



Board Officers

Sue Horn, Chair
Jack Hilbert, Vice Chair
Rachel Zenzinger, Secretary
Jackie Millet, Treasurer
Dennis McCloskey, Immediate Past Chair
Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

AGENDA
METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE
Wednesday, November 6, 2013
4:00 p.m.
1290 Broadway
First Floor Boardroom

- 
- 
1. Call to Order
 2. Public Comment
The chair requests that there be no public comment on issues for which a prior public hearing has been held before the Board of Directors.
 3. Summary of October 2, 2013 Meeting
(Attachment A)

CONSENT ITEM

4. * Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors the proposed Urban Center amendments for modeling purposes
(Attachment B) Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, Regional Planning & Operations

ACTION ITEMS

5. * Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors including RAMP projects in air quality conformity modeling for the 2013 Cycle 2 amendments to the 2035 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan
(Attachment C) Jacob Riger, Long Range Transportation Planning Coordinator, Transportation Planning & Operations
6. * Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors including all proposed projects shown in Table 1 in air quality conformity modeling for 2013 Cycle 2 amendments to the 2035 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan
(Attachment D) Jacob Riger, Long Range Transportation Planning Coordinator, Transportation Planning & Operations
7. * Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors improvements to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as agreed to during the meeting
(Attachment E) Steve Cook, Acting Director, Transportation Planning & Operations

***Motion Requested**

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) 480-6701

We make life better!



ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

8. Other Matters
9. **Next Meeting – December 4, 2013**
10. Adjournment

SUMMARY OF METRO VISION ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING
October 2, 2013

MVIC Members Present: Rachel Zenzinger – Arvada; Bob Roth – Aurora; Nancy Sharpe – Arapahoe County; Sue Horn – Bennett; Elise Jones – Boulder County; Suzanne Jones – Boulder; Dennis McCloskey – Broomfield; Cathy Noon – Centennial; Rocky Piro, Robin Kniech – Denver; Jack Hilbert – Douglas County; Todd Riddle – Edgewater; Sharon Richardson – Federal Heights; Adam Paul – Lakewood; Phil Cernanec – Littleton; Jackie Millet – Lone Tree; Val Vigil – Thornton.

Others present: Mac Callison, John Fernandez – Aurora; Joe Fowler – Douglas County; Katie Witt – Longmont; Ted Heyd – Bicycle Colorado; and DRCOG staff.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m.; a quorum was present.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Summary of June 5, 2013 Meeting

The summary was accepted as written.

Move to recommend the proposed Urban Center amendments for modeling purposes

This item was pulled from the agenda.

Move to recommend to the Board of Directors that MVIC is the appropriate group to analyze and advise the Board on TIP improvements (policies, procedures, project selection), and other improvements to the TIP as agreed to during the meeting

Jennifer Schaufele briefly described the TIP; and the anticipated schedule for development of the 2016-2021 TIP. Members were asked to begin discussion of the process for developing the next TIP, specifically the policies to be used to formulate project selection criteria. A simplified process from that used in past TIPs is desirable. Peer agencies were examined to see how other MPOs develop their TIPs. Some agencies provide direct funding to the counties, and it is up to the county and municipalities within the county to decide what projects will be funded. Some MPOs establish criteria for regional projects, and fund projects the members agree are regional in nature. One MPO is in a pilot program to swap federal funds for state funds, since state funds don't require the same match, and can be used for projects not allowable to be funded with federal dollars. Some MPOs used subjective criteria for evaluating projects; some used more objective measurements.

Elise Jones noted she was not comfortable with making decisions on the issues outlined in the memo at this time. Jack Hilbert noted that no final decisions are expected at this time, the purpose is to give staff direction to prepare additional information for discussion by members.

Jack Hilbert **moved, seconded** by Katie Witt, that MVIC is the appropriate group to analyze and advise the Board on TIP improvements to policies, procedures, and project selection, and to provide direction to staff to come back with additional information on the items noted in the topic memo. There was discussion.

Elise Jones stated she doesn't feel that members have enough information to make a recommendation to the Board regarding specific criteria.

Nancy Sharpe noted she feels MVIC is the correct body to have this discussion. She stated if there are items in the TIP that are outdated or no longer functioning, those should be brought to the group as well. Are there criteria that no local government has qualified for or haven't been used, or that no longer make sense due to changes over time?

Jackie Millet asked for information related to what prior funded TIP projects had in common. She noted funding should be awarded to projects with measurable results.

Hank Dalton asked for information on whether some of the criteria were formulated at the request of specific jurisdictions.

Suzanne Jones agreed with what has been said about additional information. She would like the opportunity to provide input on the items listed in the agenda packet.

Sue Horn asked members to think about what information staff could provide, and encouraged staff to provide the information as early as possible, so that members can ask for additional information if needed.

Jennifer Schaufele continues her presentation with specific TIP items and associated staff recommendations. The first item was overmatch.

Robin Kniech commented that Denver is one of the entities that has a practice of putting in overmatch. She stated there's an assumption that entities don't actually put in the full overmatch. She stated agreement with limiting entities to the federal minimum of 20 percent. She asked for information on jurisdictions who were awarded points for overmatch, how much did they actually put in? She further noted she feels two of the five items listed in the memo should be discussed at the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) level.

Jack Hilbert stated it is not his intent to have TAC involved at this time, rather to have the policy discussion first, and then involve the TAC at a later point. Robin Kniech stated that she thinks the TAC should be consulted on the project types and evaluation criteria. Jennifer Schaufele noted that some TAC involvement in the process is assumed. Staff will come back to the group with ways to reduce the number of project types and criteria, and provide information for making a recommendation. If additional technical review is needed, then the TAC could be consulted at that time. The purpose is to simplify the process so that policymakers have a firm understanding of how the policies are developed.

On the issue of overmatch, the consensus of the group is this is a good criterion to examine, additional information will be provided by staff before a final recommendation is made.

Jennifer Schaufele noted that DRCOG staff does not readily have information about overmatch put into projects; that is a CDOT contracting issue. If desired, staff can ask CDOT to provide the information.

The second item is funding pools for the new TIP. Staff recommends retaining funding pools. Pool projects compete on a level with similar projects using the same criteria. There are currently five pools, with approximately \$8 million per year split among the five. Suzanne Jones stated agreement with retaining funding pools. The conversation should be are they the right pools. Elise Jones expressed agreement, and noted she is in support of adding a pool for funding small infrastructure projects. Jackie Millet asked how funding levels are developed for the pools. Jennifer Schaufele replied that currently staff makes recommendations for pool funding levels based on many factors, including how many projects were submitted, and how much funding is available for those types of projects.

The consensus of the group is that pools are a good idea, and for staff to bring back additional information about pool funding levels and whether other pools should be established.

The third item relates to the number of project types and associated evaluation criteria. Staff recommends that a condensed list be formulated, and the intent is to bring additional information forward on how to make it simpler overall. Val Vigil stated this is an important decision to make. Rocky Piro stated agreement with simplification of the criteria. Elise Jones stated caution should be used when mixing the reduction of project types and reducing the number of criteria.

The consensus of the group is to move forward with staff providing additional information for this item.

The fourth item is related to adjusting minimum funding amounts for project sponsors to request. Staff recommends exploring reduction of the minimum amounts as well as the circumstances where they're applied. Dennis McCloskey noted that there have been some opportunities in the past for small projects to be funded. Rocky Piro asked if this is an issue of small projects, or allowing small communities to participate in the process. Jennifer replied that it's both. Jackie Millet stated that the definition of a small community should also be discussed. Jennifer Schaufele noted that perhaps this is an area where swapping of federal dollars for state dollars could come into play. Phil Cernanec noted that consideration should be given to demographics and other factors in other MPO areas when discussing what their processes are. Jack Hilbert agreed with establishing a pool for small infrastructure projects.

