increasing RTOT funding about 15% to at least \$20 million.
- Mac Callison said it makes sense to increase RTOT to \$20 million.
- Steve Klausung agrees with increasing funding; said make it the #1 priority.

George Gerstle asked if work group agreed with Janice Finch suggestion to increase RTOT funding to \$20 million. The work group agreed.

Air Quality Improvements

- Ken Lloyd suggested that the \$800,000 for local air quality projects (i.e., PM10 sweepers) be moved into *TDM Services & Marketing* instead.
- Steve Klausung suggested putting this \$800,000 into RTOT instead.

George Gerstle asked for the work group's recommendation for where to move the *Air Quality Improvement* set-aside's \$800,000 for local projects. Jeanne Shreve asked to table discussion on this \$800,000 until other set-asides are discussed.

Community Mobility Planning & Implementation

- Janice Finch said the \$6 million proposed for small infrastructure in the *Community Mobility Planning and Implementation* set-aside could potentially be apportioned to the Subregional pot and be removed as a set-aside.
- Steve Klausing suggested allocating \$1.6 to small infrastructure, with the rest to Subregional.

George Gerstle asked if the work group recommended reducing the \$6 million allocation proposed in small infrastructure portion of the *Community Mobility Planning and Implementation* set-aside to \$2 million, and to move \$4 million into the RTO set-aside.

Regional Infrastructure Asset Inventory (staff-proposed set-aside)

- Jeanne Shreve asked what kind of data would be gathered and decided by whose standards. Brad Calvert explained it is to be determined by the local partners.
- Kathleen Bracke questioned how this differs from current local agency data collection efforts. Brad Calvert noted it builds on the annual regional data collection and uses aerial imaging. Could lessen the local agency data collection load.
- Art Griffith asked what is the most important data needed for the region? He recommended having a ITS emphasis and this must be dynamic and timely. Is there a local match?
- John Cotten noted the difficulty in converting data; said this may be too time-consuming and difficult to implement for local agencies.
- Steve Klausing supported this set-aside.
- Janice Finch felt this set-aside proposal is not fleshed out enough and needs to be a Regional program first.
- Dave Baskett agreed it should be a Regional Share program first; at this point, it seems duplicative.
- Mac Callison agreed it should be a Regional Share program first.

George Gerstle summarized that the Regional Infrastructure set-aside needs to have more specificity; and should first see how it competes as a Regional Share program.

Human Service Transportation (staff-proposed set-aside)

Matthew Helfant gave an overview of the proposal. Doug Rex and Jayla Sanchez-Warren noted this program would be administered by the DRCOG Area Agency on Aging (AAA) program and would fund current service providers or be an RFP.

- Kathleen Bracke asked if non-traditional providers could be used. Matthew Helfant said it could.
- Janice Finch said it is untried and doesn't rise to set-aside level; felt it needs to compete as a Regional program first.
- George Gerstle and Steve Klausing disagreed with Ms. Finch and said this is not a new issue; there is a long-standing, identified need to have increased level of service for a rapidly growing population. Mr. Klausing encouraged DRCOG to look to all kinds of partners for this, including RTD.
- Mac Callison asked how \$1 million was decided. Jayla Sanchez-Warren and Hank Bracksma responded (door-to-door service, etc.)
- Art Griffith suggested \$2 million.
- Ken Lloyd was unsure if this should be set-aside or a Regional Share program. Said we need to justify a 25% increase to \$50 million for the total set-aside amount.
- Kathleen Bracke said it should be a set-aside.
- Dave Baskett said it should be a set-aside.

- Jeanne Shreve asked how the program addresses technology needs. Matthew Helfant responded that several other DRCOG grant programs will coordinate and help address the technology aspect—the Veterans Transportation & Community Living Initiative (VTCLI) and the 5310 grant (call center).

George Gerstle asked if there was consensus for the *Human Service Transportation* to be a set-aside, with the dollar amount to be further decided in context of all the set-asides.

Discussion on the dollar amounts for the set-asides

Doug Rex noted the work group's suggestions for reducing the small infrastructure amount (in *Community Mobility*) from \$6 to \$2 million, reducing the total set-aside amount from \$8 to \$4 million.

- Sarah Grant suggested taking \$3 million from the \$6 million Small Infrastructure amount and putting in RTOT (a 15% increase to RTOT, i.e., \$19.8 million). She suggested leaving \$3 million in small infrastructure (to leave door open for First/Final Mile projects).

Doug Rex summarized:

Regional Transportation Operations & Technology Increase from \$16.8 million to \$20 million. (i.e., taking \$3.2 million from the \$6 million small infrastructure amount in the *Community Mobility* set-aside and putting in RTOT, leaving \$2.8 million in small infrastructure. This would leave \$4.8 million total in *Community Mobility*.)

