

## AGENDA

### TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 12

Tuesday, October 10, 2017

2:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Conference Room – 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, west side

1. 2:30 Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. September 25, 2017 Meeting Summary  
(Attachment A)
4. 2:35 Discussion on Draft Regional Criteria and Scoring  
(Attachment B) Todd Cottrell
5. 4:30 Adjournment

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



**We make life better!**



## ATTACHMENT A

### MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg.11 Monday, September 25, 2017

#### PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

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
Janice Finch/Justin Begley	Denver, City and County
David Gaspers	Denver, City and County
Dan Herrmann	CDOT
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Doug Rex	DRCOG
Art Griffith	Douglas County
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Dave Baskett	Jefferson County, City of Lakewood
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motor
Kevin Ash	Weld County

Others present: Aaron Bustow, FHWA; JoAnn Mattson, CDOT Reg. 1; Margaret Martin, student; Josie Ortiz, Greenwood Village

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

#### Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 3:16 p.m.

#### Public Comment

There was no public comment.

#### September 12, 2017 Meeting Summary

The summary was accepted.

#### **Update on September 20 Board discussion on TIP Focus Areas**

Doug Rex said the Board approved three TIP Focus Areas, as recommended by participants at the Annual Board Workshop. Mr. Rex said there has been no further discussion or direction from the Board on whether to include regional arterials in the regional eligibility definition.

#### **Recommendation on TIP Subregional Share Guidelines**

Todd Cottrell reviewed the edits to the draft Subregional Share guidelines, as suggested at the previous meeting. Doug Rex noted these guidelines will not be used verbatim in the TIP Policy document, but will be incorporated throughout.

#### **1. Overall Subregional Forum Process**

Bryan Weimer asked whether local governments in a Subregion must be within the DRCOG boundary and if so, this needs to be made clear in document. Doug Rex clarified that governments must be within the MPO boundary (or air quality conformity boundary, in some cases) to be eligible.

George Gerstle suggested listing in policy document what entities, besides local governments, can or cannot participate.

Doug Rex clarified that an eligible jurisdiction would be able to participate in multiple forums.

George Gerstle suggested the following language (noted in italics) in 1I. “DRCOG will post all meetings on its website, *but that does not preclude local governments from also posting*”.

There was discussion on the public notification policy for Subregional meetings that involve three or more DRCOG Board members. Public notice language was suggested (in italics): *Meeting notices will be posted on the DRCOG website and placed in the DRCOG public meeting binder in DRCOG reception area*. Mr. Rex said all standing committee meetings, whether technical- or policy-level, should be posted. George Gerstle asked staff to provide more detail on the public notification policy.

Art Griffith suggested taking out reference to the White Paper in second sentence in 1E, to: “Membership should be offered to elected officers, who could appoint a designee, if desired.”

## **2. Federal and DRCOG Project Eligibility Rules**

In 2D, George Gerstle asked if individual categories of funding would be allocated to each Subregion, or balanced by DRCOG regionwide. Mr. Rex said it is a larger policy discussion for a future meeting.

Janice Finch asked if federal/state funding swap will still be considered. Danny Herrmann said CDOT is interested and will analyze results of the pilot program, but would not be ready for the next TIP call for projects.

Art Griffith suggested certain targets should be set, i.e., 10% for bike/ped projects. Kathleen Bracke supported using a minimum, versus trying to reach a target, to challenge us to achieve regional plan goals. Doug Rex said Subregions should be encouraged to have the “minimum” conversation. Bryan Weimer said Subregions need to decide their own needs; we need to be careful of what minimum is set. George Gerstle summarized this issue needs more detailed analysis.

## **4. Required Evaluation Criteria**

George Gerstle asked if there should be any minimum requirements set for either or both qualitative or quantitative-related criteria.

Kent Moorman asked whether the Board expects projects to meet some Metro Vision tenets and the RTP, if the project does not meet any of the three Focus Areas. He said the policy needs to state clearly that a project “must meet some Metro Vision tenets and RTP”.

In Row 3 in Table 4D (*Decrease traffic congestion – average travel time variation (peak vs. off-peak)*), George Gerstle said this measurement would address managed lanes. Steve Cook noted this is not a rigorous measure, is qualitative.

Bryan Weimer said there are 10 federal transportation planning factors and asked how the proposed measures reflect these factors. Are we only using Metro Vision measures? Staff noted the federal planning factors are cross-linked within Metro Vision (and other planning docs such as UPWP). Mr. Weimer asked if we are missing any factors.