Consensus of the group is to move forward with this item and ask staff to provide additional information, including having a discussion with CDOT regarding swapping state and federal funds.

The last item is to decrease the emphasis assigned to predictive and non-measurable attributes. Examples include VMT and pollutant reductions. Staff

recommends that these non-measurable benefits be eliminated from the TIP, or changed to a yes/no answer, i.e., will it reduce VMT or not. Elise Jones noted that VMT and greenhouse gas emissions are some of the greatest challenges the metro area deals with, and are the things we should be measuring the most. She noted there are many methodologies for measuring these types of benefits, and those should be explored. She encouraged staff to come back with better ways to provide more accurate measurements. Jack Hilbert expressed understanding of Commissioner Jones' comment, but is not optimistic that such measurements can be established. He agreed with simplifying the language in the criteria. Nancy Sharpe agreed, if a measurement is established, there is no way of knowing whether it is realistic or valid.

The consensus of the group is for staff to bring back additional information on whether there are better, simpler ways to measure predictive results.

Cathy Noon noted that there have been numerous times over the past few years where the policy was disregarded in awarding funds to projects. She asked for information on how many times the policy was not used.

Elise Jones asked for a friendly amendment to the motion to include the comments made by members on the staff direction. The friendly amendment was accepted by the maker. The motion second had left the meeting; Sharon Richardson seconded, and accepted the friendly amendment.

Jennifer Schaufele noted that the input provided will be used to guide staff, but cautioned that every comment cannot be analyzed. She asked Pat Cronenberger to provide a recap of the member's requests. Sue Horn added that specific statistics should be provided where requested.

After discussion, the motion **passed unanimously**.

Other Matters

The Chair asked if there were any members running for re-election in November. She expressed thanks to those members and wished them luck in their elections.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for November 6, 2013.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

ATTACH B

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
303-480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
November 6, 2013	Consent	4

SUBJECT

This action concerns approval of 2013 Urban Center amendments to the Metro Vision 2035 Plan.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

DRCOG staff recommends the proposed amendments for modeling purposes.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The proposed urban center amendments are outlined in the summary (see attachment). Proposed amendments include new urban centers and major revisions to existing urban centers.

The [Metro Vision 2035 Growth and Development Supplement](#) outlines the process and criteria for evaluation of urban center proposals. Per the Board's process, an evaluation panel was formed and included representatives of the following: RTD, Wheat Ridge, Douglas County and Jefferson County. DRCOG staff concurred with the evaluation panel on all proposals.

DRCOG staff will base the land use modeling assumptions on the MVIC's urban centers recommendation for the Metro Vision Plan Assessment process.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors the proposed Urban Center amendments for modeling purposes.

ATTACHMENT

Cycle 2, 2013 Urban Centers Summary

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org or Brad Calvert, Senior Planner, at 303-480-6839 or bcalvert@drcog.org

METRO VISION PLAN AMENDMENTS – 2013 CYCLE 2 SUMMARY

URBAN CENTERS

The DRCOG Board adopted the updated [Metro Vision 2035 Growth and Development Supplement](#) in January 2012. The Supplement outlines the process and criteria for evaluating urban center proposals.

An evaluation panel comprised of member governments and regional planning partners reviews the proposed amendments and provides recommendations to DRCOG staff. DRCOG staff in turn provides the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) with both the evaluation panel recommendations and staff findings.

For proposed revisions to previously designated urban centers, jurisdictions consult with DRCOG staff to determine if policy-level review is warranted. If so, the proposed revisions are subject to the same review process as proposed new urban centers. Minor revisions are made administratively.

- In consultation with staff from the City and County of Broomfield two urban center revisions were deemed major revisions. Both were reviewed by the evaluation panel and DRCOG staff.

The table below summarizes the 2013 Cycle 2 urban center proposals, the evaluation panel's recommendations and DRCOG staff findings.

Summary: Cycle 2 2013 Urban Center Proposals			
Proposed Center	Jurisdiction	Recommended Evaluation Panel	Recommended DRCOG Staff
Urban Centers			
Downtown Littleton (New)	City of Littleton	Yes	Yes
Original Broomfield Urban Center Expansion (Revision)	City and County of Broomfield	Yes	Yes
1-25 / SH 7 Urban Centers Expansion (Revision)	City and County of Broomfield	Yes	Yes

Proposed Urban Center (New): Downtown Littleton

Sponsor: City of Littleton

Proposed Amendment: The proposed Littleton Downtown urban center is coterminous with what Littleton residents think of as Downtown and the boundaries of the Downtown Neighborhood Plan which include a northern boundary of West Belleview Avenue, western boundary of South Santa Fe Drive and Southern Boundary of Arapahoe Community College and an eastern boundary of the light rail and heavy rail tracks. The proposed urban center is approximately 45 acres. The existing and future housing and employment densities within the Littleton Downtown Urban Center are significantly higher than those in the surrounding areas consisting of a mixed use zone district which can allow up to 100 units to the acre. The existing Downtown Neighborhood Plan identifies pursuing an urban center

designation as a high priority. The area is serviced by the Southwest Light Rail line and includes the Downtown Littleton light rail station.

Urban Centers Evaluation Panel Finding: *Recommended*

DRCOG Staff Finding: *Recommended*

Review Comments Summary

- The proposed urban center and transit station location are regionally significant and have many existing attributes consistent with the vision for urban centers
- The city estimates a doubling of housing units in the future
- The area is already covered by a mixed use zone district allowing for higher densities
- Numerous activities consistent with Metro Vision have already occurred – e.g. renovation and repurposing of buildings, installation of pedestrian-scale lighting, incentives for restoration of historic structures, widening of sidewalks, and support for numerous public events, etc.

Proposed Expansion (Existing Center): Original Broomfield Urban Center

Sponsor: City and County of Broomfield

Proposed Amendment: The existing and proposed urban center expansion covers an area generally bounded by Main Street to the east, West 112th Avenue to the south, US 36 to the south and west and the West 120th Avenue – SH 128 corridor to the north. The proposed expansion area adds 430 acres to the existing urban center (37 acres). The additional land area is a mix of undeveloped land, light industrial, business/commercial, city park facilities, and railroad rights of way. The vision for the area is a mixed use district that will support a significant new regional transit hub in the vicinity of West 116th Avenue, while preserving land for light industrial uses and protecting the historic influences of Old Broomfield. The US 36 Express Land Project (BRT) is adjacent to the urban center. West 112th Ave, located in the proposed expansion area, will be realigned to connect with Uptown Avenue (west side of US 36) to create a more direct connection with Arista/Broomfield Urban Transit Village.

Urban Centers Evaluation Panel Finding: *Recommended*

DRCOG Staff Finding: *Recommended*

Review Comments Summary

- The evaluation panel expressed some concern over the projected housing densities outlined in the application, but noted the proposed expansion area has significant potential to become more mixed-use and multimodal in the future
- Existing land use diversity in the area is an asset
- Proposed expansion area may include more diverse, attainable housing options (including seniors) than other proximal areas
- Existing planning efforts identified areas to preserve/secure for enhanced local and regional trail connections

Proposed Expansion (Existing Center): I-25/SH 7 Urban Center

Sponsor: City and County of Broomfield

Proposed Amendment: The existing and proposed urban center expansion area is generally located to the north and west of the intersection of State Highway 7 and I-25. The expansion would increase the urban center from 268 acres to approximately 868 acres. The proposed expansion includes primarily undeveloped land, but much of the area is master planned with approved planned unit development (PUD) plans. A significant portion of Broomfield's future growth is expected to occur within the northern portion of Broomfield, including the area covered by the proposed expansion. All lands within the urban center are zoned for PUD. An estimated 50,000 employees will work within the revised urban center boundary.

