

AGENDA

TIP Review Work Group

Friday, October 16, 2015

9:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, West side

1. Call to Order
 - List of Work Group Participants (Attachment A)
2. Meeting Decorum
 - Selection of a Chair
3. TIP Review Work Group Purpose
 - Board directive to create a white paper to address the TIP process. (Attachment B)
 - Funding allocations
 - Other criteria
 - Complete by February 2016
 - Review previous comments.
 - TIP Open Forum Comments (Attachment C)
 - Board of Directors Comments (Attachment D)
4. Preliminary Review of TIP Project Selection Procedures from Other MPOs (Attachment E)
5. Future meeting dates
6. Adjournment

Disabled attendees are asked to notify DRCOG at least 48 hours in advance of the need for auxiliary aids or services

We make life better!



ATTACHMENT A

TIP Review Work Group Participants – 2015

Adams County	Jeanne Shreve
Adams County	Kent Moorman
Arapahoe County	Bryan Weimer
Arapahoe County	Mac Callison
Boulder County	George Gerstle
Business	Steve Klausung
CDOT	Jeff Sudmeier
CDOT	Danny Herrmann
Denver	Janice Finch
Denver	David Gaspers
DRCOG	Doug Rex
DRCOG	Steve Cook
Douglas County	Art Griffith
Douglas County	John Cotton
Environmental	Mike Salisbury
Jefferson County	Steve Durian
Jefferson County	Dave Baskett
Regional Air Quality Council	Ken Lloyd
TDM/Non-motor	Ted Heyd
Weld County	Janet Lundquist

ATTACHMENT B

Board of Directors Summary re: TIP Review Work Group

August 19, 2015

Doug Rex presented information received from a TIP Open Forum for technical staff held in June. Summaries of the comments received were included in the agenda packet. Board members were invited to discuss the TIP development process.

Some comments received from members included:

- the disparity between urban/suburban/county needs;
- assistance for smaller communities;
- how to factor in growth;
- selecting projects by need;
- fund exchanges with CDOT;
- local vs. regional responsibilities;
- requirements of MAP-21, among others.

Members suggested an ad hoc committee made up of technical staff from the jurisdictions as well as DRCOG staff and Board members to create the white paper.

Roger Partridge **moved** in the process to create a white paper and direct DRCOG staff to arrange for an ad hoc committee of a combination of DRCOG staff and any interested TAC members to address TIP process, funding allocation and any other criteria mentioned by this Board, including looking at other MPOs around the country and bringing it back to the Committee in six months (February 2016). The motion was **seconded** and **passed** unanimously.

Members were asked if there were any additional comments. Comments were made that:

- there were some categories where projects didn't fit; perhaps there should be a process to allow those projects;
- should there be a minimum dollar amount for projects;
- should communities be limited to a certain number of project submittals, and if so what should the limits be;
- how to eliminate process mistakes; and
- how to address equity.

ATTACHMENT C

Summary of June 17, 2015 TIP Open Forum Comments

TIP Policy Document

- Need to determine how to deal with true multimodal/holistic projects and how to score them. For example, a project that includes a roadway widening with bicycle/pedestrian improvements may be awarded almost solely on cost and travel time savings even though the project may have other benefits such as pedestrian safety and transit efficiency that are sometimes not recognized. There is not a true multimodal project category.
- Give TAC and stakeholder groups more time to review policy, especially changes to the TIP Policy document, so they can provide well thought out input.
- It's been a long time since we've done a "deep dive" into the TIP policy in order to refresh the content. The MVIC/TAC interaction on TIP Policy could have been better. Bringing back the TIP Work Group could address both issues (*Note: the recommended Policy document for the 2012-2017 TIP was developed by a TIP Policy Work Group consisting of Board members and technical staff from member communities*).
- Additional time desired for the call for projects - preferably 10 weeks - in order to accommodate the city/county calendar process for signatures on applications and/or the establishment of partnerships (*Note: the 2016-2021 TIP Call for Projects lasted 8 weeks*).
- Funding roadway reconstruction projects rewards bad behavior; roadways that are in the worst shape are most likely to get TIP funding. A better solution is to allow preventative maintenance projects to be funded in the TIP and not allowing a roadway to get in a position that a total reconstruct is necessary.
- Bike/pedestrian reconstruction projects did not compete well versus new construction projects (top 16 projects were new construction projects). In future TIPs, we need to find a way to address this since the age of infrastructure is becoming a critical concern. Maybe have a set aside for bicycle/pedestrian reconstruction projects and operational projects (e.g., crosswalks signalization and eligible grade separation projects).
- Need to address sustainability/resiliency of new infrastructure in the scoring criteria. In other words, how are you going to replace the existing infrastructure with something better to reduce life-cycle costs? How are we assuring that our investment in new infrastructure is better than what we had in the past?
- Some projects really don't fit well into any category (i.e., BRT projects). Need to explore how to handle these types of projects.
- Do we need a bridge project category? We are seeing an aging of bridge infrastructure with limited funds to improve them.
- It was noted that some scoring criteria showed very little variation among projects. If a certain criterion is not serving a useful purpose to help distinguish between projects, why do we have the criterion? Is it better to consider the criterion (e.g., multimodal criterion) as a qualifier for selection and distribute the additional points to other criteria to help distinguish between projects?
- Should we consider placing a cap (maximum amount that can be awarded) for projects? Very large projects (regional in scale) should be handled in an off the top allocation before the TIP call for projects. This would allow funds to be spread over more projects.