In 4H, Kent Moorman requested everyone use the same crash mitigation factors from the same source for estimating future crashes. Doug Rex agreed there should be consistency in measures used by all the subregions.

In Table 4D, row 5, Art Griffith suggested stating as: “Reduce the potential number of severe or fatal accidents”.

Janice Finch felt quantitative measures may be burdening the process. She said we are trying to make process more flexible at the Subregional level. She pointed out one project may score high, while another project scoring lower may be a higher priority for the Subregion. She asked if the measurement will be a guideline or a rigid score. Doug Rex said a high/medium/low scoring concept could be used.

## **5. Forum Project Selection Process and Reporting**

In 5A; the work group agreed to change “Call for Projects must be open for a minimum of 6 weeks” (instead of 4 weeks).

Staff will travel to all Subregions for TIP process trainings, so the work group suggested having these trainings as soon as possible in the forum process.

Art Griffith suggested requests for data be ready up-front, including a ‘set’ cost/benefit analysis. Doug Rex said staff is considering developing something more interactive with DRCOG GIS.

### **Discussion on Regional/Subregional Quantitative Criteria, Methodology, and Scoring**

Steve Cook noted this agenda item is more detailed and replaces the draft quantitative criteria listed in Agenda Item B. The scoring is based on determining project/program benefits and has on a 3-tiered range of threshold values: high/medium/low.

Kent Moorman said he would prefer having criteria points available up-front, so sponsors can score their projects. Ted Heyd agreed.

Dave Baskett questioned whether this criterion addresses Security. Doug Rex said Security can be addressed qualitatively, as it may be more difficult to quantify. He noted the Board’s direction emphasized more the Safety aspect.

George Gerstle suggested the criteria could give maximum points for addressing Focus Areas. Steve Cook said points in the agenda memo are placeholders; Subregions could assign their own point values.

There was discussion on the definition of Security. Steve Cook noted in the RTP the criteria were more from a global terrorism perspective, i.e., does the project serve intermodal high security freight terminals, (i.e., DIA, general aviation airports, Buckley AFB, etc.)

Kent Moorman suggested each criteria row (quantitative and qualitative) have a place for the applicant to show how criteria relates to the three Focus Areas.

Janice Finch asked for correction of the Quantitative Criteria table, noting that 8 criteria X 5 maximum points = 40 maximum points, not 50. She also said the criteria points should not be equal in weight and said alignment with Focus Areas could be used to weight some factors.

Todd Cottrell said staff has not addressed how to assign points for the remaining 50 points in the Qualitative Criteria. Doug Rex noted this is just an exercise for discussion of possible quantitative and qualitative scores, and subject to change. Janice Finch said Denver went through a similar exercise recently and suggested looking at point frequency (i.e., if project has a lot of 5s versus a lot of 1s). Mr. Rex said he would like more information on this concept.

Art Griffith felt the Quantitative Benefits approach would work for certain types (such as capacity project with a lot of multimodal, holistic elements) but if it is a straightforward project (such as a transit project) there should just be points. Steve Cook noted this approach was designed with a normalization mechanism that considers project type difference. George Gerstle said prioritizing project types should be based on Focus Areas alignment.

Dave Baskett said the Subregions may want to make their own criteria, not just be able to change the scoring points. He said he preferred just using the previous TIP call's quantitative criteria.

- Doug Rex said this exercise is ultimately to establish some criteria to use for Regional.
- Mr. Rex agreed each Subregion Forum's criteria is up to their own discretion and noted FHWA will require each Subregional Forum to formally submit their selection process.

Tom Reiff said he also liked the previous TIP criteria and scoring project types. He questioned how benefits criterion will apply to all funding category types; why reinvent everything.

George Gerstle questioned if the evaluation criteria would change depending on type of funding that is available to the Subregion.

Art Griffith said this exercise shows we should not try to compare all projects.

Steve Cook suggested preparing a full set of Regional criteria first, then Subregional.

Art Griffith said ROI should only be based on amount of federal dollars requested for the project.

Kent Moorman asked whether the Subregional criteria and selection process will have to be approved by the Board; this will add more time needed to the timeline.

Kathleen Bracke said she felt the discussion was going backwards. Based on the Board's direction, project scoring should be tied back to Metro Vision.