Urban Centers Evaluation Panel Finding: Recommended

DRCOG Staff Finding: Recommended

Review Comments Summary

- The proposed urban center and transit station location are regionally significant and have many existing attributes consistent with the vision for urban centers
- A multi-jurisdictional approach (including the City of Thornton) may contribute to a more cohesive approach
- Approved planned unit development (PUD) plans are in place
- The area has many positive aspects and Broomfield should consider seeking revised designation in the future to include the area east of Sheridan

ATTACH C

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
303 480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
November 6, 2013	Action	5

SUBJECT

This item concerns air quality conformity modeling of four new projects selected by the Transportation Commission for RAMP (Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships) funds.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends including these projects in air quality conformity modeling as part of the 2013 Cycle 2 process to amend the 2035 Fiscally Constrained RTP.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

Historically, CDOT has accumulated all the funds needed to pay for a given project before starting construction. As a result, CDOT has several million dollars on hand for numerous preselected projects.

RAMP, CDOT's new approach to expending funds, captures these accumulated dollars to pay for RAMP projects selected by the Transportation Commission in October. Some of the RAMP projects include those for which CDOT has been accumulating funds; some projects are new.

The Transportation Commission selected four new projects in the DRCOG region which must be amended into the 2035 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (2035 FC-RTP) before they can access RAMP funds. Prior to amending them into the Plan, they must also be modeled for air quality conformity, a way to ensure they are consistent with EPA air quality goals.

These four projects (see Table 1) are consistent with the goals, policies, and action strategies in the RTP; staff assumes all projects modeled as part of the Cycle 2 air quality conformity process will be amended into the 2035 FC-RTP by the DRCOG Board of Directors.

NOTE: [Per adopted Board policy \(January 2009\)](#) the sponsors of the C-470 Toll Highway amendments are required to provide additional information as part of their application submittal. CDOT is also required to provide this information for the I-70 project (see links below).

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

April 3, 2013 MVIC
May 15, 2013 Board
June 5, 2013 MVIC

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors including RAMP projects in air quality conformity modeling for the 2013 Cycle 2 amendments to the 2035 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan.

ATTACHMENTS/LINKS

- Table 1: CDOT-Selected RAMP Projects Requiring Amendment into the DRCOG 2035 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (Cycle 2, 2013)
- Additional required tolling information for [I-70](#) and [C-470](#) FC-RTP amendments
- [C-470 Corridor Coalition Draft Revenue Memo](#) (October 29, 2013)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or jschuafele@drcog.org or Jacob Riger, Long Range Transportation Planning Coordinator at 303 480-6751 or jriger@drcog.org

**Table 1: CDOT-Selected RAMP Projects Requiring Amendment into the
DRCOG 2035 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (2013 Cycle 2)**

October 29, 2013

Project Name	County	Applicant	RTP Amendment Requested
Regionally Significant RAMP Projects <u>Not</u> in 2035 FC-RTP (Amendment Required)			
C-470 Corridor New Managed Tolled Express Lanes: • Eastbound: Platte Canyon Rd. to I-25 (1 new lane) • Westbound: I-25 to Wadsworth Blvd. (1 new lane)	Douglas/Jefferson	C-470 Corridor Coalition	Add to Fiscally Constrained Network
I-70 Eastbound Peak Period Shoulder Tolled Express Lane	Clear Creek	CDOT – Region 1	New/more defined Project
Highway 2: 72nd Ave. to I-76 (widening)	Adams	City of Commerce City	Add to Fiscally Constrained Network
US 6 and 19th Street New Interchange	Jefferson	City of Golden	Add to Fiscally Constrained Network

ATTACH D

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

From: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
303 480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
November 6, 2013	Action	6

SUBJECT

This item concerns air quality modeling of proposed 2013 Cycle 2 amendments.

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends including all proposed projects in air quality conformity modeling for the 2013 Cycle 2 amendments to the 2035 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (FC-RTP).

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

DRCOG amends the 2035 FC-RTP twice a year. We are starting the 2013 Cycle 2 amendment process now. Several requested amendments were received (see Table 1).

These projects are consistent with the goals, policies, and action strategies in the RTP; staff assumes all projects modeled as part of the Cycle 2 air quality conformity process will be amended into the 2035 FC-RTP by the DRCOG Board of Directors.

NOTE: [Per adopted Board policy \(January 2009\)](#) the sponsors of the C-470 Toll Highway amendments are required to provide additional information as part of their application submittal. CDOT is also required to provide this information for the I-70 project (see links below).

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors including all proposed projects shown in Table 1 in air quality conformity modeling for 2013 Cycle 2 amendments to the 2035 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan.

ATTACHMENTS

- Table 1: DRCOG 2013 Cycle 2 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan Amendments (Non-RAMP)
- Additional required tolling information for [I-70](#) and [C-470](#) FC-RTP amendments
- [C-470 Corridor Coalition Draft Revenue Memo](#) (October 29, 2013)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org or Jacob Riger, Long Range Transportation Planning Coordinator at 303-480-6751 or jriger@drcog.org

Table 1: DRCOG 2013 Cycle 2 Fiscally Constrained (FC)-RTP Amendments (Non-RAMP)

Last Revised: October 29, 2013

Agency	Project Description	Amend. Source	Current FC-RTP Status	Cycle 2 Amendment
CDOT/C-470 Coalition (Non-RAMP)	C-470: new managed toll express lanes: • Eastbound: Kipling Pkwy. to Platte Canyon Rd. (1 new lane) • Westbound: Wadsworth Blvd. to Kipling Pkwy. (1 new lane)	Toll/Local	Not in	Add to FC network (<2025), locally funded
	C-470: additional managed toll express lanes: • Eastbound: Broadway to I-25 (1 additional lane) • Westbound: I-25 to Lucent Blvd. (1 additional lane)	Toll/Local	Not in	Add to FC network (<2035), locally funded
RTD	North Metro Rail Line (extension from 72nd Ave. to _____?)	RTD Request	Not in	TBD
	I-225 LRT: Move location of Montview (Fitzsimons) Station	RTD Request	In	Move Station to new site
Brighton	Bridge St./I-76 new interchange	Local Request	Not in	Add to FC network, 100% local funding
Centennial	Arapahoe Rd. remove interchanges at Havana St. and Revere St.	Local Request	In	Remove from FC network
Broomfield	120th Ave.: Allison St. to Emerald St. new road	Staff Review	In	Change completion to the 2015 to 2024 staging period. Will not be completed prior to 2015.
Denver	Central Park Blvd: 47th Ave. to 56th Ave. new road	Staff Review	In	
	Broadway: Exposition Ave. to Mississippi Ave. widening and I-25 interchange	Staff Review	In	
	MLK Blvd.: Havana St./Iola St. to Peoria St. new road	Staff Review	In	
	56th Ave.: Havana St. to Pena Blvd. widening	Staff Review	In	
Parker	Chambers Rd: Stroh Rd. to Hess Rd. new road	Staff Review	In	
	Stroh Rd.: Chambers Rd. to Crowfoot Valley Rd. new road	Staff Review	In	

ATTACHE

To: Chair and Members of the Metro Vision Issues Committee

From: Steve Cook, Acting Director, Transportation Planning and Operations
303-480-6749 or scook@drcog.org

Through: Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director
303-480-6701 or jschaufele@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
November 6, 2013	Action	7

SUBJECT

Developing the next TIP (*Transportation Improvement Program*).

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommend for the Board's consideration more simple, straightforward policies and procedures for selecting projects in the upcoming 2016-2021 TIP.