ATTACHMENT C

Summary of June 17, 2015 TIP Open Forum Comments

- More first/final mile projects would be a cost effective way to integrate a multimodal vision
 - Limit first/final mile projects to increasing access to mobility hubs or high frequency transit as opposed to a project's proximity to a bus stop. This refinement would add value to emphasizing key transit stations.

Specific Project-Type Criteria

- Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects - need to better define barrier elimination, gap closure, grade separated facilities and RTP corridor criteria.
- Indicator units (and associated formulas) used in the evaluation of bicycle/pedestrian and transit projects were confusing. Criteria should be reevaluated to make sure it is measuring something meaningful. Too much of a black box.
- EJ criteria didn't appear to be very useful. TAZ level was not fine-grained enough.....didn't seem to be a meaningful differentiator.
- Need to take a look at how the FOCUS transportation model output is representing various travel metrics. Need to do more testing so we are not post-processing the information at the last minute.

Required Training

- Training was great and good to have CDOT and RTD participating.
- Lack of coordination between CDOT and DRCOG regarding the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). The result was two separate calls for projects, which was confusing.
- Came too late in the process.
- In the future, offer the training as a webinar or as a recording on the DRCOG website.

Website Application Entry

- Overall website worked really well. Issues with the mapping function were noticed (i.e. not robust enough, trouble integrating with shapefiles, scale seemed to change from page to page).

DRCOG Review/Rescoring

- Clearer communication on the definition of criteria so that there are no misinterpretations from applicants (e.g., gap and barrier criteria).

First and Second Phase Selection

- Funding targets for First Phase selection by project type:
 - More funds should be allocated in the next TIP for transit.
 - Consider off the top funding for "beyond" FasTracks service projects (similar to the off the top funding set aside for 1st and 2nd commitments for FasTracks in previous TIPs).

ATTACHMENT C

Summary of June 17, 2015 TIP Open Forum Comments

- Off the top funding (e.g., FasTracks and I-70 E) should be factored/considered when establishing the project type funding allocation targets.
- More technical evaluation of funding allocation targets for next TIP.
- Consider using the First Phase funding targets for Second Phase selection to simplify process.
- Revisit the need for a target and specific criteria for Studies. (*Note: Studies were not scored and therefore were not eligible for First Phase in the 2016-2021 TIP*)
- More focus in Second Phase on synergies of a *regional* system. Use regional travel demand forecasting model (FOCUS) to determine if there is benefit to the region if communities work together on specific projects.
- While equity is useful and should be a focus in Second Phase, we have to be sure that the formula does not only look at where funds are invested, but who is using the facility.

General Comments

- Look to other regions for best practices or other models for TIP funding allocation.
- Is a two year call for projects possible? While it is possible, it may be difficult since the ROW and environmental costs would have to be provided by the local communities since CDOT will not begin work on a project until it is in the TIP.

ATTACHMENT D

Board of Directors 2016-2021 TIP Comments

August 19, 2015

- Work to address urban vs. suburban concerns. Not all voices being heard; needs a more meaningful evaluative process (to be developed through an ad hoc committee) to address disparities, be more equitable.

- TIP process is complex and small communities don't have staffing with expertise. A request that DRCOG staff give more educational trainings, seminars, visits to (small) jurisdictions.

