

AGENDA

TIP Policy Work Group – Mtg. 13

Tuesday, November 14, 2017

2:30 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Conference Room – 1st Floor, west side

1. 2:30 Call to Order
2. Public Comment
3. October 10, 2017 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)
4. 2:35 Discussion on Subregional Share forum usage of IGAs or MOU/MOAs
(Attachment B) Doug Rex
5. 3:30 Discussion on Subregional Share forum postings of agenda material
(Attachment C) Doug Rex
6. 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.



ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SUMMARY TIP POLICY WORK GROUP – Mtg.12 Monday, October 10, 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
Tom Schomer	Broomfield, City and County
Dan Herrmann	CDOT
Janice Finch/Justin Begley	Denver, City and County
David Gaspers	Denver, City and County
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Doug Rex	DRCOG
Art Griffith	Douglas County
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Dave Baskett	Jefferson County, City of Lakewood
Ken Lloyd	Regional Air Quality Council
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motor
Kevin Ash	Weld County

Others present: Aaron Bustow, FHWA

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Mark Northrop, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

September 25, 2017 Meeting Summary

The summary was accepted.

Discussion on Draft Regional Criteria and Scoring

Todd Cottrell reviewed revisions to the draft Regional evaluation criteria and scoring, based on feedback from previous discussions. He reviewed the scoring process that is sectioned into three parts:

1. qualitative-related questions (50 points maximum);
2. quantitative-related benefit criteria (40 points maximum); and
3. funding request effectiveness (10 points maximum)

Comments

- Kent Moorman suggested Part 1, item D should be a subpart of Part 1, item C.
- George Gerstle questioned if using high/medium/low points is appropriate. Doug Rex said it determines the degree to which the project/program mitigates the existing problem.
- Art Gerstle agreed high/medium/low may be confusing, and suggested using yes/no.
- Kathleen Bracke questioned whether using either yes/no or high/medium/low would adequately indicate the level of public support for a project.

- Janice Finch said criteria should ask the key question: “*Why is this project regionally significant?*” She questioned whether qualitative should even use points. Ted Heyd agreed qualitative should be a narrative and quantitative be scoring.
- Kent Moorman said having a uniform format of questions in the qualitative section allows the Board to be able to more easily review the answers for all submittals.
- Mac Callison said using quantitative/qualitative scoring is more applicable when evaluating a lot of projects. He didn’t foresee many Regional projects applying, and suggested the sponsor’s narrative should address several core criteria, such as how it relates to Focus Areas, Metro Vision, and RTP.
- Dave Baskett compared the qualitative process to that of ranking college entrance essays. Kathleen Bracke said there is a scorecard structure behind the essay; and the qualitative questions provide the framework for the sponsor’s narrative.
- Doug Rex said there could be a quantitative approach integrated within the sponsor’s narrative, as opposed to breaking out separately as quantitative and qualitative.

George Gerstle summarized:

1. Part 1 should not be points-based and there should be an identification of issues the applicant should address
 2. There should be the expectation that a project address Part 1, items G (Focus Areas) and H (Metro Vision Performance Measures) and that evaluators will use these items as a basis for the evaluation.
 3. Should provide metrics (that are not rated, but are quantifiable) that staff and evaluators will be looking at when evaluating a project, such as how a project will affect vulnerable populations, or how it increases reliability of existing network.
- Doug Rex said the process could be built like a RFP to establish the parameters a project would need to address (such as, establish that a certain percentage of the overall score will be how a project addresses Safety). After further discussion, George Gerstle said:
 - every proposed Regional project would be required to address these parameters
 - there would be the expectation that the sponsor would provide a quantitative analysis to demonstrate how the project addresses it
 - there would be no bottom line score (as Regional projects differ and have different objectives)
 - George Gerstle noted the Board has not put a priority on the Focus Areas, nor on performance measures. Doug Rex said the Board has directed that Focus Areas will be used as a guide, and not a litmus test for eligibility.
 - Dave Baskett said, ultimately, you will need to compare projects, even if projects compared are very different. Mac Callison noted the difficulty in comparing across modes at the regional level, even with agreed-upon methodologies.
 - Art Griffith noted projects scoring could be “gamed” if there is not a requirement to address all 8 Metro Vision criterions.
 - After some discussion, George Gerstle summarized that several members suggested having a two-step process. The initial proposals would be short listed, and qualitative, with some combination Part 1, items A-F and G-H criteria. If a project makes the short list, then the sponsor would be invited to do a more detailed quantitatively-based analysis in its application to the Board.