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

At the October meeting, MVIC agreed on the following recommendations to the Board: MVIC is the appropriate group to analyze and advise the Board on TIP policies and project selection improvements; and, MVIC has the discretion to refer technical questions to the TAC (Transportation Advisory Committee).

Also during the October meeting, MVIC requested additional background information about the current TIP in six topic areas. Today's discussion will focus on these topic areas and staff recommendations to make project selection more straightforward and reduce both member and DRCOG costs. Some items will not be finalized today as they are related to other recommendations MVIC will make in the coming months.

Background information regarding the current TIP:

- There were 12 distinct project types. There were over 80 unique evaluation criteria used for scoring projects. Project scores were used as the basis for allocating 75 percent of funds. In addition to the project score, the Board considered other factors, e.g., past county-level funding equity and very small community designation to allocate the remaining 25 percent of funds.
- Seventy-eight projects of 95 eligible applications were selected for funding (see Table 1 and Table 2, sorted by sponsor and project type respectively).

MVIC requested additional information about the following six topic areas.

1. Identify current "Pools" and set-aside programs

Pools are essentially TIP funds set-aside "off-the-top." They were established with set funding levels and were created to manage specialized projects.

Pool projects are selected every 2 years. In the current TIP, the pools and funding are:

- TDM (Travel Demand Management) Pool (\$1.2 mil./yr.)

- Station Area Master Plan (STAMP) / Urban Center Study Pool (\$1 mil./yr.)
- ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems) Pool (\$0.8 mil./yr.)
- Traffic Signal System Improvement Program (\$3.7 mil./yr.)
- DRCOG Way to Go Program (set aside) (\$1.8 mil./yr.)

In the current TIP, the process calls for projects within each pool to be scored and recommended by subject matter experts; ultimately, they must be approved by the DRCOG Board.

Staff recommendation: Pools inherently simplify the TIP and have proved successful in selecting unique types of smaller projects on a more frequent basis than the 4-year TIP. Staff recommends retaining the current pools and set-asides with discussion on funding levels to be held after overall TIP revenue estimates are available.

2. Number of “project types” designated for the TIP

Table 3 identifies the 12 project types used in the current TIP. For simplification, some project types could be combined.

Staff recommendations:

1. Combine all bicycle/pedestrian project types into one project type, including smaller multimodal last-mile/final-mile type projects.
2. Combine studies into one project type.

3. Project evaluation criteria

Table 3 lists the individual criteria used for scoring projects, based on a 100-point system. In the current TIP, criteria fall into two categories: those that are process/technical oriented and those that are policy oriented.

- Process/Technical Oriented
 - Objective Measurement of Condition, *e.g., traffic count or # of crashes*
 - Predicted Benefits that are reliable, *e.g., DRCOG model results*
 - Predicted Benefits that are unreliable, *e.g., economic benefit of streetscape improvements*
- Policy/ Oriented
 - Yes/No Project Traits—easy to define, *e.g., signed the Mile High Compact*
 - Other Project Traits—require some judgment, *e.g., supports Urban Center*
- Predictions of benefits in the application are not the same as measurements of results after the project is completed.
- All projects were assigned points for “environmental justice” (0-3 points) and level of “overmatch” funding (0-9 points).
- All projects were assigned points for Metro Vision implementation (0-26 points) either associated with the project itself or based on other actions taken by the local government.

For detailed descriptions of each criterion, see pages 22-53 of the [current TIP Policy Document](#).

Staff recommendations:

1. Eliminate rigorously quantified benefit predictions for criteria identified as unreliable in Table 3.
2. Eliminate scoring of the following project types: Other Enhancements, Air Quality Improvements, and Studies. It is extremely difficult to calculate meaningful criteria-based scores for these project types; they can be considered in some other fashion and will be discussed by MVIC in a future meeting.

4. Overmatch criteria

Overmatch occurs when sponsors provide more than the minimum federally-required amount of matching funds. For example, a project with a construction value of \$1 million requires \$200,000 of local match (20 percent). If a sponsor offers match of \$300,000 and requests just \$700,000 federal, that equates to \$100,000 (10 percent) overmatch.

In the current TIP:

- A maximum of 9 points were awarded for projects promising overmatch.
- Half the projects selected included overmatch.
- 17 of the 28 jurisdictions awarded funding promised overmatch.
- The total amount of overmatch funds promised was ~\$40 million. This was much higher than previous TIPs, primarily because of the \$19 million promised by the City and County of Denver for the Peoria/Smith grade separation project.

It is hard to determine how much, or even if, overmatch frees-up federal funds because some sponsors provide overmatch to improve their attractiveness for selection. In other words, a sponsor may overestimate the project cost in their application, promises overmatch but does not provide as much overmatch since the actual project cost is lower than what was described in the application. Also, overmatch is a barrier for communities with small operating budgets who struggle to provide the requisite match, let alone overmatch. Most important, CDOT no longer tracks overmatch so DRCOG cannot confirm how much overmatch local sponsors provide versus what they promise to provide.

Another criterion in the current TIP, cost-effectiveness, can act as a surrogate for overmatch. Without going into the math details, this criterion could be modified to focus on the amount of federal funds **requested**, rather than the total estimated cost of the project, and would give sponsors more points for a lower federal funds request. With this change, there would be no need to track overmatch.

Staff recommendations:

- 1) Eliminate overmatch as a point-based evaluation criteria.
- 2) To offset elimination of the overmatch criterion, establish cost-effectiveness criteria based on amount of federal funds requested.

5. Defining “very small” communities

In the current TIP, sponsors designated as “very small” communities (population less than 12,500 and employment less than 12,500) receive special consideration during what’s known as the second phase project selection process.

Staff evaluated the MVIC suggestion to consider local revenues for designating “very small” communities. One revenue-based possibility would be use of the Colorado Department of Revenue “Net Sales Tax.” For example, in the “2012 Net Sales Tax” the values range from \$9,000 to \$350 million. A significant gap occurs at the \$10 million level; that could be the threshold value used for very small community designation. Table 4 shows 28 communities would be designated as “very small” in this scenario, with two communities being added to the “very small” category and two others being removed from “very small” category.

Staff recommendation: Using the most recent Colorado Department of Revenue net sales tax value available at the time TIP project applications are submitted, designate “very small” communities as those with < \$10,000,000 annual net sales tax.

6. Minimum funding amount required for construction projects

The current TIP requires a minimum request of \$200,000 for “very small” communities and \$300,000 for all other sponsors so many worthwhile projects aren’t submitted for TIP funding.

In addition, federalized construction projects cost more than those funded with local or state funds due to numerous rigorous federal requirements and while it may be counter-intuitive, smaller projects require a high proportional amount of administrative oversight. In addition, non-federal funds don’t require match.

To address these issues, staff is exploring the possibility of a federal-for-state dollar funding swap with CDOT which would also allow a lowering of the minimum amount for TIP requests.