George Gerstle summarized:

1. Don't pit one type against another
2. Have significant quantitative evaluation of projects to appropriately vet projects
3. The quantitative evaluation of Regional and Subregional projects needs to be significantly related to focus areas
4. The qualitative evaluation is a mechanism that will tie back to focus areas

Doug Rex questioned the purpose for having quantitative points. He cited Seattle's more qualitative process (and a minimal quantitative process) rates projects high/medium/low. He said, ultimately what we want to provide to the Board is as perfect information as possible about the projects they are evaluating. We need to ask if the project makes sense, not just has the most points, and addresses what we want the region to be.

George Gerstle felt it's important to keep the quantitative part and categorize to Focus Areas.

Bryan Weimer said this process could help a project that is a community's high priority, but may not necessarily be its highest scoring project. He said tying the criteria to it will be the challenge.

George Gerstle summarized:

1. Need to focus on the Regional Share criteria first (staff develop and bring back)
2. Within the criteria, try not to compare every project to each other; look into using criteria by project type still
3. Relate what is seen in each project type to the focus areas

(The existing TIP Policy is located [here](#) with criteria starting on page 18 of the document.)

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m. The next meeting date is September 25, 2017.

## ATTACHMENT B

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
October 10, 2017	Action	4

### SUBJECT

Subregional Share policy topics.

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

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

### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

### SUMMARY

DRCOG staff has developed draft evaluation criteria for the **Regional Share** project and program applications based on the previous discussions (Attachment 1). Key points of the draft criteria:

- **Part 1** of the application contains *qualitative-related questions* that each applicant would answer.
  - The example scoring system is based primarily on a 3-level range of low, medium, and high.
  - The ADA Transition Plan criteria uses a yes/no response.
  - Each question is scored (see decision point below) and a proposed maximum number of points for that question is shown.
  - As proposed, part 1 of the application is worth a maximum of 50 points.

**Decision point:** Who should fill in the scoring for each qualitative-related question? Potentially, this could be the project sponsor (then reviewed by DRCOG staff or a scoring review panel); DRCOG staff (then a scoring review panel); or a scoring review panel (like the TDM Pool).
- **Part 2** of the application contains *quantitative-related benefit criteria* that each applicant would respond to.
  - Project sponsors would fill in values for each criterion applicable to the scope of the project. *It's possible that not all questions will be answered.*
  - Some criteria values will be calculated by the sponsors, others provided with DRCOG staff assistance.
  - Each criterion will state the TIP Focus Areas it addresses.
  - Responses to the questions in red text (in table) will be used to score the project.
  - Specific threshold ranges for point allocation are in the process of being established (those provided are rough estimates). DRCOG staff is reviewing past TIP project applications and current practices and will bring updated ranges to a future meeting.

- The example scoring system presented is based on a 3-tiered range of low = 1 point, medium = 3 points, and high = 5 points.
- As proposed, part 2 of the application is worth a maximum of 40 points.
- Two options are presented to score the benefits criteria of the application.

Decision point:

Option 1: Points scored for each applicable question answered are totaled. A maximum of 40 points are possible. The more elements a project has, the higher the potential score.

Option 2: Normalize projects based on magnitude (number of project elements) of the project scope. The initial total score would be divided by the number of criteria associated with the project (*e.g., 20 points, divided by 6 criteria used for scoring = 3.33 points per criterion*). That result is then normalized up to the 40-point maximum by multiplying by 8 (*e.g., 3.33 x 8 = 26.64 total quantitative benefit points*).

- **Part 3:** The final criterion is funding request-effectiveness, in which the DRCOG funds requested is divided by the total Benefit Points received for both part 1 and part 2 of the application. The specific formula cannot be set until the benefit point system is established and both sections are scored. As proposed, this response is worth a maximum of 10 points.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

1. Draft Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Points for Regional Share Project Applications

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner, at 303-480-6737 or [tcottrell@drkog.org](mailto:tcottrell@drkog.org).

**Draft Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Points for  
REGIONAL SHARE Project Applications  
(October 10, 2017)**

**Part 1. Qualitative-related**

A. What specific existing problem(s) will the project/program address?

High: \_\_\_ Medium: \_\_\_ Low: \_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_ (max 5)

B. Describe the public outreach taken place for this project/program to date.

High: \_\_\_ Medium: \_\_\_ Low: \_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_ (max 3)

C. How will this project/program improve mobility for individuals with disabilities?

High: \_\_\_ Medium: \_\_\_ Low: \_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_ (max 3)

D. If applicable, does this project advance the sponsor's ADA Transition Plan?

Yes: \_\_\_ No: \_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_ (max 3)

E. How will minority and low income persons benefit from the project/program?

Does project DIRECTLY serve a designated EJ Area? \_\_\_; Indirectly? \_\_\_

If outside of EJ Areas, will the project serve EJ persons (low income, minority, \_\_\_\_\_)?

