

## AGENDA

### TIP Review Work Group – Mtg. 2

Friday, October 30, 2015

9:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, West side

1. Call to Order
2. October 16, 2015 Summary  
(Attachment A)
3. Draft of future topics to be covered  
(Attachment B)
  - Possible work group survey
4. Sample White Paper outline  
(Attachment C)
5. Continued review of TIP project evaluation and selection procedures from other MPOs  
(Attachment D)
  - Recommendations for White Paper
6. Adjournment

#### Upcoming meeting dates

- Fri., November 13
- Wed., December 2
- Fri., December 18
- Fri., January 8
- Fri., January 22
- Wed., February 3

*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

### MEETING SUMMARY

### TIP REVIEW WORK GROUP – Mtg. 1

Friday, October 16, 2015 9:30 a.m.

#### PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve	Adams County
Kent Moorman	Adams County, City of Thornton
Bryan Weimer	Arapahoe County
Mac Callison	Arapahoe County, City of Aurora
George Gerstle	Boulder County
Steve Klausing	Business
Jeff Sudmeier	CDOT
Danny Herrmann	CDOT
Janice Finch	Denver
David Gaspers	Denver
Doug Rex	DRCOG
Steve Cook	DRCOG
John Cotten	Douglas County, City of Lone Tree
Mike Salisbury	Environmental
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Dave Baskett	Jefferson County, City of Lakewood
Ken Lloyd	Regional Air Quality Council
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motor
Janet Lundquist	Weld County

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Will Soper, Casey Collins

#### Call to Order

Doug Rex called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Participants were introduced around the table.

The work group agreed to consensus being two-thirds of the participants present at the meeting.

George Gerstle was nominated as Chair and Steve Klausing as Vice Chair of the work group. A vote was taken and the work group unanimously agreed.

#### TIP Review Work Group Purpose

Doug Rex discussed the purpose of the work group, which is to create a White Paper on the DRCOG TIP process by February, 2016. Two main objectives the Board asked for were to 1.) take a holistic look at the TIP process; and 2.) look at how other TIPs from around the nation are implemented. He noted the purpose is not to rewrite the TIP process, but to prepare a White Paper to inform future Boards.

The work group was asked to identify potential issues to address at future meetings.

#### Discuss urban vs. suburban priorities

- Need to discuss fundamental issues, i.e., how to recognize and accommodate both urban and suburban priorities. How challenges of small communities are being addressed. County and city divide.

### Sub-regional processes

- How to meet regional goals while also looking at projects more on a sub-regional basis.

### What we do right

- Suggested acknowledging what we do well with the TIP.

### Funding flexibility

- Suggested discussion on funding swaps with federal dollars to increase flexibility. CDOT is looking at this, but noted the CDOT process for state funded projects is very similar to a project using federal funds. Does it make a difference and what would have to be changed?

### Limited funding

- Greatest challenge is allocating limited funding.

### Metro Vision alignment

- Keeping goals and objectives of Metro Vision 2040 in mind. Make sure Metro Vision is reflected in TIP policy.
- How to recognize both local needs/differences and 2040 MV regional goals/policies in the allocation of limited resources.
- Integrate better timing of the TIP Policy and regional Metro Vision plan updates.

### Flexibility

- Having more flexibility in project type categories. How to evaluate projects that have benefits in multiple categories.

### Partner collaboration

- Need to have further, more comprehensive collaboration between partners.
- Suggested RTD have representation on the work group.
- Need to identify high priority projects, and collaborate with RTD and CDOT on combined priorities.
- Suggested CDOT have additional staff available at work group meetings, as off-the top allocations are to be discussed.
- Would like a discussion with CDOT on strategic investments in the metro area and how to leverage that investment through the TIP process.
- Current TIP process doesn't take into consideration mutual priorities of both sponsors and of CDOT. Is there a way to identify those opportunities for collaboration, even before projects are identified, or have it as part of the evaluation process? Perhaps consider a "before application" identification process.

### Potential presentations

- Best practices—TIP processes from other MPOs.
- Suggested CDOT give an update at work group on streamlining process for DRCOG projects.
- Suggested each jurisdiction (or county) having a short presentation to the work group on: 1.) what their greatest challenges, top needs or priorities are; and 2.) what each jurisdictions' policy directives are.

- Suggested having a presentation on MAP-21 and a list of what its requirements are. Planning rules are not going to be ready until March/April 2016, but a performance measures presentation could be done.

#### TIP cycle

- Discussion on having a 2-year TIP cycle vs. a 4-year cycle.
- **Staff will develop a timeline of agenda discussion items for future work group meetings.**
- 

#### **Preliminary Review of TIP Project Selection Procedures from Other MPOs**

Will Soper presented a [review of TIP procedures](#) for eight MPO areas: Atlanta, Chicago, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Columbus, Albuquerque, and Seattle areas.