- Ted Heyd disagreed with using a yes/no scoring in the 1st phase (short list) screening; felt it was too black or white. He said there should be a quantitative basis for scoring (1 to 10 points) by a committee.
- Bryan Weimer recommended having quantitative scoring, so a sponsor can self-score its project. If doing high/medium/low, we need to have boundaries, otherwise it's too subjective. Doug Rex said this won't be possible unless projects are organized by type.
- Art Griffith asked how many Regional projects a Subregion would be able to submit. Doug Rex said this has not been addressed. He noted DRCOG submittals are not limited to Subregions; any federal funding-eligible entity can submit independently. (Todd Cottrell noted, in Seattle, all entities submit through their four counties.)
- Ted Heyd asked if each applicant's Board presentations would uniformly incorporate the metrics in Part 2; saying it could become an "apples to oranges" exercise if there is no uniformity.
- Kent Moorman noted in Part 2, an applicant should need to specifically address why a criterion was not addressed. He said an applicant should also address the key question in the Part 1, "*why is this project regionally significant?*", in addition to addressing G (Focus Areas) and H (Performance Measures).
- Doug Rex said he was agreeable to the concept of having a two-step process, although with hesitancy about staff deciding the first cut of projects, and suggested having a subset of the Board decide. He said Part 1 of the application should be able to provide solid quantitative evidence on the front side, noting a qualitative Part 1 application could potentially be too rosy, with weak quantitative backing.
- Art Griffith suggested limiting Subregions to 2 projects and CDOT and RTD to 3 to 4 projects. He said we need to establish submittal limits and consider color of money issues. Doug Rex said a separate topic is "do you put a maximum on the amount of any one funding type that is in the Regional pot? Do you cap STP, for instance?" The work group should make a recommendation to Board at some time.
- Kent Moorman noted the quantitative piece sets the performance measures.
- Jeanne Shreve observed that Regional projects should have a certain discernment to them. She said Part 1, items G (Focus Areas) and H (Performance Measures) should be the standard for a Regional project to meet.
- Janice Finch asked staff to provide an updated work group timeline.
- Doug Rex noted the next scheduled TIP Policy Work Group meeting on October 23 will be rescheduled due to a conflict with the CDOT Transportation Summit. Staff will email a poll to re-schedule.
- Doug Rex said the November 2 Board Work Session will hopefully finalize Regional eligibility/definitions and Regional/Subregional funding split to bring to the November 15 Board meeting. If that is successful, the December 6 Board Work session will finalize Regional scoring.
- George Gerstle suggested using same scoring for Subregional as Regional.
- Dave Baskett said the point of having Subregional is to have more flexibility. Doug Rex said the Subregional can continue to use the existing TIP criteria, if desired, but doesn't think it works well at the regional level.

- Kent Moorman said FHWA requested each Subregion's scoring processes be made public. Does this subregional process have to be presented or approved by the Board?
 - Art Griffith suggested it could be a review by DRCOG staff and FHWA.
 - Kathleen Bracke said it's important there is public vetting of Subregional criteria.
 - Todd Cottrell said the FHWA letter stated "*Subgeographical units will provide DRCOG with their documented process prior to commencement, ensuring that the local entities are engaging in an equal process and a competitive environment for all stakeholders and project sponsors.*"
- Ted Heyd reiterated there needs to be some uniformity in Subregional forums and the criteria they develop to ensure some degree of adherence to Metro Vision 2040.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

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 #
November 14, 2017	Action	4

SUBJECT

Subregional forum development.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion on development of Subregional forums IGAs or MOU/MOAs.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

Over the last few months, discussions have been held on guidelines for the Subregional Share project/program selection process. One specific item mentioned was the development of an IGA or MOU/MOA for each Subregional Share forum formation. Time during this agenda item will be devoted to this discussion.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

ATTACHMENT C

To: TIP Policy Work Group

From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner
303 480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
November 14, 2017	Discussion	5

SUBJECT

Subregional forum meeting notices and agenda postings.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion on universal process for posting Subregional Share forum meeting notices and agenda materials.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

An item brought up earlier when discussing public involvement, is needing further discussion on how to handle the posting of Subregional forum meeting notices, agendas, and other meeting materials. Time during this agenda item will be devoted to this discussion.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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