Staff recommendation: Continue investigating further and develop a recommendation for a future MVIC meeting.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

2013 DRCOG Board Workshop

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to recommend to the DRCOG Board of Directors improvements to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as agreed to during the meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- Table 1—Sponsor Sorted - DRCOG Selected Projects in the 2012-2017 TIP
- Table 2—Project Type Sorted – DRCOG Selected Projects in the 2012-2017 TIP
- Table 3—Project Types and Criteria in the 2012-2017 TIP
- Table 4—2012 Net Sales Tax and Very Small Communities (VSC)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or jschuafele@drcoq.org or Steve Cook, Acting Director, Transportation Planning & Operations at 303-480-6749 or scook@drcoq.org

Table 1 - Sponsor Sorted - DRCOG Selected Projects in the 2012-2017 TIP				
\$ 1,000s				
Sponsor	Project Title	TIP-ID	Project Type	FY 12 - 15 Total Federal \$
Adams County	Clay Community Trail: Zuni Street to 60th Avenue	2012-005	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,054
Adams County	NW Rail South Westminster Ped Bridge	2012-083	Bike/Ped - New	\$500
Adams County	NM Rail: Welby Rd Extension	2012-084	Capacity	\$984
Arapahoe County	I-25 & Arapahoe Rd. Interchange Reconstruction - Design	2012-043	Studies - Cap/Ops	\$4,200
Arapahoe County	Arapahoe Rd/Yosemite St. Intersection Operational Improvement	2012-087	Operational	\$3,000
Arvada	Kipling Pkwy Underpass: Van Bibber Trail Ext 56th Place to Grandview Ave	2012-045	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,600
Arvada	Ridge Road Bike/Ped Project	2012-052	Bike/Ped - New	\$800
Arvada	W. 57th Ave. Bike/Ped Project	2012-092	Bike/Ped - Up/Recon	\$546
Aurora	Tollgate Creek/Tollgate Elementary School Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and Trail	2012-004	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,214
Aurora	Peoria-Smith Commuter Rail Station Bike/Pedestrian Access Improvements	2012-050	Bike/Ped - New	\$397
Aurora	Nine Mile Station; Bike/Ped Access Improvements	2012-071	BikePed-Up/Recon	\$476
Aurora	Colfax Ave. Bike/Ped Improvements; Fitzsimons Pkwy to Peoria St.	2012-091	Bike/Ped - Up/Recon	\$485
Aurora	Parker Road/Quincy Ave. Intersection Operational Study	2012-093	Studies-Cap/Ops	\$239
Boulder	Wonderland Creek Underpass at 28th St.: Kalmia Ave. to Winding Trail	2012-053	Bike/Ped-New	\$900
Boulder	Pearl Parkway Multi-Use Path: 30th Street to Foothills Pkwy/SH157	2012-001	Bike/Ped - New	\$4,000
Boulder	Wonderland Underpass & Multiuse Path: Foothills Pkwy to 30th St	2012-002	Bike/Ped - New	\$2,000
Boulder	Diagonal Hwy (SH 119) Reconstruction: 28th/US 36 to East of 30th St	2012-039	Reconstruction	\$2,800
Boulder	Foothills Parkway/SH 157 Operational Improv. - Diagonal Hwy to Valmont	2012-040	Operational	\$600
Boulder	Baseline Rd Bike/Ped Underpass: Broadway/SH 93 to 28th/US 36	2012-046	Bike/Ped - New	\$4,046
Boulder	28th St/US36 Multiuse Path/Bike Improv: Iris Ave to Yarmouth Ave	2012-055	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,224
Boulder County	BOLT Transit Service Enhancement: Longmont to Boulder	2012-016	Expanded Bus Service	\$555
Boulder County	Enhanced Bus Service: Boulder, Longmont, and Lyons	2012-017	Expanded Bus Service	\$414
Boulder County	US 36 Final Mile Study: Boulder to Westminster	2012-029	Studies - Station	\$85
Boulder County	SH-119/Airport Road Underpass	2012-058	Bike/Ped-New	\$915
Broomfield	120th Avenue Connection, final phase: new SH 128 to 120th Ave	2007-029	Capacity	\$20,800
CDOT	North I-25 Interim Managed Lanes; US36-120th Ave.	2012-073	Capacity	\$5,000
CDOT Region 1	I-25: 20th St to Speer Blvd Operational Improvements	2007-040	Operational	\$2,711
CDOT Region 4	Trucks and Anti-Ice Trailers (US-36, I-25, SH-119)	2012-076	Air Quality	\$400
CDOT/HPTE	US 36: Boulder to I-25 Managed Lanes (Phase 1 & 2)	2008-114	Capacity	\$34,000
Centennial	Smoky Hill Rd./Himalaya St. Intersection Operational Improvement	2012-090	Operational	\$475
Commerce City	72nd Ave South Station Area Master Plan : E. 72nd Ave and Colorado Blvd.	2012-028	Studies - Station	\$100
Commerce City	Commerce City Northern Range to Denver CBD	2012-088	New Bus Service	\$444
Denver	Confluence Bike-Ped Ramps: So Platte Greenway	2012-003	Bike/Ped - Up/Recon	\$2,765
Denver	Denver Traffic Signal System Upgrade: Citywide	2012-011	Air Quality	\$4,800
Denver	Speer / Colfax / Auraria Next Steps Plan	2012-020	Studies - Station	\$80
Denver	Northeast Downtown Next Steps Plan	2012-022	Studies - Station	\$150
Denver	Golden Triangle Area Plan	2012-023	Studies - Station	\$150
Denver	So Broadway Reconstruction: Kentucky Ave to south of Tennessee	2012-035	Reconstruction	\$2,692
Denver	Peoria St / Smith Rd / RR Grade Separation	2012-044	Operational	\$25,000
Denver	Blake Street Bike-Ped Station Access (40th Ave to 38th/Blake Station)	2012-056	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,224
Denver	NM Rail: Stockshow Station trails	2012-082	Bike/Ped-New	\$1,639
Douglas County	C-470/Lucent Station Area Master Plan	2012-026	Studies - Station	\$90
Douglas County	Quebec/C-470 Ped/Bike Bridge: County Line Rd. to Park Meadows Dr.	2012-059	Bike/Ped-New	\$500
Douglas County	I-25: Ridgeway to County Line Road Lane Balancing and Widening	2012-096	Capacity	\$10,400
DRCOG	Transportation Model Network Enhancements Study	2012-095	Studies-DRCOG	\$100
Englewood	Englewood, Oxford, and Bates Station Area Master Plan	2012-027	Studies - Station	\$120
Federal Heights	Adams County West Side Park and Ride	2012-019	New Bus Service	\$496
Federal Heights	US 287 (Federal)/92nd Avenue Intersection Operations Improvements	2012-072	Operational	\$3,970
Golden	West Corridor End of Line Bike/Pedestrian Overpass	2012-008	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,220
Golden	Golden Circulator Bus: West Corridor end of line to Golden Downtown	2012-015	New Bus Service	\$1,237
Greenwood Village	Greenwood Plaza Blvd Sidewalk: Berry Ave. to Dorado Pl., Marin Dr. to Long Ave.	2012-006	Bike/Ped - New	\$871
Greenwood Village	Bellevue Ave and Quebec St Intersection	2012-038	Operational	\$1,053
Greenwood Village	Village Center & Goldsmith Gulch Trail Extension: Fair Drive to Yosemite Street	2012-047	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,536
Lakewood	Lakewood City Center Connectivity and Urban Design Study	2012-025	Studies - Station	\$100
Lakewood	Wadsworth Roadway Capacity Project: Highland Drive to 10th Ave	2012-089	Capacity	\$5,400
Lakewood	Wadsworth Roadway Capacity Project: 10th Ave to 14th Ave	2012-036	Capacity	\$6,240
Longmont	Dry Creek Underpass: Hover south of Bent Way	2012-049	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,616
Longmont	SH119 - Diagonal Highway: South of Hover Underpass	2012-051	Bike/Ped - New	\$965
Longmont	Main St/US287: Ken Pratt Blvd to 3rd Ave Reconstruct	2012-057	Reconstruction	\$1,890
Louisville	Downtown Louisville NW Rail Station- Next Steps	2012-030	Studies - Station	\$80
Lyons	US 36 - Lyons Streetscape Beautification: Stone Canyon Rd. to 3rd Ave	2012-009	Other Enhancements	\$1,781
Nederland	Nederland Sidewalks Phase 2	2012-061	Bike/Ped - New	\$486
RAQC	Advanced Fleet Technology	2012-012	Air Quality	\$6,121
RAQC	Air Quality and Transp. Outreach & Education through Ozone Aware	2012-013	Air Quality	\$1,663
RTD	Bellevue call-n-Ride	2012-014	New Bus Service	\$827
RTD	Eagle P-3 FasTracks Corridors (Gold/East) - previous 2nd Commitment for East	2008-111	Rapid Transit	\$24,111
Sheridan	West Oxford Ave.: S. Clay St. to S. Federal Blvd. Reconstruct	2012-060	Reconstruction	\$600
Thornton	Thornton City Center Urban Center Study	2012-024	Studies - Station	\$120
Thornton	104th Ave. Station TOD Master Planning Study	2012-031	Studies - Station	\$120
Thornton	88th Ave. Station TOD Master Planning Study	2012-032	Studies - Station	\$120
Thornton	144th Ave. Station TOD Master Planning Study	2012-033	Studies - Station	\$120
Thornton	NM Rail: Ped/Bike Access to 4 Stations	2012-081	Rapid Transit	\$1,539
Thornton	NM Rail: Welby Rd Realignment	2012-085	Operational	\$930
Univ of Colorado	STAMPEDE Bus Service Enhancements	2012-018	Expanded Bus Service	\$426
Westminster	120th Ave/Federal Blvd Operational Improvements	2012-041	Operational	\$3,421
Westminster	Little Dry Creek Trail: Federal Blvd. to Lowell Blvd.	2012-048	Bike/Ped - New	\$324
Wheat Ridge	32nd Avenue Widening: Wright Court to Braun Court Operational Improvement	2012-042	Operational	\$2,924
Wheat Ridge	Kipling Multi-Use Path: 32nd Avenue to 44th Avenue	2012-054	Bike/Ped - New	\$2,473
Wheat Ridge	Wadsworth Widening PEL Study: 35th Ave. to 46th Ave.	2012-094	Studies-Cap/Ops	\$636
TOTAL				\$222,090

