

AGENDA

TIP Review Work Group – Mtg. 3

Friday, November 13, 2015

9:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, West side

1. Call to Order
2. October 30, 2015 Summary
(Attachment A)
3. Draft TIP Survey
(Attachment B)
4. Continued review of TIP project evaluation and selection procedures from other MPOs.
(Attachment C)
 - Next Steps
5. Adjournment

Upcoming meeting dates

- 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. 2

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

PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Kent Moorman	Adams County, City of Thornton
Bryan Weimer	Arapahoe County
Mac Callison	Arapahoe County, City of Aurora
George Gerstle	Boulder County
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

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

Summary of October 15, 2015 meeting

The summary was accepted as written.

Discussion on Survey

Staff will be drafting a survey to get feedback from TIP stakeholders on the TIP process. The work group will review the draft for its feedback on the content prior to the survey's distribution to TIP stakeholders in November. Survey results will be used for more in-depth discussion at upcoming meetings.

Comment on survey questions:

- Suggested including 5 top priorities by project type and providing a checkbox list by project type.

Discussion on list of future topics

General comments:

- Requested more clarification on placement of work group's recommendations within the White Paper.
 - Staff noted the current timeline calls for having final recommendations drafted by January 8 and a preliminary draft White Paper by January 22.
- Suggested adding an "Issues, Challenges, and Recommendations" for each topic and tie up recommendations in the conclusion.

- Staff noted there may be different types of recommendations made, but believe most should focus on broad topic areas than say, specific evaluation criteria.
- Asked if there was an opportunity for leeway of a few months to form the final recommendations, as the work group timeframe (due February 2016) is short.
 - Staff said the Board would have to give direction on that suggestion.

Existing TIP Process

- Thought the current scoring criterion is a good framework for fleshing out good projects, regardless of category. Points and framework in place force applicants to come up with good projects.
- Asked if first phase funding targets could be more aligned with demonstrated demand in the region.
- Suggested amending the Policy to shorten the cycle between TIPs. Have a pros/cons session for shortening the TIP cycle.
 - Staff noted the topic, “Years between a Call for Projects” is scheduled for January 22.
- Thought there should be clearer procedures for TAP funding allocations.

What are other MPOs doing

- Do other MPOs establish criteria for set-asides? What is their process to reach a consensus?

Priorities and Challenges within Communities

- North Front Range MPO has a 23% set-aside for smaller communities. May be worth looking at so projects from similar size communities can be compared against each other.
- Small communities were not funded through the STAMPs set-aside. Should be compared differently.
- Noted a significant challenge in “older” communities is the catch-up to provide sidewalks and ROW, etc. because of past DOT policies to end a project at the curb.

Metro Vision Integration

- More discussion is needed on how to look at projects more holistically.
- The TIP process has gotten away from being a regional funder; needs to be balanced between regional and local.
- Look at the TIP processes for (same) cities that we are in competition with and that were compared for Metro Vision (i.e., Austin, Dallas, Portland, Salt Lake City) and review how they incorporate their regional vision plans.
- Stressed that Metro Vision and TIP Policy need to be developed together, not separately, to fully understand consequences.

Working Together

- We have funding silos – is there an opportunity to consider other ways to compare? Need to consider a cost/benefit analysis on how funds get invested.

- Consider allocating a portion of funding to sub-regions to better integrate sub-regional priorities into TIP project funding.
- If process is sub-regional, project selection could be easier for everyone.
- Would like more discussion on cross-regional boundary (inter-regional) projects.

Continued review of TIP project evaluation and selection procedures from other MPOs

Will Soper reviewed updated information for the [TIP Review Matrix of MPO Procedures](#) in continuation of the previous meeting's discussion.

Comments on MPO evaluation

- Look at the TIP processes for same cities that we are in competition with and that were compared for Metro Vision (i.e., Austin, Dallas, Portland, Salt Lake City) and review how they incorporate their regional vision plans.
- Do other MPOs established criteria for set-asides? What is their process to reach a consensus?
- Would like to know examples of unique criteria used by other MPOs.
- Suggested asking other MPOs "what approaches would the MPO do differently" and reasons why.
- Suggested adding Austin and Salt Lake to the MPO matrix.
- Suggested adding columns indicating "percent of MPO allocations going to interstates" and "policy for important off-the-top projects"
- Ask other MPOs in Colorado how they allocate their funds (Pikes Peak, North Front Range)
- Need to better define column titles in matrix.

Upcoming meetings

Staff noted the following items will be discussed:

November 13 meeting

1. Survey of eligible TIP sponsors
2. A deeper dive into other MPO TIP methodologies (Staff noted most MPOs conduct their TIP process similar to DRCOG. Seattle and Chicago use a regional/subregional allocation model. Albuquerque does a single call for projects, but does different selection processes for each of the large urban, small urban, and rural areas.)

