

AGENDA

TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 9

Tuesday, August 28, 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. Public Comment
3. August 8, 2017 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)
4. 2:35 Board Annual Workshop Debrief
Doug Rex
5. 3:00 Continued Discussion on TIP Subregional Share
(Attachment B) 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.



ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg. 8 Monday, August 8, 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 Klausning	Business
Justin Begley	Denver, City and County
David Gaspers	Denver, City and County
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Doug Rex	DRCOG
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

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

Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. The work group agreed to set a second work group meeting on the second Tuesday of each month through the end of the year. The additional meetings are September 12, October 10, and November 14 from 2:30 p.m-4:30 p.m. The December date is to be determined, if needed.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Board Work Session Debrief

Doug Rex gave feedback on the August 2 Board Work Session (BWS).

- *TIP Set-asides*: BWS was favorable to the proposed set-asides and the increased amounts suggested and would like staff to provide more information about individual set-asides, by summarizing the previous TPWP presentations, to the August 16 Board. The BWS noted dollar amounts for set-asides could change per the final funding amount established by CDOT at end of year.
- *Regional Share definition*: The BWS requested broadening the definition for roadway projects to include Major Regional Arterials (currently only Limited Access Facilities) to bring back to the BWS for discussion next month.
- *Funding split inversion*: A board member suggested a possible inversion of 30/70% versus a 70/30% Regional/Subregional funding split. This will be discussed at the September 6 BWS, as they wanted to have a full and acceptable definition of Regional.

Mr. Rex discussed a handout prepared for the BWS, but was not distributed. The handout listed previously-funded projects that could be considered Regional-share eligible (per Board member request for perspective on what the Regional definition would mean using projects from the last two TIPs). He advised them that a takeaway noted from this list is 23.4% of projects in current TIP and 35.5% in previous TIP would be Regional share-eligible based on the TPWG's definition (averaging 29.5% overall). Additional information will be brought to the BWS next month that includes Major Regional Arterials.

George Gerstle said whatever decision is made on the Regional definition would influence the Regional/Subregional funding percentages.

John Cotten said he understood regional projects to be just projects outside of TIP scoring (i.e., I-25 North, US-36, etc.), while this list included others. Mr. Rex said the projects on the handout are consistent with the definition the TPWG previously recommended.

TIP Focus Area Discussion at August 26 Board Annual Workshop

Doug Rex said the discussion scheduled for the August 26 Board Annual Workshop will concentrate on Focus Areas. He provided a sheet listing several potential Focus Areas and asked for other work group suggestions to be emailed to staff.

Ted Heyd suggested making the shaded Focus Area suggestions more action-oriented, i.e., improve access to jobs and services.

Bryan Weimer noted the high level of the suggested Focus Areas give Subregions more flexibility.

Kathleen Bracke suggest visually showing how Focus Areas align with Metro Vision; show the visual connections of how linked to the outcomes.

George Gerstle asked staff to be sure to demonstrate the linkage to Metro Vision to the Board.

Discussion on TIP Subregional Share

Todd Cottrell reviewed a draft of the Subregional Share guidelines and processes compiled by staff and asked for comment.

1. Overall Subregional Forum Process

Dave Baskett asked how smaller local governments that don't typically apply for DRCOG funding and non-DRCOG members will be able to participate in the Subregional process. Todd Cottrell said all jurisdictions in the DRCOG MPO area eligible for federal funding will be invited to participate, as federally required. Doug Rex asked that Subregions document their outreach to these non-DRCOG or participating jurisdictions.

Steve Durian asked how multi-jurisdictions should be advised. Steve Cook said to invite everyone; it's all geographic, where the project is located.

Ted Heyd suggested DRCOG provide TIP trainings to the Subregions. Aaron Bustow agreed.

Mr. Bustow asked if there will be a champion/direct contact in each county forum that is accountable for administration of the process. Doug Rex noted there are two county representatives on this work group who can work back channels to establish a structure in their subregions.

Aaron Bustow asked further questions about standardization: How do you document the process for inviting entities to participate? Who's invited, who's not; What data will be compiled; Will it be

standardized? If meetings are open to public, does it need to be posted on a webpage, etc. George Gerstle suggested staff generate minimum standards.

Jeanne Shreve noted Adams County has an executed IGA for collaborative transportation planning that is being updated to include all jurisdictions in the Subregion and will include a Subregional framework. She is looking for specific direction from FHWA/FTA on federal requirements for all the subregions across the board (ROI, modeling, etc.).

Steve Cook noted Subregions will be establishing their own processes, with DRCOG's role being to assist, as-needed.