Other Set-Asides and Pools				
DRCOG	Traffic Signal System Program	1997-045	Operational	\$16,647
DRCOG	Regional TDM Pool (30+ projects)	1999-097	TDM	\$5,925
DRCOG	Regional ITS Pool (4 projects with 12/13 funds)	2005-026	Operational	\$3,751
DRCOG / RTD	First FasTracks Commitment to RTD	2007-044	Transit Operational	\$24,000
DRCOG	STAMP/Urban Center Pool (12 projects)	2007-089	Studies - Station	\$1,985
DRCOG	Regional TDM Program: DRCOG (Way To Go)	2012-064	TDM	\$7,200
TOTAL				\$59,508

Table 2 - Project Type Sorted - DRCOG Selected Projects in the 2012-2017 TIP				
\$ 1,000s				
Sponsor	Project Title	TIP-ID	(sorting) Project Type	FY 12 - 15 Total Federal \$
CDOT Region 4	Trucks and Anti-Ice Trailers (US-36, I-25, SH-119)	2012-076	Air Quality	\$400
Denver	Denver Traffic Signal System Upgrade: Citywide	2012-011	Air Quality	\$4,800
RAQC	Advanced Fleet Technology	2012-012	Air Quality	\$6,121
RAQC	Air Quality and Transp. Outreach & Education through Ozone Aware	2012-013	Air Quality	\$1,663
Adams County	Clay Community Trail: Zuni Street to 60th Avenue	2012-005	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,054
Adams County	NW Rail South Westminster Ped Bridge	2012-083	Bike/Ped - New	\$500
Arvada	Kipling Pkwy Underpass: Van Bibber Trail Ext 56th Place to Grandview Ave	2012-045	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,600
Arvada	Ridge Road Bike/Ped Project	2012-052	Bike/Ped - New	\$800
Aurora	Tollgate Creek/Tollgate Elementary School Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge and Trail	2012-004	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,214
Aurora	Peoria-Smith Commuter Rail Station Bike/Pedestrian Access Improvements	2012-050	Bike/Ped - New	\$397
Boulder	Wonderland Creek Underpass at 28th St.: Kalmia Ave. to Winding Trail	2012-053	Bike/Ped - New	\$900
Boulder	Pearl Parkway Multi-Use Path: 30th Street to Foothills Pkwy/SH157	2012-001	Bike/Ped - New	\$4,000
Boulder	Wonderland Underpass & Multiuse Path: Foothills Pkwy to 30th St	2012-002	Bike/Ped - New	\$2,000
Boulder	Baseline Rd Bike/Ped Underpass: Broadway/SH 93 to 28th/US 36	2012-046	Bike/Ped - New	\$4,046
Boulder	28th St/US36 Multiuse Path/Bike Improv: Iris Ave to Yarmouth Ave	2012-055	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,224
Boulder County	SH-119/Airport Road Underpass	2012-058	Bike/Ped - New	\$915
Denver	Blake Street Bike-Ped Station Access (40th Ave to 38th/Blake Station)	2012-056	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,224
Denver	NM Rail: Stockshow Station trails	2012-082	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,639
Douglas County	Quebec/C-470 Ped/Bike Bridge: County Line Rd. to Park Meadows Dr.	2012-059	Bike/Ped - New	\$500
Golden	West Corridor End of Line Bike/Pedestrian Overpass	2012-008	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,220
Greenwood Village	Greenwood Plaza Blvd Sidewalk: Berry Ave. to Dorado Pl., Marin Dr. to Long Ave.	2012-006	Bike/Ped - New	\$871
Greenwood Village	Village Center & Goldsmith Gulch Trail Extension: Fair Drive to Yosemite Street	2012-047	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,536
Longmont	Dry Creek Underpass: Hover south of Bent Way	2012-049	Bike/Ped - New	\$1,616
Longmont	SH119 - Diagonal Highway: South of Hover Underpass	2012-051	Bike/Ped - New	\$965
Nederland	Nederland Sidewalks Phase 2	2012-061	Bike/Ped - New	\$486
Westminster	Little Dry Creek Trail: Federal Blvd. to Lowell Blvd.	2012-048	Bike/Ped - New	\$324
Wheat Ridge	Kipling Multi-Use Path: 32nd Avenue to 44th Avenue	2012-054	Bike/Ped - New	\$2,473
Arvada	W. 57th Ave. Bike/Ped Project	2012-092	Bike/Ped - Up/Recon	\$546
Aurora	Colfax Ave. Bike/Ped Improvements; Fitzsimons Pkwy to Peoria St.	2012-091	Bike/Ped - Up/Recon	\$485
Aurora	Nine Mile Station; Bike/Ped Access Improvements	2012-071	Bike/Ped - Up/Recon	\$476
Denver	Confluence Bike-Ped Ramps: So Platte Greenway	2012-003	Bike/Ped - Up/Recon	\$2,765
Adams County	NM Rail: Welby Rd Extension	2012-084	Capacity	\$984
Broomfield	120th Avenue Connection, final phase: new SH 128 to 120th Ave	2007-029	Capacity	\$20,800
CDOT	North I-25 Interim Managed Lanes; US36-120th Ave.	2012-073	Capacity	\$5,000
CDOT/HPTE	US 36: Boulder to I-25 Managed Lanes (Phase 1 & 2)	2008-114	Capacity	\$34,000
Douglas County	I-25: Ridgeway to County Line Road Lane Balancing and Widening	2012-096	Capacity	\$10,400
Lakewood	Wadsworth Roadway Capacity Project: Highland Drive to 10th Ave	2012-089	Capacity	\$5,400
Lakewood	Wadsworth Roadway Capacity Project: 10th Ave to 14th Ave	2012-036	Capacity	\$6,240
Boulder County	BOLT Transit Service Enhancement: Longmont to Boulder	2012-016	Expanded Bus Service	\$555
Boulder County	Enhanced Bus Service: Boulder, Longmont, and Lyons	2012-017	Expanded Bus Service	\$414
Univ of Colorado	STAMPEDE Bus Service Enhancements	2012-018	Expanded Bus Service	\$426
Commerce City	Commerce City Northern Range to Denver CBD	2012-088	New Bus Service	\$444
Federal Heights	Adams County West Side Park and Ride	2012-019	New Bus Service	\$496
Golden	Golden Circulator Bus: West Corridor end of line to Golden Downtown	2012-015	New Bus Service	\$1,237
RTD	Bellevue call-n-Ride	2012-014	New Bus Service	\$827
Arapahoe County	Arapahoe Rd/Yosemite St. Intersection Operational Improvement	2012-087	Operational	\$3,000
Boulder	Foothills Parkway/SH 157 Operational Improv. - Diagonal Hwy to Valmont	2012-040	Operational	\$600
CDOT Region 1	I-25: 20th St to Speer Blvd Operational Improvements	2007-040	Operational	\$2,711
Centennial	Smoky Hill Rd./Himalaya St. Intersection Operational Improvement	2012-090	Operational	\$475
Denver	Peoria St / Smith Rd / RR Grade Separation	2012-044	Operational	\$25,000
Federal Heights	US 287 (Federal)/92nd Avenue Intersection Operations Improvements	2012-072	Operational	\$3,970
Greenwood Village	Bellevue Ave and Quebec St Intersection	2012-038	Operational	\$1,053
Thornton	NM Rail: Welby Rd Realignment	2012-085	Operational	\$930
Westminster	120th Ave/Federal Blvd Operational Improvements	2012-041	Operational	\$3,421
Wheat Ridge	32nd Avenue Widening: Wright Court to Braun Court Operational Improvement	2012-042	Operational	\$2,924
Lyons	US 36 - Lyons Streetscape Beautification: Stone Canyon Rd. to 3rd Ave	2012-009	Other Enhancements	\$1,781
RTD	Eagle P-3 FasTracks Corridors (Gold/East) - previous 2nd Commitment for East	2008-111	Rapid Transit	\$24,111
Thornton	NM Rail: Ped/Bike Access to 4 Stations	2012-081	Rapid Transit	\$1,539
Boulder	Diagonal Hwy (SH 119) Reconstruction: 28th/US 36 to East of 30th St	2012-039	Reconstruction	\$2,800
Denver	So Broadway Reconstruction: Kentucky Ave to south of Tennessee	2012-035	Reconstruction	\$2,692
Longmont	Main St/US287: Ken Pratt Blvd to 3rd Ave Reconstruct	2012-057	Reconstruction	\$1,890
Sheridan	West Oxford Ave.: S. Clay St. to S. Federal Blvd. Reconstruct	2012-060	Reconstruction	\$600
Arapahoe County	I-25 & Arapahoe Rd. Interchange Reconstruction - Design	2012-043	Studies - Cap/Ops	\$4,200
Aurora	Parker Road/Quincy Ave. Intersection Operational Study	2012-093	Studies - Cap/Ops	\$239
Wheat Ridge	Wadsworth Widening PEL Study: 35th Ave. to 46th Ave.	2012-094	Studies - Cap/Ops	\$636
Boulder County	US 36 Final Mile Study: Boulder to Westminster	2012-029	Studies - Station	\$85
Commerce City	72nd Ave South Station Area Master Plan : E. 72nd Ave and Colorado Blvd.	2012-028	Studies - Station	\$100
Denver	Speer / Colfax / Auraria Next Steps Plan	2012-020	Studies - Station	\$80
Denver	Northeast Downtown Next Steps Plan	2012-022	Studies - Station	\$150
Denver	Golden Triangle Area Plan	2012-023	Studies - Station	\$150
Douglas County	C-470/Lucent Station Area Master Plan	2012-026	Studies - Station	\$90
Englewood	Englewood, Oxford, and Bates Station Area Master Plan	2012-027	Studies - Station	\$120
Lakewood	Lakewood City Center Connectivity and Urban Design Study	2012-025	Studies - Station	\$100
Louisville	Downtown Louisville NW Rail Station- Next Steps	2012-030	Studies - Station	\$80
Thornton	Thornton City Center Urban Center Study	2012-024	Studies - Station	\$120
Thornton	104th Ave. Station TOD Master Planning Study	2012-031	Studies - Station	\$120
Thornton	88th Ave. Station TOD Master Planning Study	2012-032	Studies - Station	\$120
Thornton	144th Ave. Station TOD Master Planning Study	2012-033	Studies - Station	\$120
DRCOG	Transportation Model Network Enhancements Study	2012-095	Studies-DRCOG	\$100
TOTAL				\$222,090