Dec. 2 meeting

Doug Rex noted the Dec. 2 work group meeting will include a session with Robert Liberty of Portland University's Urban Sustainability Accelerator program. Subjects for discussion include transportation investment decisions. DRCOG is a potential future participant in the program.

Adjournment

The meeting ended at 10.55 a.m. The next meeting is Friday, November 13, 2015 at 9:30 a.m.

Upcoming schedule of meetings:

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

ATTACHMENT B

To: TIP Review Work Group

From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
November 13, 2015	Action	3

SUBJECT

Draft TIP Survey

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Finalize survey

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

At the last meeting, the Work Group discussed the opportunity to create a survey to gather input from those agencies submitting TIP project applications in the last call for projects. It was also suggested the survey include questions about the transportation priorities and challenges of DRCOG communities.

Please review the attached draft survey. The survey will be finalized at the November 13 meeting.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[October 30, 2015](#) TIP Review Work Group meeting

PROPOSED MOTION

Finalize survey for distribution

ATTACHMENT

Draft survey

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT C

To: TIP Review Work Group

From: Douglas W. Rex, Transportation Planning and Operations Director

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
November 13, 2015	Action – Direction to staff	4

SUBJECT

TIP project selection procedures from other MPOs

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Next steps

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

Over the past two meetings, staff has highlighted the comparisons of TIP process characteristics from other MPOs around the country. The latest iteration is attached for your review.

Staff has identified two very distinct process models for the selection of MPO projects through its research: (1) a process similar to DRCOG's model relying on a centralized process where applications are submitted to the MPO and are collectively scored and ranked; and (2) a process that has a subregional allocation element to its selection process.

Staff recommends pursuing an evaluation of both processes to determine if one or both can account for the regional challenges already discussed by the Work Group or additional challenges identified in the upcoming TIP survey.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Work Group direction

ATTACHMENT

TIP Project Selection Matrix

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Doug Rex, Transportation Planning and Operations Director, at 303-480-6747 or drex@drcog.org.

ATTACHMENT C

**TIP Project Selection Procedures Matrix
MPO Comparison
November 13, 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? ^{vii}	Are PE/Design Phases Eligible?	Years Between Solicitation	Number of Entities in MPO Area	Total Expenditures (Over Four Year TIP)	Interstates Funded with MPO Allocations?	Funding Targets for Last TIP?	Minimum Project Size	Added for 10/30/2015	Added for 11/13/2015
																Does the MPO Use Set Asides?	
Denver Regional Council of Governments	\$65 m	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Project	Regionally Significant	Yes	4	56 municipalities	\$3.7 b	Yes	Yes	\$100 k	Yes	
Atlanta Regional Commission	\$99 m	No	No	No	No	No	Funding	All Projects	Yes	Varies	13 counties	\$3.2 b	Yes	No	\$1 m ^v		
Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning	\$230 m	Yes	Yes	No	Yes ⁱ	Yes ⁱ	Funding	Major Capital Projects	No	Depends on selection	284 municipalities	\$9.1 b	Yes	Varies	None	Yes	
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (Philadelphia)	\$63 m ⁱⁱ	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Funding	Regionally Significant	Yes	2	353 municipalities	\$5.0 b	Yes	No	\$250 k ^v		
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	Yes	
Mid-America Regional Council (Kansas City)	\$35 m	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Funding	Regionally Significant	No ⁱⁱⁱ	2	119 municipalities	\$2.8 b	Yes	Yes ⁱ	\$25 k ^{iv}	Yes	
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	Yes	
Mid-Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (Albuquerque)	\$23 m	No	No	No	No	Yes	Funding	Major Projects	Yes	2	30 entities	\$0.6 b	Yes	Yes	None		
Puget Sound Regional Council (Seattle)	\$80 m	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Funding	Capacity	Yes	2	88 entities	\$5.6 b	Yes	Yes	None	Yes	

Added for 11/13/2015	North Front Range MPO (Ft Collins)	\$7.5 m	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Funding	Capacity	Yes	4	15 municipalities	\$0.1 b	Yes	No	\$100 k ^{vi}	Yes
	Pikes' Peak Area Council of Governments (Colorado Springs)	\$7.5 m ^{vi}	No	No	No	No	Yes	Project	Capacity	Yes	4	9 municipalities	\$.03 b	Yes	Yes	\$25 k	Yes
	Capital Area MPO (Austin, TX)	\$23.5 m ^{vi}	No	No	Yes	No	No	Project	Capacity	Yes	Varies	44 entities	\$0.6 b	Yes	Yes	None	No
	Wasatch Front Range Council (Salt Lake City)	\$33 m	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Funding	Capacity	No	1	53	\$1.9 b	Yes	Yes	None	No

ⁱ for CMAQ selection process only

ⁱⁱ NJ STP figures include NJDOT funding swap

ⁱⁱⁱ Construction only for STP, all phases for CMAQ

^{iv} For programs and outreach, \$50 k for CMAQ capital. No minimum for STP

^v Recommended minimums

^{vi} STP-Metro Only

^{vii} Definitions per the MPO