

AGENDA

TIP Review Work Group – Mtg. 4

Wednesday, December 2, 2015

9:30 – 12:00 p.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, West side

1. Call to Order
2. November 18, 2015 Summary
(Attachment A)
3. Session with Robert Liberty (Director, [Urban Sustainability Accelerator Program](#), Portland State University)
(Attachment B)
4. Discussion of TIP survey results
(Attachment C)
5. Discussion of TIP process model exercise
(Attachment D)
6. Adjournment

Upcoming meeting dates

- 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. 3

Friday, November 13, 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
Steve Klausing	Business
Danny Herrmann	CDOT
David Gaspers	Denver
Doug Rex	DRCOG
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Art Griffith	Douglas County
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

Others: Chris Quinn, RTD

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Will Soper, Brad Calvert, Casey Collins

Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

Summary of October 30, 2015 meeting

The summary was accepted as written.

Discussion on draft TIP Survey

The work group provided comment on the draft TIP survey enclosed in the agenda packet. The survey was developed to generate a high-level overview of the current TIP process from stakeholders' feedback.

The committee was asked to provide any further comment on the survey by email to staff by Monday, November 16. The survey is expected to be emailed to stakeholders within one week. The work group will review results at the next meeting on December 2.

Discussion on TIP Issues

There was discussion on whether big issues should be addressed by the work group. Staff noted solving "big issue" topics may be difficult given the time constraints, but it seems appropriate to offer recommendations, if possible.

Work Group Comments:

- Board is really looking for guidance on big issues.
- Noted previous committees and the DRCOG Board have given feedback that the TIP is somewhat aimless. Big issue-level discussion is needed.

- Board wants to know how to improve resource allocation and project selection –need to address these topics head on. This was why the Board wanted the work group formed.
- Board didn't like having to horse-trade and have multiple meetings on it.
- While the equity issue is not a technical-level role to address, could this be addressed somehow in the White Paper? There should be further discussion on key policy issues.
- Equity is important and should be the first priority; subregional model is tied to the equity issue.
- Need to be cognizant of the legislation (rules) we are currently under ("What does legislation require".) Identify and put this in the preamble of the White Paper.
- Need to look at in terms of "What is the return on investment?" Should look at making investment decisions based on a projects ability to address "congestion relief" and "air quality". Fiduciary responsibility to do so. May be difficult to score and quantify.
- Suggested using the term to "provide better mobility" instead of "congestion".

Chair Gerstle summarized the discussion. Suggested the following "big" issues":

1. Identify the purpose of the TIP.
2. The role of regional allocations.
3. The link to policy direction in the regional plan (Metro Vision).

Other issues mentioned:

4. What are our federal requirements - what is the base requirement that we, as an MPO have to do.
5. How to deal with equity.
6. Handling the off-the-top project/programs funding.
7. What are the specific performance goals?

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

Doug Rex presented a discussion about staff's identification in its research of two unique models that MPOs use for project selection:

- 1) a centralized process where applications are submitted to the MPO and collectively scored and ranked (similar to DRCOG's model); and
- 2) a decentralized process that has a subregional allocation element.

Staff asked if the work group wanted to consider examining the pros and cons of the two models. Specifically, conduct a case study for the White Paper to evaluate how each model may address the identified issues (e.g. equity, Metro Vision, etc.). After discussion, staff agreed to provide an outline of the key issues for the exercise.

Updates to the MPO Matrix

Will Soper noted several updates to the MPO matrix spreadsheet. Staff said it will continue to add information to the matrix as it becomes available.