Kent Moorman suggested having a standardized report format for all the subregions. George Gerstle suggested DRCOG provide the format of the report to be used.

George Gerstle asked what does public involvement look like for an entity that doesn't formally exist, (the Subregion). Doug Rex said this question will be addressed as part of the documentation staff will prepare to establish minimum requirements for public involvement in conjunction with FHWA.

Ted Heyd asked whether Subregional forums would be legally required to hold a public hearing on each project application, noting in past TIPs, only one public hearing is held when the Board considers adoption of the TIP.

Janet Lundquist suggested Subregions could use TAC meetings (already a public meeting) so as not to have to create a new public meeting process. She felt it's Subregions responsibility to provide good public outreach.

Bryan Weimer said it's up to Subregion to determine public involvement policy and governance.

Steve Klausing suggested structuring to imply the least number of legal requirements (keep it simple). Noted it may require posted public notice, if county commissioner and mayors are voting. Each region may have different policy and requirements.

Staff will reach out to Puget Sound staff to get more details on their Subregional process (public involvement, public hearings, etc.).

John Cotton noted public notice of meetings is required with elected officials.

Aaron Bustow said projects don't need to be voted on by subregions, as the DRCOG Board has final decision. Doug Rex clarified the Subregions will be voting on a recommendation to bring before the DRCOG Board for its approval. Mr. Rex said it would be best to post public notice of meetings of the forums.

George Gerstle suggested staff work with FHWA to identify minimum critical federal and DRCOG Board process requirements to provide a minimum foundation for Subregion operation. Jeanne Shreve and Dave Baskett agreed to share their respective IGAs with the work group.

2. Federal and DRCOG Project Eligibility Rules

George Gerstle asked staff to provide what minimum federal and DRCOG eligibility rules will be.

#2. Decision Point: What is the minimum federal project request for subregions?

The current TIP request minimum is \$100,000. After discussion, George Gerstle said the sense of the group is no minimum.

Kent Moorman suggested adding “as applicable” for bullet point “EA or EIS decision documents must be signed or reasonably expected to be signed within 2020-2023”. Also, indicate this applies to construction projects.

#2. Decision Point: Other eligibility traits.

Aaron Bustow suggested listing the federal regulations for each funding type. Steve Cook said the final TIP Policy document will reference this information.

Ted Heyd suggested changing sub-bullet from “Metro Vision target relationship” to “Metro Vision target consistency” (targets such as GHG, SOV, VMT, etc.). Bryan Weimer said targets were too narrow, could be challenging. Mr. Heyd said targets can help discern projects not consistent with Metro Vision. Kathleen Bracke said projects should be thought of as incremental steps towards reaching targets.

Aaron Bustow noted projects must meet federal performance requirements as well.

Jeanne Shreve said we can reach goals, objectives, and initiatives, but questioned how Subregional projects can reach the narrower targets. Mac Callison felt targets could pre-screen projects too much. Steve Cook felt this could be worded better; i.e., projects should be considered as being consistent or inconsistent with reaching targets. Dave Baskett noted the overall TIP collectively reaches a target. Bryan Weimer suggested the TIP eligibility should meet MVRTTP requirements at a higher level, while the criteria requirements could link to Metro Vision at a more detailed level. Doug Rex agreed, and said the target bullets should be listed in #4. *Evaluation Criteria*, not #2. *Eligibility*.

George Gerstle summarized that eligibility should be consistent with RTP and other federal requirements, as well as with Focus Areas defined by the Board. The evaluation criteria need to be consistent with the Metro Vision Plan, although each Subregion may weigh the criteria differently.

Kent Moorman suggested Subregions have the option to require, if desired, a higher level of eligibility requirements than minimum.

Kent Moorman suggested the Subregions decide the number of projects allowed; no limit. George Gerstle noted the work group agreed.

Ted Heyd suggested asking Puget Sound why they decided on a 10% subregional set-aside to multimodal; how did they do it, is it working, is it really constraining roadway capacity projects or other projects.

3. Required Application Information

#3. Decision Point: What level of (scope) detail is required? Similar to existing TIP process or less detailed?

Kent Moorman said the broader the better, for maximum flexibility.

Dave Baskett noted detailed scopes have been problematic; Subregions can decide the level information they need.

Steve Cook said anything that is claimed in application (points, description, ties to Metro Vision) should be included.

George Gerstle summarized that less detailed TIP scopes should be required, though there needs to be accountability, so that what was described in the project proposal is actually done but not be so strict that a small change is too bureaucratic to do.