- Factor in growth of communities; some growing at different speeds and have different needs; communities want regional help through the TIP for major infrastructure.

- Take a higher, strategic look at the TIP. Base evaluation on need, not project category type.

- TIP is complex; need ad hoc committee; investigate best practices from other MPOs.

- In order for TIP to be perceived by all as "fair", needs to be explainable and understandable. Consider investigating the following:
 - the benefit of swapping with CDOT federal dollars for state dollars;
 - understanding the difference between local responsibility and regional responsibility;
 - make sure the TIP process doesn't get "gamed"; and
 - ensure best practices are considered.

- It's time to reconsider how this TIP process is done. Look at other best practices- other concepts that may be a better fit. Look outside the box.

- Why is there not a first/last mile connections category prioritized in Phase 1? Why allow sponsors to submit multiple applications for the same project with different funding scenarios?

- TIP process brings out parochial thinking; need to elicit more thinking and collaborating regionally.

- Establish the flow from RTP to TIP.
 - Timing was wrong, need to get the timing right - develop big picture first (i.e., Metro Vision, then RTP, then TIP); can't develop criteria without knowing big picture.

- Fund a higher percentage of regionally significant projects.
 - Need to be more regionally strategic; majority of projects funded should be regionally strategic.

ATTACHMENT D

Board of Directors 2016-2021 TIP Comments

August 19, 2015

-
- Determine criteria earlier.
 - Determine criteria way ahead of time, so jurisdictions can strategize.
-
- Have as hoc committee write white paper.
 - Formulation of an Ad Hoc committee is not to develop a new TIP at this time, but to work towards development of a White Paper; look at best practices.
-
- TIP project selection should take into account for local sponsors' priority of projects.
-
- Start this process by doing a brainstorming session to determine what the biggest regional transportation projects/focus are. What would have the biggest effect on the region?
-
- If we stay with current system, is first and second phase breakdown appropriate?
-
- Consider road maintenance as a project type.
-
- Revisit project types that had a low number of projects submitted.
-
- Focus on strategic level, get best practices, define criteria more clearly, TAC should be more involved.
-
- Consider Metro Vision objectives.
-
- Make process more transparent.
-
- Should there be a minimum requested funding amount?
-
- Review the number of project applications a community can submit; does the current number still make sense?
-
- Review equity criteria.

ATTACHMENT E

TIP Project Selection Procedures Matrix MPO Comparison

MPOs	Approximate Annual STP & CMAQ Funding	Subregional Selection Process?	Considers Geographic Equity?	Special Project Selection Committee?	Selection Based Purely on Points?	Engineering Rigor in Application?	Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?	What Projects are in RTP before TIP?	Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?	Years Between Solicitation
Denver Regional Council of Governments	\$65 m	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Project	Capacity	Yes	4
Atlanta Regional Commission	\$99 m	No	No	No	No	No	Funding	All Projects	Yes	Varies
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning	\$230 m	Yes	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes*	Funding	Major Capital Projects	No	Depends on selection agency
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (Philadelphia)	\$63 m**	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Funding	Regionally Significant	Yes	2
Metropolitan Council (Minneapolis/St. Paul)	\$75 m	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Project	Regionally Significant	No	2
Mid-America Regional Council (Kansas City)	\$35 m	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Funding	Regionally Significant	No***	2
Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus)	\$31 m	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Project	All Projects	No	2
Mid-Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (Albuquerque)	\$23 m	No	No	No	No	Yes	Funding	Major Projects	Yes	2
Puget Sound Regional Council (Seattle)	\$80 m	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Funding	Capacity	Yes	2

* for CMAQ selection process only

** NJ STP figures include NJDOT funding swap

*** Construction only for STP, all phases for CMAQ

ATTACHMENT E

Summary of TIP Project Selection Procedures from other MPOs

Atlanta Regional Council (ARC)

Sub-Regional Selection Process?

- No

Considers Geographic Equity

- While there is no established equity policy, staff indicated that it is a consideration

Special Project Selection Committee?

- No. Staff indicated that projects are selected by staff and recommended/approved by the standing Transportation and Air Quality Committee and Transportation Coordinating Committee

Project Selection Based Purely on Points?

- Very subjective ranking; points used as one factor in decision making process

Engineering Rigor in Application

- No

Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?