Other Set-Asides and Pools				
DRCOG	Traffic Signal System Program	1997-045	Operational	\$16,647
DRCOG	Regional TDM Pool (30+ projects)	1999-097	TDM	\$5,925
DRCOG	Regional ITS Pool (4 projects with 12/13 funds)	2005-026	Operational	\$3,751
DRCOG / RTD	First FasTracks Commitment to RTD	2007-044	Transit Operational	\$24,000
DRCOG	STAMP/Urban Center Pool (12 projects)	2007-089	Studies - Station	\$1,985
DRCOG	Regional TDM Program: DRCOG (Way To Go)	2012-064	TDM	\$7,200
TOTAL				\$59,508

Table 3 - Project Types and Criteria in the 2012-2017 TIP								
			Type / Quality of Criteria					Notes, Suggestions for new TIP
Project Type	Specific Criteria	Max Pts	Objective Measure of Condition	Yes/No Project Traits (easy)	Other Project Traits (some judgment)	Predicted Benefit - "Reliable"	Predicted Benefit - "Unreliable"	
Roadway Capacity <i>(funded 6 of 6 eligible projects)</i>	Current congestion	10	x					
	Crash reduction - crashes reduced	5	x			x		
	Crash reduction - Current weighted crash rate							
	Cost-effectiveness (e.g., cost per PMT)	10	x			x		Surrogate for overmatch
	Condition of major structure (e.g., bridges)	5	x					
	Long range plan (2035 RTP) score / rank	12			x			
	Transportation system management (e.g., access, ITS, medians)	5		x				
Roadway Operations <i>(funded 8 of 13 projects)</i>	Multimodal connectivity (13 items , e.g., bus pads, bike lanes, ped connections, sidewalks)	15		x				
	Current congestion	12	x					
	Crash reduction - crashes reduced	5	x			x		
	Crash reduction - Current weighted crash rate							
	Delay reduction	12				x		
	Cost-effectiveness (e.g., cost per PMT)	10				x		
	2035 MVRTP emphasis corridors	3		x				
Roadway Reconstruction <i>(funded 4 of 4 projects)</i>	Transportation system management (e.g., access, ITS, medians)	5		x				
	Multimodal connectivity (13 items , e.g., bus pads, bike lanes, ped connections, sidewalks)	15		x				
	Pavement condition	20	x					
	Crash reduction - crashes reduced	5	x			x		
	Crash reduction - weighted crash rate/crash range							
	Cost-effectiveness (e.g., cost per PMT)	10				x		
	Usage (e.g., AWDT/lane)	7	x					
	Transportation system management (e.g., access, ITS, medians)	5		x				
	Multimodal connectivity (13 items , e.g., bus pads, bike lanes, ped connections, sidewalks)	15		x				
Rapid Transit	Only RTD is eligible; must be a fixed guideway project. Projects not scored							
Transit Passenger Facilities	Predicted Usage (i.e., persons served)	30					X	No rigorous calculation - new method
	Air quality benefits (e.g., daily pounds reduce)	8					X	No rigorous calculation - new method
	Multimodal connectivity (# of modes served)	24		x				
Bus Service (New or Expanded) <i>(funded 7 of 10 projects)</i>	Usage (e.g., projected daily boardings)	13					X	No rigorous calculation - new method
	Cost-effectiveness (subsidy per passenger)	13					X	Surrogate for overmatch; new method
	Long term funding	15			x			
	Connectivity	8		x				
	Air quality benefits (daily pounds reduced)	13					X	No rigorous calculation - new method
	RTP priority corridors (e.g., project location)	5			x			
New Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility <i>(funded 24 of 26 projects)</i>	Safety - relevant recent crashes	10	x					
	Safety - conflicts (speed limit)			x				
	Safety - lighting			x				
	Connectivity - gap closure	19			x			
	Connectivity - access				x			
	Connectivity - barrier elimination				x			
	Connectivity - transit				x			
	Connectivity - location			x				
	Multiple enhancements (width, bike spaces)	4			x			
	Air quality (daily pounds reduced)	8					X	No rigorous calculation - new method
Upgrade or Reconstruct Existing Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility <i>(funded 6 of 9 projects)</i>	User base (i.e. modeled trip ends)	8	x			x		
	Cost-effectiveness (e.g., cost per PMT)	8					X	
	RTP priority corridors (e.g., project location)	5			x			Combine Bicycle/Pedestian into one Project Type: "Bike/Ped/Multimodal"
	Safety - relevant recent crashes	14	x					
	Safety - design standards (ADA/AASHTO)			x				
	Safety - lighting			x				
	Connectivity - access	15			x			
	Connectivity - barrier elimination			x				
	Connectivity - transit				x			
	Connectivity - location				x			
	Multiple enhancements (amenities, bike spaces)	4		x				
	Existing users	8	x					
	User base (i.e. modeled trip ends)	8	x			x		