4. Required Evaluation Criteria

#4. 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).

George Gerstle asked Aaron Bustow if there are any minimum qualitative vs. quantitative federal requirements. Mr. Bustow said performance measures are done system-level (entire TIP), so no.

Kathleen Bracke felt evaluation criteria needs to demonstrate how a project connects with regional Metro Vision goals and targets.

Aaron Bustow said federal targets are very different from Metro Vision targets. DRCOG, CDOT, and FHWA are working together on targets (safety, etc.) and will notify when finalized.

Bryan Weimer said targets and criteria are two different things. Criteria such as crash reduction, congestion, accidents, ridership, etc. address elements of Metro Vision in projects, while Regional targets are addressed in context of the TIP in its entirety.

George Gerstle said staff should describe how evaluation criteria is linked, relates to, is consistent with, and describes progress towards targets and Board Focus Areas.

John Cotton suggested a section in the application for sponsors to specify how a project will contribute to these targets and with what metric.

George Gerstle summarized that qualitative criteria will provide a narrative of the project describing all the elements that contribute to the policy direction of Metro Vision targets and Focus Areas. The quantitative ones will be included to demonstrate, at a basic level, the analysis of the proposed project (i.e., accident analysis, congestion, ridership).

Bryan Weimer said this should be limited to transportation-related Metro Vision elements. Steve Cook and Doug Rex said it would be up to Subregion to decide.

Doug Rex said Metro Vision regional targets are aspirational. Attainment of Metro Vision targets is envisioned in conjunction with other non-DRCOG funded projects in the region (since DRCOG funding only accounts for 2-3% of total funding). He said it would be almost impossible for DRCOG to measure whether a single project has moved the needle on reaching a target, which is why DRCOG is measuring ROI on a package of projects. The region is so large that models aren't sensitive enough.

Dave Baskett said there should be no minimum share of points required for any measure or criteria. Ted Heyd and Bryan Weimer agreed.

5. Forum Selection Process and Reporting

George Gerstle asked that the Jefferson County and Adams County IGAs be shared with the work group for reference.

Doug Rex said more discussion is needed on the process that Broomfield and Denver will need as they are the only entity within their respective Subregions.

George Gerstle suggested DRCOG prepare a basic application format for all. Doug Rex noted staff will talk with Puget Sound on how they did this.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m. The next meeting date is August 28, 2017.

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 28, 2017	Discussion	5

SUBJECT

Continued discussion on Subregional Share policy topics.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

DRCOG staff has revised the draft guidelines for the Subregional Share project/program process and applications, as shown in Attachment 1, based on the previous discussion.

Highlighted text/passages are major adjustments/changes from the August 8 version at the last meeting.

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

- A. All local governments within the subregion eligible for federal funding, regardless if they are a DRCOG member or not, must be invited to participate on the forum.
- B. Regional partner agencies (RTD and CDOT) must be invited to participate.
- C. Each forum can invite other agencies and stakeholders to participate.
- D. DRCOG staff will participate and assist to the extent requested, but may attend any forum meeting. **It is suggested staff present adopted eligibility rules and procedures at one of the initial forum meetings.**
- E. Individual participating members 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.
- F. **Staff will coordinate with existing TIP Policy Work Group members within each forum to gather information such as who was invited, forum meeting summaries, and public notifications until such a time a forum leader is selected. Staff will also provide a minimum level of standard on how to collect and report the information.**
- G. Forums may establish technical subcommittees, but must be open to all member entities.
- H. Coordination with other subregional forums is encouraged (e.g., for project development and funding partnerships).
- I. Forum meetings must be open to the public. *(Note: staff has yet to have conversations with PSRC staff regarding their process. Information will be forthcoming before or during the meeting.)*

2. Federal and DRCOG project eligibility rules

- A. **Minimum federal funding request is \$100,000.**
- B. Minimum 20% non-federal match required.
- C. Per the 2040 MVRTP, TIP roadway projects must be on the designated Regional Roadway System.
- D. Capacity projects (e.g., rapid transit or roadway widening of a new physical facility longer than a mile) must be defined as eligible for regional funding in the correct staging period in the latest approved modeling networks for the 2040 MVRTP, at the time of application. **A list of eligible capacity projects by county will be provided to each Subregional Forum.**
- E. Roadway operational projects may be located at any location on the 2040 MVRTP designated Regional Roadway System.
- F. For projects with construction phases that require EA or EIS decision documents, they must be signed or reasonably expected to be signed within 2020-2023.
- G. **Projects on or within ROW of state highways must have CDOT concurrence to submit. Projects in need of RTD involvement (operations or access to property) must have RTD concurrence.**
- H. The target for each Subregion is to recommend at least xx% of its funds to CMAQ eligible projects. This is due to the high level of "less-flexible" CMAQ funds available through DRCOG. For example, roadway capacity or roadway reconstruction projects may not use CMAQ funds.
- I. Projects must be consistent with Board-adopted TIP Focus Area(s).
- J. **Projects must be eligible under specific federal rules and guidance for the applicable funding program(s) (CMAQ, STP-M, or TAP) for the type of project. Links to these are available within the TIP Policy document and will be provided to each forum.**