High: \_\_\_ Medium: \_\_\_ Low: \_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_ (max 3)

F. How will connectivity to multiple travel modes be improved by the project?

High: \_\_\_ Medium: \_\_\_ Low: \_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_ (max 3)

**Draft Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Points for  
REGIONAL SHARE Project Applications  
(October 10, 2017)**

G. What DRCOG Board-defined TIP Focus Area(s) will be addressed?

	<b>DRCOG TIP Focus Areas</b>	<b>Does Project/Program address Focus Area?</b>	
		Check if yes	Explain how (with word # limitation)
1	Improve mobility infrastructure and services for vulnerable populations		
2	Increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network		
3	Improve transportation safety and security		

(Base your scoring on the number of, and level to which, TIP Focus Areas are addressed)

High: \_\_\_ Medium: \_\_\_ Low: \_\_\_

Points: \_\_\_ (max 15)

H. What Metro Vision Plan transportation-related performance measure(s) will be addressed?

	<b>Transportation-related Metro Vision Performance Measures</b>	<b>Does Project address Measure?</b>	
		Check if yes	Explain how (with word # limitation)
1	Increase the non-single-occupant-vehicle (non-SOV) mode share to work		
2	Decrease vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita		
3	Decrease traffic congestion - average travel time variation (peak vs. off-peak)		
4	Reduce daily person delay per capita		
5	Reduce the number of traffic fatalities		
6	Reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per capita		
7	Increase the share of the region's population living in areas with housing and transportation costs affordable to the typical household in the region		
8	Increase the share of the region's housing and employment near high-frequency transit		

(Base scoring on number of, and level to which, Performance Measures are addressed)

High: \_\_\_ Medium: \_\_\_ Low: \_\_\_

Points: \_\_\_ (max 15)

# Draft Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Points for REGIONAL SHARE Project Applications

(October 10, 2017)

## Part 2. Quantitative-related Benefit Points

### Scoring Instructions:

- Criteria Column: Provide data, as noted, for applicable criteria (out of 8 criterion).
- Scoring Threshold Column: Based on input data, a project scores High, Medium, or Low.
- Points Scored Column: Score: High = 5 pts, Medium = 3 pts, and Low = 1 pt.
- Tally your initial total score.
- Divide by the number of questions answered to receive your average score.
- Multiply your Total Average Score by 8. This score is for the quantitative section of the application.
- The maximum allowed score for this section is 40 points, out of a total 100 for the application.

Quantitative Benefit Criteria for Project	Scoring Thresholds	Points Scored
<p><b>1. Transit Ridership:</b> (May Address Focus Areas 1, 2)</p> <p>a. Existing weekday transit ridership boarding's (source RTD):            _____                ▪ <i>Zero, if no service</i></p> <p>b. Estimated weekday <b>ridership increase:</b> _____                ▪ <i>Source: applicant, RTD, or DRCOG</i></p>	<p>Score for daily ridership increase:  <b>High: 1,000 +</b>  <b>Medium: 500-999</b>  <b>Low: 1-499</b>  <b>Not applicable: 0</b></p>	<p>(example values)</p> <p><b>0</b></p>
<p><b>2. Bicycle and Pedestrian Users:</b> (May Address Focus Areas 1, 2, 3)</p> <p>a. Existing weekday count: _____ (on, or adjacent to project site)                ○ <i>Source: applicant provides all day count or short count factored up</i></p> <p>b. Estimated weekday increase: _____ <b>user increase</b>                ○ <i>based on trip growth factor from 2030 travel model (regional share only) or another technical source (subregional share)</i></p>	<p>Score for the bike/ped increase:  <b>H: 500 +</b>  <b>M: 200-499</b>  <b>L: 1-199</b>  <b>Not applicable: 0</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>
<p><b>3. SOV Trip and VMT Reduction:</b> (May Address Focus Areas 1, 2, 3)</p> <p>a. Transit: 50% of transit increase (from #1 above) = _____ SOV Trips reduced x 9 miles (source: HH survey)            = _____ <b>VMT Reduction</b></p> <p>b. Bicycle/Pedestrian: 50% of bicycle/pedestrian increase (from 2.) = _____ trips 6 miles (Source: HH survey avg. P/B/Transit) = _____ <b>VMT Reduction</b></p>	<p>Score for the VMT reduction:  <b>H: 5,000 +</b>  <b>M: 1,000-4,999</b>  <b>L: 1-999</b>  <b>Not applicable: 0</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>