Staff noted that in 2016-2021 TIP, DRCOG will expend 38.9% of STP and CMAQ funds on state owned facilities:

- Chicago – 17.9%
- Minneapolis – 34.9%
- Columbus – 43.3%
- Kansas City – 42.6%

At the work group's request, staff contacted King County, Washington staff to get their opinion on the Puget Sound Regional Council's TIP selection process:

- In general, King County was positive about the subregional process. Says it gets more participation from smaller jurisdictions. Has other entities participating, such as parks departments, port authorities and small airports, etc. Still some equity issues – urban vs. rural.
- The selection process suballocates to 3 competitive pots (large, small jurisdiction/rural (which tracks equity), and non-motorized).
- Puget Sound MPO also receives additional state DOT STP funds.

Next Meeting agenda items

- Robert Liberty, Director of Portland State University's [Urban Sustainability Accelerator Program](#) will be present at the December 2 meeting to discuss transportation investment decision making. Doug Rex noted an invitation to is going out to Board members and staff, as well as other stakeholders to explore DRCOG's participation in a cohort group for the Accelerator Program. Meetings will be held over a two-day period (Dec. 2 and 3).
- TIP survey results.
- Discussion of pros and cons of the two TIP process models and how they are able to address identified TIP issues.

Adjournment

The meeting ended at 10.55 a.m. The next meeting is Wednesday, December 2, 2015 at 9:30 a.m.

Upcoming schedule of meetings:

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

ATTACHMENT B



DRCOG is exploring participation in a cohort group sponsored by the Urban Sustainability Accelerator Program at Portland State University in Oregon. The program involves a 13-month priority-setting partnership led by director Robert Liberty, a university research team, and policy, planning and transportation experts. If selected to participate, DRCOG could explore an improved process for prioritizing allocation of transportation funding. The cohort would likely include two other urban areas examining their decision-making process and priorities for transportation investments.

Because participation would require time and financial investments by DRCOG, your input is critical in determining whether we pursue this opportunity. You are invited to fact-finding sessions in early December to learn more about the program and how it might inform DRCOG's transportation investment decisions.

The session below will be part of the regularly scheduled TIP Review Work Group meeting.

Wednesday, Dec. 2
9:30 a.m.
Independence Pass



ATTACHMENT C

To: TIP Review Work Group

From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
December 2, 2015	Information	4

SUBJECT

TIP Survey Results

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The TIP survey results will be shared with the work group at the December 2 meeting. Respondents have until the close of business on November 30 to respond to the survey. The final survey instrument is attached for your information.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[October 30, 2015](#) TIP Review Work Group meeting
[November 13, 2015](#) TIP Review Work Group meeting

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

Final TIP Survey

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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

2016-2021 TIP Survey

INTRODUCTION

1. Do you represent a:

Municipality County Regional Agency (RAQC, CDOT, RTD, etc.) Other

2. If you represent a municipality, what is your community's size?

0-10,000 10,001-50,000 50,001-100,000 100,001+

3. What are the current transportation needs within your community? Rank order from 1 to 10, with 1 being the highest rank and 10 the lowest rank.

☰	<input type="text"/>	Bicycle Facilities (capacity, reconstruction)
☰	<input type="text"/>	Roadway Capacity
☰	<input type="text"/>	Roadway Operational Improvements (e.g., intersection modifications)
☰	<input type="text"/>	Roadway Reconstruction
☰	<input type="text"/>	Roadway Resurfacing (mill and fill, overlay)
☰	<input type="text"/>	Sidewalks (capacity, reconstruction)
☰	<input type="text"/>	Studies
☰	<input type="text"/>	Transit
☰	<input type="text"/>	Travel Demand Management (TDM)
☰	<input type="text"/>	Other (please specify in comment box below)

4. List any "Other" transportation needs from Question 4 above (if applicable).

5. Did you apply for funding in the 2016-2021 TIP?

Yes No

If No, why not?