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

3. Required Application Information (DRCOG will provide a standard application format for each forum to tailor to their own needs)

- A. TIP project/program sponsor (local govt/regional/state entity): _____
 - a. 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)
- B. Project/program name: _____
- C. Project/program scope (clearly state all the key components and what will be accomplished)
- D. What adopted plan(s) or document(s) identify the project/program?
- E. DRCOG federal funding request by federal fiscal year (2020-2023)
- F. Local matching funds (20% minimum)
- G. Total cost

4. Required Evaluation Criteria

Qualitative-related

- A. What specific existing problem(s) will the project/program address?
- B. Describe the public outreach that has taken place for this project/program to date.
- C. What DRCOG Board-defined TIP Focus Area(s) will be addressed?

	DRCOG TIP Focus Areas	Does Project/Program Address Focus Area?	
		Check if yes	Explain How
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

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

D. What Metro Vision Plan outcome targets will be addressed?

	Metro Vision Outcome Targets	Does Project Address Target?	
		Check if yes	Explain How
1	Increase share of the region's housing and employment located in urban centers		
2	Increase the regional population-weighted density		
3	Increase the Non-single-occupant-vehicle (non-SOV) mode share to work		
4	Decrease vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita		
5	Decrease traffic congestion - Average travel time variation (peak vs. off-peak)		
6	Reduce daily person delay per capita		
7	Reduce the number of traffic fatalities		
8	Reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per capita		
9	Increase amount of protected open space		
10	Decrease the share of the region's housing and employment in high risk areas		
11	Increase the share of the region's population living in areas with housing and transportation costs affordable to the typical household in the region		
12	Increase the amount of regional employment		
13	Increase the share of the region's housing and employment near high-frequency transit		

- E. How will this project/program prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities?
 - a. If applicable, does this project advance the sponsor's ADA Transition Plan?
- F. How will minority and low income persons benefit from the project/program?
- G. Define any multimodal elements of the project/program or connectivity improvements to other travel modes.

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

Quantitative-related (measures and numbers)

- *Each forum will design specific evaluation criterion or criteria to address each using a forum-derived point system. Measures should be tailored depending on the project type being submitted.*

H. What are the existing conditions and future estimated measures following completion of project?

- Transit Ridership: Current: ____; Estimated Future: _____
- Number of daily bicyclist and pedestrian users: Current: ____; Estimated Future: _____
- SOV Trip Reduction: _____; VMT Reduction: _____
- Average Daily Vehicle Traffic on roadway: Current: ____; Estimated Future: _____
- Existing Pavement and/or Bridge Condition: _____
- Total Traffic Crashes, Serious Injuries, and Fatalities: Current: ____; Estimated Future: _____
- Applicable Traffic Crashes (per type of project): Current: ____; Estimated Future: _____
- Congestion and Travel Delay: Current: ____; Estimated Future: _____

I. DRCOG can provide data attributes to assist sponsors and forums, as requested. Examples include:

- Roadway volumes
- Data within X feet/miles of project site
- Demographic or socioeconomic population and/or employment data
- Travel model data (e.g. bicycle and walk trip activity estimates)

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

5. Forum Project Selection Process and Reporting

- Call for Projects must be open for a minimum of 4 weeks.
- DRCOG staff can assist with compilation of applications, if requested.
- DRCOG staff reviews applications for consistency with state and federal rules and TIP Policy guidelines.
- Development of project/program selection recommendations
 - Offer opportunity for sponsors to present their projects at forum meeting
 - Evaluate and rank projects
 - Select/recommend projects to be funded and amount.
- A forum representative will present to the DRCOG Board the recommended projects/programs to be funded, including explanations of:
 - How they will benefit the region and provide a return on investment (ROI),
 - How they will advance the TIP Focus Area(s), and
 - How they are consistent with Metro Vision and the Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan.
- The DRCOG Board has the final authority of projects/programs selected to be included within the TIP.