	Cost-effectiveness (e.g., cost per PMT)	8	x				X	Surrogate for overmatch; new method
Other Enhancements <i>(funded 1 of 3 projects)</i>	Historic Preservation - part of larger effort, positively affects trans system	30			x			Do not do quantified score
	Aesthetics/Scenic - scenic hwy system, removes blight, enhances visual environ				x			
	Water Mitigation - clean water plan, and improves water quality				x			
	Reduce Wildlife Mortality - type of roadway remedy	32		x				eliminate
	Cost-effectiveness (economic benefit)						X	
Air Quality Improvements <i>(funded 4 of 5 projects)</i>	Project type (e.g., retrofits, street sweepers, CNG)	4		x				Do not do quantified score Consider defining "set-aside" \$
	GHG reduction	6					X	
	Other air pollution reduction (e.g., indirectly by VHT or VMT, or directly by specific air pollutant)	26					X	
	Cost-effectiveness (e.g.,cost per pound of reduction)	26					X	
Roadway/Transit Studies <i>(funded 4 of 5 projects)</i>	Current Congestion	20	x					Do not do quantified score:
	Usage (e.g., AWDT/lane)	16	x			x		
	Other critical criteria	26	x	x		x	X	
Additional Studies <i>(funded 1 of 1 project)</i>	DRCOG and RAQC studies as determined through each Board; not scored							
Criteria for ALL project types	Environmental justice	3			x			
	Overmatch	9		x				Not tracked
Project-Related Metro Vision	- location to urban center	6			x			No project received a point
	- features of urban center	4		x				
	- location UGB/A	3			x			
	- location to DIA	1		x				
	- location to strategic corridors	4			x			
Sponsor-Related Metro Vision	- adopted MV design policy	1		x				
	- implemented alt. mode plans	1		x		x		
	- signed Mile High Compact	2		x				
	- PM10 commitment	4		x		x		

Table 4 - 2012 Net Sales Tax and Very Small Communities (VSC)

	Current Criteria and Designation			Recommended New Criteria and Designation	
Place	Population	Employment	Very Small Community ?	2012 Net Sales Tax	Very Small Community ?
Denver (City & County)	600,200	309,500		\$ 346,264,184	
Arapahoe County	572,000	291,500		\$ 245,564,916	
Jefferson County	534,500	281,100		\$ 188,359,789	
Adams County	441,600	211,100		\$ 168,479,021	
Boulder County	294,600	155,600		\$ 120,067,945	
Douglas County	285,500	147,000		\$ 114,684,592	
Aurora	325,000	158,400		\$ 109,137,306	
Lakewood	143,000	73,600		\$ 65,784,549	
Boulder	97,400	52,400		\$ 60,079,473	
Centennial	100,400	53,800		\$ 46,476,855	
Westminster	106,100	56,600		\$ 42,599,358	
Littleton	41,700	20,800		\$ 38,001,330	
Lone Tree	10,200	5,800	Yes	\$ 35,778,407	
Thornton	118,800	59,800		\$ 34,550,838	
Englewood	30,300	16,800		\$ 32,837,929	
Broomfield (City & County)	55,900	28,900		\$ 29,651,024	
Longmont	86,300	42,200		\$ 27,688,436	
Arvada	106,400	54,800		\$ 27,407,995	
Parker	45,300	23,700		\$ 19,156,478	
Golden	18,900	9,500		\$ 18,326,653	
Castle Rock	48,200	24,100		\$ 17,880,370	
Greenwood Village	13,900	7,300		\$ 17,456,769	
Commerce City	45,900	20,200		\$ 17,080,052	
Brighton	33,400	15,100		\$ 15,430,418	
Wheat Ridge	30,100	14,900		\$ 15,255,651	
Weld County (SW Only)	70,000	8,200		\$ 11,500,989	
Northglenn	35,800	17,600		\$ 11,324,861	
Louisville	18,400	10,100		\$ 10,556,600	
Glendale	4,200	3,000	Yes	\$ 10,251,518	
Sheridan	5,700	2,400	Yes	\$ 6,100,771	Yes
Lafayette	24,500	13,100		\$ 6,051,714	Yes
Superior	12,500	7,000	Yes	\$ 5,074,044	Yes
Frederick	8,700	4,400	Yes	\$ 4,839,399	Yes
Federal Heights	11,500	5,400	Yes	\$ 3,677,031	Yes
Firestone	10,100	4,700	Yes	\$ 3,209,490	Yes
Fort Lupton	7,400	4,600	Yes	\$ 2,368,342	Yes
Edgewater	5,200	2,800	Yes	\$ 1,762,477	Yes
Erie	18,100	9,400		\$ 1,611,414	Yes
Dacono	4,200	1,900	Yes	\$ 1,303,983	Yes
Mead	3,400	1,700	Yes	\$ 1,116,797	Yes
Castle Pines North	10,400	1,400	Yes	\$ 1,096,406	Yes
Bennett	2,300	1,100	Yes	\$ 707,469	Yes
Nederland	1,400	800	Yes	\$ 666,422	Yes
Cherry Hills Village	6,000	2,500	Yes	\$ 617,776	Yes
Morrison	400	200	Yes	\$ 596,163	Yes
Hudson	2,400	1,100	Yes	\$ 444,464	Yes
Lyons	2,000	1,000	Yes	\$ 424,808	Yes
Foxfield	700	400	Yes	\$ 232,850	Yes
Lochbuie	4,700	300	Yes	\$ 227,886	Yes
Larkspur	200	100	Yes	\$ 151,678	Yes
Columbine Valley	1,300	600	Yes	\$ 121,466	Yes
Lakeside	-	1,000	Yes	\$ 106,656	Yes
Deer Trail	500	200	Yes	\$ 33,794	Yes
Ward	200	-	Yes	\$ 9,491	Yes
Bow Mar	900	400	Yes		Yes
Jamestown	300	-	Yes		Yes
Mountain View	500	100	Yes		Yes