Air Quality Improvements set-aside Ken Lloyd said move the \$800,000 local air quality projects amount to TDM. TDM projects is now at \$1.8 million.

TDM Services set-aside There was more discussion on the proposed \$1.6 million increase in the Way to Go program (from \$7.2 to \$8.8 million).

- Ken Lloyd noted the Way to Go budget handout from Steve Erickson shows a \$1 million increase in advertising and promotions as well as about 5% increase for staff.
- Steve Erickson noted DRCOG currently augments Way to Go advertising funding with spenddown funds from the sale of previous vanpool assets. This non-federal source will not be available after two years and Way to Go is pursuing other funding sources.
- Art Griffith suggested removing the term, "marketing". George Gerstle suggested Marketing/Implementation.

Community Mobility Planning & Implementation set-aside Reduce small infrastructure amount from \$6 million to \$2.8 million.

It was noted the existing total set-aside amount is currently \$40 million. The proposed new total is \$45.4 million. If adding *Human Services* would be about \$49 million, a 25% increase overall.

George Gerstle asked if the work group would recommend the Way to Go program within the *TDM Services* set-aside at current \$7.2 million level (with any increase for funding to compete in Regional pot), \$2.8 million for 7 regional TMAs, and \$1.8 million for TDM marketing projects.

- Ken Lloyd suggested to change to \$8.8 for Way to Go.
- Janice Finch suggested a 5% increase across the board. She didn't feel the Way to Go advertising increase was justified. She said Denver Board representatives expressed skepticism in the Way to Go program without good performance measures.
- George Gerstle suggested basing on Janice Finch's 5% increase suggestion, or \$7.2 million increased 5% annually (i.e., add \$360,000 to \$7.2 million, or \$7.56 million instead of \$8.8 million).
- Kathleen Bracke suggested \$8 million for Way to Go (\$600,000, an 8% increase).

Jeanne Shreve asked if outside sponsorships could help defray the Way to Go program funding gap. Steve Erickson spoke on successful sponsorship efforts. He also noted Way to Go has not had a funding increase in four years, while TDM in the region (which is designated as a high priority for Denver in Mayor Hancock's Mobility Action Plan) is rapidly expanding.

- Ted Heyd felt Way to Go program should be increased because of regional growth.
- John Cotton said work group should keep in mind set-asides take away from roadway funding. He suggested \$7.9 million for Way to Go.
- Ken Lloyd said this doesn't help with Way to Go's funding shortfall, at that amount it would lose \$700,000.
- Jeanne Shreve suggested funding Way to Go for 2 years at \$7.9 million (giving 2 years' time to show performance results).

At end of discussion, a motion was made:

Ken Lloyd MOVED to leave Way to Go funding amount at \$8.8 million for 4 years. Art Griffith seconded.

Dave Baskett made a friendly amendment to clarify as \$8.8 million for the Way to Go program, \$2.8 million for the 7 regional TMAs partnership @ \$100,000 per year, and \$1.8 million for TDM projects (but not infrastructure). Art Griffith seconded. 10 voted in favor and 7 opposed. The motion passed.

Doug Rex summarized the following 4-year set-aside amounts for the work group's recommendation:

Community Mobility Planning & Implementation funding amount - \$4.8 million total, \$2 million for small area planning and /or transportation studies, and \$2.8 million for small infrastructure.

TDM Services funding amount – \$13.4 million total, \$8.8 to Way to Go, \$2.8 million to TMA partnership, \$1.8 million to TDM projects

Regional Transportation and Technology (RTOT) funding amount - \$20 million

Air Quality Improvements funding amount - \$7.2 million

Human Services funding amount - \$4 million

Doug Rex noted the \$49.4 million grand total.

Steve Klausing MOVED to recommend the above set-aside amounts. Art Griffith seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion and recommendation on the Regional Share definition

Todd Cottrell presented a discussion on refinements to the definition of Regional Share.

Jeanne Shreve requested reference maps only depict what is eligible on each level of the regional system to make it clearer for Board to understand. Make sure all maps indicate if projects are completed or not.

Kathleen Bracke had concerns about reference maps accuracy. She is not supportive of the maps used and listed issues:

- Transit map – Ms. Bracke questioned depiction of dash line end points for SH-119 corridor (should go to downtown Longmont and Boulder).
- Bicycle corridor system map – In highlighted key multi-use trails, why it does not include State Highways 7 and 119.

- Doug Rex said this map is a placeholder and will be updated as part of the Active Transportation Plan.
- Ms. Bracke said, in meantime, the map should indicate that regional corridors are “To Be Determined”
- George Gerstle suggested stating that until a new map is adopted, that regional corridors also be eligible.
- Ms. Bracke agreed, but if still using this map, to denote that regional corridors are to be determined.
- Doug Rex noted new map creation will be expedited when AT Plan consultant is finalized.