*If you entered **Yes** to Question 5, continue on to Question 6.*

*If you answered **No** to Question 5 and would like to answer specific questions about the 2014 DRCOG TIP Call for Projects (2016-2021 TIP), continue on to Question 6. If you do not wish to do so, you may proceed to Question 20.*

2016-2021 TIP Survey

TIP CALL FOR PROJECTS

Questions 6 through 13 are statements regarding the 2014 DRCOG TIP Call for Projects (2016-2021 TIP). Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

6. My organization benefited from mandatory TIP training.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

No Opinion

Comments

7. The web-based Call for Projects was an effective way for my organization to submit project applications.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

No Opinion

Comments

8. Submitting projects by Project Type (Roadway Capacity, Roadway Operations, Roadway Reconstruction, Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transit Services, Transit Passenger Facilities, Other Enhancements, Studies) worked well.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

No Opinion

Comments

9. The Project Types (as listed in Question 8) were adequate.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

No Opinion

Comments

10. Pre-construction activities such as NEPA, design, ROW, etc. should remain eligible for funding.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

No Opinion

Comments

11. A two-phase selection process utilizing additional factors determined by the DRCOG Board (i.e., equity, very small communities, etc.) in Second Phase is preferable to a 100% score-based single-phase process.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

No Opinion

Comments

12. Studies should be scored in First Phase.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

No Opinion

Comments

13. The amount of match required for projects should be greater than the current 20% minimum.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

No Opinion

Comments

Questions 14 through 19 are additional statements about the last TIP Call for Projects. Please indicate your satisfaction with each statement.

14. The last Call for Projects was open for 7 1/2 weeks to complete applications. The amount of time was...

Too little

About right

Too much

No Opinion

Comments

15. The maximum number of TIP submittals for your agency was ...

Too little

About right

Too much

No Opinion

Comments

16. The minimum federal funding request of \$100,000 was ...

Too little

About right

Too much

No Opinion

Comments

17. Metro Vision criteria accounted for 25 points (of a possible 100 points). This amount was...

Too little

About right

Too much

No Opinion

Comments

18. The level of engineering or technical effort required in project applications was ...

Too little

About right

Too much

No Opinion

Comments

19. Multimodal Connectivity criterion for roadway projects accounted for 18 points (of a possible 100 points). The amount was ...

Too little

About right

Too much

No Opinion

Comments

Only 3 more questions!

20. A Call for Projects is currently issued every 4 years. A more appropriate interval for selecting projects is every...

1 year

2 years

3 years

or keep at 4 years

Comments

21. List any challenges your agency has encountered in applying for or administering TIP-funded projects.

22. Please provide any additional comments.

23. Contact Information (optional)

Name

Agency

Address

City/Town

Email Address

Phone Number

Thank you for your participation!

ATTACHMENT D

To: TIP Review Work Group

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
December 2, 2015	Discussion	5

SUBJECT

TIP Process Model Exercise

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

At the November 13 meeting, the work group discussed key issues related to the DRCOG TIP process they believe should be addressed in the white paper to the Board. Issues identified include:

- Applicable federal (and state) requirements
- TIP funding purpose – What are we trying to accomplish through the TIP?
 - Link between the TIP and Metro Vision
- Equity – What does equity mean? Does our current two-phase process adequately address equity?
- Small vs. large communities – Are the transportation and administrative issues facing small communities different than large communities? Can small communities compete?
- Off the top project/program funding – How/when should off the top project/program funding decisions be made?

Other key issues will likely emerge as the work group continues its effort.

Also at the November 13 meeting, staff identified two very distinct process models for the selection of MPO projects: (1) a process similar to DRCOG's model relying on a centralized two-phase process where applications are submitted to the MPO and are collectively scored and ranked; and (2) a dual process that has both regional and subregional allocation elements to its selection process.

The work group discussed participating in an exercise to evaluate how well each model does in resolving the key issues identified above. At the December 2 meeting, staff would like to begin this exercise by (1) presenting an overview of the Puget Sound Regional Council's TIP process, which includes a subregional allocation and project selection component; (2) further define the key TIP issues listed above; and (3) discuss any additional key issues the work group would like to address in this exercise.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

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