- Funding type; CMAQ and STP-M calls usually separate

What Projects are in RTP before TIP?

- All projects in the TIP must be depicted in RTP

Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?

- Yes

Years Between Solicitations

- There are no set call for project dates; they solicit projects when substantial funds become available. Staff indicated that they are moving to a rolling application process

Other notes

- Selection criteria vary from call to call. For example, the current call focuses on completing existing projects and deliverability
- The project selection process is not ratified by their Board

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP)

Sub-Regional Selection Process?

- Regional STP-Metro allocation is divided by geography. 5% off the top for projects that benefit the region (programmed by City of Chicago). Of the remaining, 45% goes to Chicago to program and 55% goes to suburban councils to program. Suburban council money is divided up based on population

Considers Geographic Equity?

- Yes, in that STP-Metro and STP-County (STP funds allocated to state based on non-metro population) funds are partially allocated by population

Special Project Selection Committee?

- Suburban councils differ in their selection methods. Regional and CMAQ funds do not have a special committee; they are selected through the CMAP Transportation Committee

ATTACHMENT E

Summary of TIP Project Selection Procedures from other MPOs

Project Selection Based Purely on Points?

- For CMAQ: projects selected based on AQ cost benefit ranking

Engineering Rigor in Application?

- For CMAQ: yes

Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?

- Funding type

What Projects are in RTP before TIP?

- Major capital projects in RTP are given a TIP ID in anticipation of programming

Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?

- For CMAQ: Phase I Engineering not eligible

Years between Solicitations

- Most suburban councils do an open call, some do one every 3 years

Other notes

- STP-County are divided so that each county gets an equal share of 50% of the funds, with the rest divided up by population

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC - Philadelphia)

Sub-Regional Selection Process?

- Funds/selection processes separated by state (Pennsylvania, New Jersey)

Considers Geographic Equity?

- Equity is not considered within each TIP, but tends to balance out over TIP; subcommittee members are very aware of how much they have gotten, according to staff

Special Project Selection Committee?

- No. Projects selected by each state's technical committee

Project Selection Based Purely on Points?

- Decision making process includes points, but other considerations, too such as need, cost-effectiveness, etc

Engineering Rigor in Application?

- Yes

Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?

- Funding type

What Projects are in RTP before TIP?

- Regionally significant projects

Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?

- Yes

Years between Solicitations

- Two years

Other notes

- New Jersey has a program whereby they swap DVRPC's STP allocation with state funds. Staff stated that it is a dollar for dollar swap and that this allows for some flexibility in the types and

ATTACHMENT E

Summary of TIP Project Selection Procedures from other MPOs

locations of projects funded. Staff also indicated that recipients were happy with this arraignment

- Before most recent call for projects, staff led a TIP tour for technical committee members in order to show projects finished, under construction or that localities would like to see programmed; staff felt this was very successful in facilitating project selection process

Metropolitan Council (Minneapolis-St Paul)

Sub-Regional Selection Process?

- No

Considers Geographic Equity?

- Equity not officially a factor and points drive project ranking. However, staff thinks it's rare that a county gets nothing

Special Project Selection Committee?

- Reviewed by TAC Funding and Programming Committee

Project Selection Based Purely on Points?

- Projects selected by score within project types; politics comes in to play when deciding project type funding targets

Engineering Rigor in Application?

- Staff recommends that application is completed by engineering staff or consultant with PE capabilities

Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?

- Project types

What Projects are in RTP before TIP?

- Regionally significant projects

Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?

- No

Years between Solicitations

- Two years

Mid-America Regional Council (MARC - Kansas City)

Sub-Regional Selection Process?

- Yes, funds separated by state (Kansas, Missouri)

Considers Geographic Equity?

- According to staff, equity considered unofficially during project ranking process

Special Project Selection Committee?

- Yes. Each funding type has a subcommittee tasked with identifying selection criteria and a further work group tasked with project selection

Project Selection Based Purely on Points?

- Projects are scored by work group (CMAQ) or staff (STP) and ranking achieved by the subcommittee using scores, "relevant project information and committee discretion"

ATTACHMENT E

Summary of TIP Project Selection Procedures from other MPOs

Engineering Rigor in Application?

- No

Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?

- Projects solicited by funding type and further divided into project type subcategories (i.e., CMAQ projects could have been submitted as Alternative Fuels; Bike/Ped; Public Transportation; Traffic Flow; Outreach and other; or Diesel Retrofit)

What Projects are in RTP before TIP?