#### Requests for follow up MPO survey information:

- What are the criteria used by other MPOs. What gets scored and how does that compare with what we do.
  - How many entities (regions) in each MPO.
  - What are their DOT allocations – How do other MPO allocate to state facilities – Are they allocating dollars like we do on state facilities. What is DOT receiving for allocation in that MPO area.
  - Are there funding targets in the TIP and what were they (\$ or % of total amount) for their last cycle.
  - What is the minimum project size.
  - Ask other MPOs how they translate their goals to the TIP (quantify their goals).
  - Identify and contact some of the major municipalities/ jurisdictions to get different perspectives on lessons learned, particularly on sub-regional allocations.
  - Case studies of how to link regional plans to TIP decision-making.
- **Staff will provide follow up MPO survey information at the next work group meeting.**
- 

#### Future meeting dates

A calendar list of proposed future meeting dates was distributed. Meetings are held from 9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

#### Upcoming schedule of meetings:

1. Fri., October 30
2. Fri., November 13
3. Wed., December 2
4. Fri., December 18
5. Fri., January 8
6. Fri., January 22
7. Wed., February 3

#### Adjournment

The meeting ended at 11:05 a.m. The next meeting is Friday, October 30, 2015 at 9:30 a.m.

## ATTACHMENT B

# TIP White Paper Roadmap

As of October 30, 2015

### October 30, 2015

- Review topics to be covered in future meetings
- Additional MPO research – presentation and discussion
- Report Outline
- Introduce survey

### November 13, 2015

- Priorities and challenges in urban/suburban/rural and large /small communities
- Further examination of other MPO procedures
- Current TIP Policy: What works well? (survey)

### December 2, 2015

- Conclusions of other MPO procedures
  - Recommendations for White Paper
- Portland State University opportunity

### December 18, 2015

- Metro Vision and TIP alignment
- Priorities and partnerships with RTD and CDOT; leveraging regional collaborations and allocations

### January 8, 2016

- Swap federal for state funding
- Other items for staff to research or Board to consider
- Final recommendations on previous discussed topics

### January 22, 2016

- Years between a Call for Projects?
- Preliminary draft White Paper

### February 3, 2016

- Final draft White Paper

# Sample TIP White Paper Outline

---

As of October 30, 2015

## Introduction

## Purpose

## Existing TIP Process

- How well are specific policies and procedures liked?
- What policies and procedures logistically work well?
- Issues/challenges

## What are other MPO's doing?

- Similarities
- Differences
- Unique ideas to investigate

## Priorities and Challenges within Communities

- Urban versus suburban and rural
- Large, medium, and small

## Metro Vision Integration

- Metro Vision policies to consider
- Methods for integration

## Working Together

- Priorities and potential partnerships with RTD and CDOT
- Leveraging regional collaborations and allocations
- Potential to swap federal for state funding

## Conclusions

**ATTACHMENT D**

**TIP Project Selection Procedures Matrix  
MPO Comparison  
October 30, 2015**

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	Added for 10/30/2015				
											Number of Entities in MPO Area	DOT Allocation (Over Four Year TIP)	Interstates Funded with MPO Allocations?	Funding Targets for Last TIP?	Minimum Project Size
Denver Regional Council of Governments	\$65 m	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Project	Capacity	Yes	4	57 municipalities	\$3.7 b	Yes	Yes	\$100 k
Atlanta Regional Commission	\$99 m	No	No	No	No	No	Funding	All Projects	Yes	Varies		\$3.2 b	Yes		\$1 m <sup>v</sup>
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning	\$230 m	Yes	Yes	No	Yes <sup>i</sup>	Yes <sup>i</sup>	Funding	Major Capital Projects	No	Depends on selection	284 municipalities	\$9.1 b	Yes	Varies	None
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (Philadelphia)	\$63 m <sup>ii</sup>	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Funding	Regionally Significant	Yes	2	353 municipalities	\$5.0 b	Yes	No	\$250 k <sup>v</sup>
Metropolitan Council (Minneapolis/St. Paul)	\$75 m	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Project	Regionally Significant	No	2	186 communities	\$3.2 b	No	Yes	\$75 k - \$1 m
Mid-America Regional Council (Kansas City)	\$35 m	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Funding	Regionally Significant	No <sup>iii</sup>	2	119 municipalities	\$2.8 b	Yes	Yes <sup>i</sup>	\$25 k <sup>iv</sup>
Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus)	\$31 m	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Project	All Projects	No	2	79 local entities	\$2.1 b	Yes	Yes	\$250 k
Mid-Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (Albuquerque)	\$23 m	No	No	No	No	Yes	Funding	Major Projects	Yes	2		\$0.6 b	Yes		
Puget Sound Regional Council (Seattle)	\$80 m	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Funding	Capacity	Yes	2		\$5.6 b	Yes	Varies	

<sup>i</sup> for CMAQ selection process only

<sup>ii</sup> NJ STP figures include NJDOT funding swap

<sup>iii</sup> Construction only for STP, all phases for CMAQ

<sup>iv</sup> For programs and outreach, \$50 k for CMAQ capital. No minimum for STP

<sup>v</sup> Recommended minimums