Ms. Bracke said Boulder’s preference is that the Major Regional Arterials be eligible too, not just the freeways.

- Janice Finch said she was in favor of using freeways and above for Regional Share competition. She does not think a project on the arterial roadway system could be transformative.

Ms. Bracke requested clarification on the RR crossing map. It references the Regional Roadway System map, but if being changed to reflect only freeways, does that take off RR crossings that are not on freeways.

- Steve Cook said anything in grey on map is on the RTP-designated Regional. She asked to have better definition where they can be eligible.

Art Griffith asked an eligibility question (Grade-separation map at RR crossings). Is it just grey dots on map or can grade-crossings that improve the function of major roads be eligible.

- George Gerstle said if a grade crossing demonstrates significant improvements to the regional roadway facility it should be eligible.

George Gerstle said, in Fig. 6.3 Regional Managed Lanes, there needs to be clarification that arterial bus lanes are considered part of that managed lane definition.

- Steve Cook said yes, operational improvements are eligible, unless it’s new capacity, or deleting capacity, which would require plan amendment.

Bryan Weimer asked if freeway reconstructs are eligible as a stand-alone project? Steve Cook said yes. Mr. Weimer asked if we then are supplementing CDOT’s maintenance.

George Gerstle felt reconstruction is not transformative and should not be included under Regional. Doug Rex noted the term “transformative” has been removed in Regional definition.

Janice Finch asked if the yellow tollways shown in freeways map are eligible. Doug Rex said no.

Mac Callison questioned whether the “50% of total project cost” used in the Regional Share eligibility definition is final. Doug Rex said it’s not. George Gerstle said definition of Regional has nothing to do with source of money. Percentage of other funding sources should not be in the Regional definition, but be an important criterion in evaluation selection.

Janice Finch said Denver Board representatives would like DRCOG to do analysis of previous 2 to 3 TIP cycles. She asked, if we use this Regional definition, what percentage of projects could have been eligible to compete for Regional funding. (She said that’s bigger than \$25 mil. to I-70, and because if they were freeway projects, they would have been eligible). Then what should the percentage be for Regional vs. Subregional pot.

Steve Durian asked why toll roads are not shown as being eligible. Steve Cook noted they are identified in RTP as 100% locally-funded, such as by a separate funding authority.

George Gerstle asked if the Work Group was agreeable to the Regional definition presented, with the amendments suggested in the discussion.

Doug Rex summarized the map changes below:

- **Regional BRT map**

Kathleen Bracke noted her concerns with the accuracy of maps. She said Flatiron Flyer encountered problems because of maps showing end of physical improvements at the edge of Boulder, when people on bus are trying to get to CU Boulder and downtown Boulder. A similar issue also exists on the north end.

Doug Rex said, as an example, if a general lane is converted to BRT lane, it would require a plan amendment and would not be eligible, as currently proposed.

George Gerstle said, while FHWA likes the dashed line to end where the construction ends, he suggested showing that service goes into the city.

- Doug Rex said we could do that, but understand that no additional BRT infrastructure can be outside of this without a plan amendment.
- Steve Cook noted this was what was proposed by Boulder County three years ago. George Gerstle said they learned their error, and said it would be helpful to show extended service.
- Doug Rex said we could show a BRT system and show capacity projects as part of the Fiscally Constrained.

Jeanne Shreve questioned if changing maps at will would be problematic. She said changing maps needs to do a plan amendment.

- George Gerstle agreed, when it is for infrastructure capital projects, but said it's important to show service extent, not only capital extent.
- Doug Rex noted the map is accurate from the Fiscally Constrained RTP perspective.
- Mr. Gerstle and Ms. Bracke said Boulder might have to do a plan amendment.
- Janice Finch suggested showing this issue as a map footnote. Mr. Gerstle and Ms. Bracke did not agree.

- **Use Multi-use Trails and Regional Corridors (until Active Transportation Plan is done)**
- **No changes to Freeway map, but clarify that it doesn't include tollways (highway authority type)**
- **No changes to Regional Managed Lanes map**
- **For the Rail Freight System, the rail separation must benefit the regional roadway system facility.**

The eligibility of a Regional project should not require a share of outside source funds (i.e., 50%), but the funding share should be an important criterion in evaluating any proposed Regional project.

More discussion on the definition and eligibility of operational projects will be held in later meetings.

The work group agreed staff could bring work group feedback to the August 2 Board work session.

Next meeting

The meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m. The next meeting date will be determined by polling the work group. (After polling, the next meeting is Tuesday, August 8, 2017 at 2:00 p.m.)