- Regionally significant – capacity is ½ mile or larger; and minor arterial or higher; and transit is fixed guideway

Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?

- Only construction phases of projects are eligible for STP money; all phases can be funded for CMAQ projects

Years between Solicitations

- Two years

Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC - Columbus)

Sub-Regional Selection Process?

- No

Considers Geographic Equity?

- Staff indicated that equity is not explicitly considered in project rankings

Special Project Selection Committee?

- Projects scored by staff and primary recommendations made by Attributable Funds Committee

Project Selection Based Purely on Points?

- Points used to guide decision making, with other considerations; however, staff indicated that the top scoring projects pretty much always get funded and the bottom ones almost never do

Engineering Rigor in Application?

- Yes

Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?

- Project type

What Projects are in RTP before TIP?

- All projects

Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?

- Generally, only construction and ROW phases are funded

Years between Solicitations

- Two years

Other notes

- Only allocates funds to projects within Urbanized Areas (except for studies and ride-share programs)
- Projects must comply with Complete Streets policy

ATTACHMENT E

Summary of TIP Project Selection Procedures from other MPOs

- CMAQ funds distributed by ODOT through a statewide call for projects, rather than MORPC. Scored by MORPC and selected projects submitted as applications to ODOT
- For applicants with multiple applications, they must submit their priorities, which are taken into account

Mid-Region Council of Governments/Mid-Region MPO (Albuquerque)

Sub-Regional Selection Process?

- No

Considers Geographic Equity?

- Equity is not an official factor in project selection, but staff indicated that cooperative project selection allows for subjectivity and that no counties have been completely left out of funding

Special Project Selection Committee?

- No. The Transportation Program Technical Group is a standing committee

Project Selection Based Purely on Points?

- No. Transportation Program Technical Group reviews submitted projects based on subjective 'qualitative information' such as the project's significance to the region; the local community; private sector involvement; land use; environmental justice and minority communities; and other pertinent information; as well as objective technical assessment score

Engineering Rigor in Application?

- Yes

Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?

- Funding type

What Projects are in RTP before TIP?

- Major projects

Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?

- Yes

Years between Solicitations

- RTP every 4 years, so every other TIP update synchronized with RTP update

Other notes

- Only one out of five counties eligible for CMAQ funds
- Allocate STP-Metro for Albuquerque UA; and what they call STP-Small Urban for smaller UAs and STP-Rural (both the latter appear to be STP funds allocated to state based on non-metro population) for areas not in the UA. There is one call for projects with different processes for the different funds
- Encourages a 'soft match' by sponsors where they pay for pre-construction work and get reimbursed for all construction

ATTACHMENT E

Summary of TIP Project Selection Procedures from other MPOs

Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC - Seattle)

Sub-Regional Selection Process?

- Two calls for projects; funds split 50/50 between both calls
 - Regional
 - Applications limited by county
 - Intended for regional, high priority projects
 - Projects scored by staff, but the project rankings by the Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC) take into consideration other factors (equity, cost effectiveness, etc)
 - County
 - Counties get allocations based on population
 - Select projects for inclusion based on internal processes/criteria (as long as they are consistent with federal statute)
 - Recommend projects to RPEC

Considers Geographic Equity?

- Staff indicated that equity is one of several factors used to rank projects submitted in the regional solicitation

Special Project Selection Committee?

- RPEC and Counties recommend projects to Transportation Policy Board which makes overall recommendation to PRSC's Executive Board

Project Selection Based Purely on Points?

- No. Regional solicitation includes staff scoring of project as well as other factors

Engineering Rigor in Application?

- Point criteria for the regional call for projects do not appear to rely heavily on engineering methodologies (except, possibly, the air quality and climate change points which look at reductions in SOV, VMT, etc). Points awarded low, medium, high and applicants are asked to describe how their projects fulfill functions

Solicit by Project Type or Funding Type?

- Funding type

What Projects are in RTP before TIP?

- Capacity projects

Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?

- Yes

Years between Solicitations

- Two years

Other notes

- Not all MPO area within non-attainment for CMAQ funds
- Rural areas get a set aside as do "rural town centers and corridors," areas that may not necessarily be designated "rural" by the Census Bureau. PRSC appears to receive non-MPO allocated state STP funds in addition to their STP-U allocation