**Draft Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Points for  
REGIONAL SHARE Project Applications**

(October 10, 2017)

Quantitative Benefit Criteria for Project	Scoring Thresholds	Points Scored
<p><b>4. Congestion:</b> (May Address Focus Areas 2, 3)</p> <p>a. Current average daily traffic volume(s) (ADT) on applicable roadway segments ____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Source: applicant or CDOT</i></li> </ul> <p>b. Estimated Future ADT ____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Source: 2030 travel model</i></li> </ul> <p>c. <b>DRCOG Current Congestion Score:</b> ____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Source: DRCOG</i></li> </ul>	<p>Score for current congestion:</p> <p>H: xxx + M: xx-xxxx L: xx-xxx Not applicable: 0</p>	<p align="center"><b>5</b></p>
<p><b>5. Future Person Travel Delay Reduction per Day:</b> (may address Focus Areas 1, 2, 3)</p> <p>a. Future (2030) vehicle and person hours of delay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Source: engineering analysis or travel model – depending on type of project</i></li> </ul> <p>b. Without project (no-build) Vehicle Hours of Delay: ____ With project Vehicle Hours of Delay: ____</p> <p>c. <b>Future Reduction VHD:</b> ____ x 1.4 = <b>PHD:</b> ____ (different value than 1.4 may be used for <u>high</u> transit ridership roadways)</p>	<p>Score for PHD delay reduction:</p> <p>H: xxx + M: xx-xxxx L: xx-xxx Not applicable: 0</p>	<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>
<p><b>6. Crash Reduction:</b> (may address Focus Areas 2, 3)</p> <p>a. Existing Traffic Crashes (min. of a 3-year annual average): PDO: ____, Serious Injuries: ____, and Fatalities: ____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Source: applicant</i></li> </ul> <p>b. Estimated (weighted) reduction in annual <u>applicable</u> traffic crashes, based on the improvements being implemented: <b>Reduced PDO Crashes (x1):</b> ____, <b>Serious Injury Crashes (x5):</b> ____, and <b>Fatal Crashes (x5):</b> ____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Source: applicant; attach engineering analysis. Additional methodology guidelines from DRCOG</i></li> </ul>	<p>Score for crash reduction:</p> <p>H: 30 + M: 10-29 L: 1-9 Not applicable: 0</p>	<p align="center"><b>5</b></p>
<p><b>7. Bridge Condition Rating</b> (if rehabbed or replaced): (may address Focus Areas 2, 3)</p> <p>a. _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Source: CDOT</i></li> </ul>	<p>Score for bridge condition:</p> <p>H: 1-49 M: 50-79 L: 80+ Not applicable: 0</p>	<p align="center"><b>0</b></p>

**Draft Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Points for  
REGIONAL SHARE Project Applications**

(October 10, 2017)

Quantitative Benefit Criteria for Project	Scoring Thresholds	Points Scored
<b>8. Roadway Pavement Condition</b> (if road reconstructed): (may address Focus Areas 2, 3) a. _____ <b>Condition measures</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Source: applicant using their own system. Must convert to a 10-point scale.</i></li> </ul>	Score for pavement condition: <b>H: 1-2</b> <b>M: 3-6</b> <b>L: 7-10</b> <b>Not applicable: 0</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Points Option 1:</b>	<b>Initial Score (max 40)</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>OR</b>		
<b>Points Option 2:</b> Normalizing Method (based on average score/criteria):		
	<b>Initial Score (max 40)</b>	20
	<b>Number of Applicable Criteria</b>	6
	<b>Total Average Score per criteria (max 5.0)</b>	3.33
	<b>Avg. Score x 8 = TIP application Benefit Points (Max points = 40)</b>	<b>26.64</b>

**Part 3. Funding Effectiveness**

A. Funding Effectiveness: Funding Request divided by Benefit Points: \_\_\_\_\_

High (xx-xx): \_\_\_\_ Medium (nn-nn): \_\_\_\_ Low (zz-zz): \_\_\_\_ Points: \_\_\_\_\_ (max 10)

Part 1 Points: \_\_\_\_\_ (max 50)

Part 2 Points: \_\_\_\_\_ (max 40)

Part 3 Points: \_\_\_\_\_ (max 10)

Grand Total Points: \_\_\_\_\_ (max 100)