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 #
August 8, 2017	Discussion	4

SUBJECT

Discussion on Subregional Share policy topics.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

DRCOG staff has drafted Subregional Share guidelines/process for the TIP Policy Work Group's consideration, which is shown in Attachment 1. Specific discussion questions for the workgroup are highlighted in yellow.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

1. Draft Guidelines for the Subregional Share Projects/Programs Process and Applications

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

Draft - Guidelines for Subregional Share Project/Program Process and Applications

1. Overall Subregional Forum Process

- All local governments within the subregion must be invited to participate on the forum.
- Regional partner agencies (RTD and CDOT) must be invited to participate (non-voting).
- Each forum can invite other agencies and stakeholders to participate.
- DRCOG staff will participate and assist to the extent requested, but may attend any forum meeting
- Individual participating membership will be determined by the forum and each local government. The Board-accepted White Paper suggests membership be offered to elected officials, who could appoint a designee, if desired.
- Forums may establish technical subcommittees, but must be open to all member entities.
- Coordination with other subregional forums is encouraged (e.g., for project development and funding partnerships).
- Forum meetings must be open to the public.

2. Federal and DRCOG project eligibility rules

- **Decision Point:** *What is the minimum federal project request for subregions?*
- Minimum 20% non-federal match required.
- Capacity projects (rapid transit or roadway) must be defined as eligible for regional funding in the correct staging period in the 2040 MVRTP, or as amended* (Appendices 3 and 4) before the Call for Projects is completed.
- EA or EIS decision documents must be signed or reasonably expected to be signed within 2020-2023.
- **Decision Point:** *Other eligibility traits. Examples:*
 - *Per the 2040 MVRTP, TIP roadway projects must be on the designated Regional Roadway System*
 - *Other Federal requirements outlined in guidance documents*
 - *Place a limit to how many applications one sponsor can submit?*
 - *Metro Vision targets relationship*
 - *Regional Transportation Plan consistency*
 - *Multimodal: No more than XX% of available funds can be allocated to a combination of roadway capacity and roadway reconstruction projects OR A minimum of XX% of available funds must be allocated to multimodal elements (no roadway capacity or reconstruction)*

*The proposed amendments/networks to model must be approved by the DRCOG Board even if the entire amendment process is not yet complete.

3. Required Application Information

- TIP project/program sponsor (local govt/regional/state entity)
 - The sponsor is contractually and financially responsible for the work through the IGA with CDOT/RTD and project delays with DRCOG. Work elements do not necessarily need to be completed by the project sponsor (i.e., another local government could do the work)
- Project/program name
- Project/program scope
 - **Decision Point:** *What level of detail is required? Similar to existing TIP process or less detailed?*
- What adopted plan(s) or document(s) identify the project/program?
- DRCOG federal funding request by federal fiscal year (2020-2023)
- Local matching funds (20% minimum)
- Total cost

Draft - Guidelines for Subregional Share Project/Program Process and Applications

4. Required Evaluation Criteria

Each forum must address the following however they wish:

- Multimodal elements of the project/program
- Connectivity to other modes

Qualitative-related

Each application must answer the following:

- What specific existing problem will the project/program address?
- Describe the public outreach that has taken place for this project/program to date.
- How does this project/program address the Board-defined TIP Focus Area(s)?
- Explain how this project/program relates to and addresses DRCOG's Metro Vision Plan targets and outcomes?
- How will this project/program prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities?
 - If applicable, does this project advance the sponsor's ADA Transition Plan?
- How will minority and low income persons benefit from the project/program?

Quantitative-related

Each forum will design specific evaluation criterion or criteria to address each using a forum-derived point system

Decision Point: *Should a minimum share of points be required for any measures or criteria? (e.g., a minimum of XX out of 100 points must be attributed to the existing conditions)*

- What are the existing conditions?
 - Example measures: congestion, pavement condition, crashes, volume, usage, ridership, service gaps, barriers
 - What are the likely benefits?
 - Example measures: crash/delay reduction, new users, ridership/service, connectivity
-

5. Forum Selection Process and Reporting

- Call for Projects must be open for a minimum of 4 weeks
- Compilation of applications
- Review and scoring
 - DRCOG staff reviews for consistency with state and federal rules and TIP Policy guidelines
- ROI (to be determined through separate agenda item conversations)
- Project/program selection for recommendation to DRCOG Board
 - Offer opportunity for sponsors to present their projects
 - Evaluate and rank projects
 - Select/recommend projects to be funded and amount
- A forum representative presents the recommended projects/programs to be funded to the DRCOG Board, including an explanation of how they will benefit the region, advance the TIP Focus Area(s), and are consistent with Metro Vision and the Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan.

ATTACHMENT C

To: TIP Policy Work Group
From: Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director
303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
August 8, 2017	Discussion	5

SUBJECT

Discussion on TIP Focus Areas

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

Staff would like to brief the TIP Policy Work Group on the proposed method of discussion for TIP Focus Areas at the upcoming Board Workshop on August 26.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Acting Executive Director, at 303 480-6747 or drex@drcog.org.