

**Board Officers**

Jackie Millet, Chair  
Elise Jones, Vice Chair  
Bob Roth, Secretary  
Herb Atchison, Treasurer  
Jennifer Schaufele, Executive Director

## AGENDA

### TIP Review Work Group – Mtg. 6

Friday, January 8, 2016

9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

1290 Broadway

Independence Pass Board Room - Ground floor, West side

1. Call to Order
2. December 18, 2015 Summary  
(Attachment A)
3. TIP Purpose Statement Discussion  
(Attachment B)
4. White Paper Recommendations Discussion  
(Attachment C)
5. Updated White Paper Structure  
(Attachment D)
6. Adjournment

Upcoming meeting dates

- 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. 5

Wednesday, December 18, 2015 7:30 a.m.

#### PARTICIPANTS PRESENT:

Jeanne Shreve	Adams County
Kent Moorman	Adams County, City of Thornton
Bryan Weimer	Arapahoe County
Mac Callison	Arapahoe County, City of Aurora
George Gerstle	Boulder County
Steve Klausing	Business
Janice Finch	Denver
Doug Rex	DRCOG
Steve Cook	DRCOG
Art Griffith	Douglas County
John Cotten	Douglas County, City of Lone Tree
Steve Durian	Jefferson County
Dave Baskett	Jefferson County, City of Lakewood
Ken Lloyd	Regional Air Quality Council
Chris Quinn	RTD
Ted Heyd	TDM/Non-motor

DRCOG Staff: Todd Cottrell, Will Soper, Casey Collins

#### Call to Order

Chair George Gerstle called the meeting to order at 7:41 a.m.

#### Summary of December 2, 2015 meeting

The summary was accepted as written.

#### **Discussion of TIP process model exercise**

The meeting was dedicated to working through an exercise to determine how well two very distinct TIP project selection processes (Regional model vs. Regional/Subregional model) would do in resolving the key issues identified in previous work group meetings. To aid in the discussion, staff prepared a TIP Process Comparison Matrix.

#### **1. Purpose of TIP**

The work group developed the following purpose statement after discussion: *The purpose of the TIP allocation is to leverage federal dollars to supplement other resources, that meet minimum federal requirements and the basic goals of Metro Vision and the Regional Transportation Plan, while allowing flexibility for local jurisdictions to equitably implement a balance of local and regional transportation priorities that meets today's needs, but leads to future multi-modal transportation requirements.*

Staff suggested it would attempt to “clean-up” some of the language and present the revised version back to the work group at the next meeting.

#### **2. Incorporation of Metro Vision**

The work group discussed various viewpoints on Metro Vision integration.

- George Gerstle felt the TIP should distribute funding consistent with the goals and policies identified in the regional plan.

- Steve Klausing felt TIP funding distribution should be consistent with the plans of the individual communities and noted Board support was not unanimous on integration of Metro Vision.
- Steve Durian noted developing and prioritizing Metro Vision tenets for each subregion could be a potential challenge.
- Steve Klausing suggested specifically referencing the Regional Transportation Plan, instead of emphasizing Metro Vision tenets.

### **3. Geographic equity and**

#### **4. Small vs. large communities**

- Art Griffith felt subregional model allocations will help solve equity issues and said the model's dedicated funding would help areas plan better.
- Bryan Weimer agreed the subregional model would be good for establishing a dedicated funding source.
- Dave Baskett noted, even with a subregional model, the issue of equity will not go away.
- George Gerstle said the subregional model addresses regional equity by shifting it to the county to some degree.
- Janice Finch said the subregional model is an opportunity for subregions to prioritize.
- Jeanne Shreve felt the subregional model could potentially reduce the amount available to the subregions. She noted the equity challenge shifts to the subregion.
- Art Griffith suggested requiring a percent minimum for small communities. A subregion could decide each TIP cycle if they want a higher percentage.
- Kent Moorman said a minimum project size should be required, as the cost of administering a federalized project is high.
- Steve Durian supported the subregional model. Noted the success of the Federal Heights project.
- Art Griffith suggested putting equity criteria in First Phase if the current TIP model is continued – have a certain percentage for every county.

#### **5. Off-the-top programs and projects**

- Bryan Weimer agreed with having off-the-top funding from a regional pot, saying it doesn't preclude a subregion from designating funding as 'regional' in order to partner with other subregions.
- Dave Baskett said we need more flexibility for pools. Technology moves faster than pool definitions. Should change definitions to make them more flexible.
- Jeanne Shreve commented that if changing to another TIP model, and committing to a regional or "off-the-top fund", then collaboration/cooperation with transportation agencies, (i.e., RTD, CDOT and any other funding partners) is important and we should pull those entities to the table with their own funding. We, as a region, need to drive the conversation.
- Steve Klausing said neither TIP model addresses his following concerns about programmatic set-asides: 1. some programs should not be federalized; and 2. the efficacy/benefits of some programs (e.g., TDM).
  - Ted Heyd suggested having a TDM set-aside for innovation projects/design.
  - Bryan Weimer suggested programs should be re-evaluated, but felt the Traffic Signal Operations program is very beneficial.
- Janice Finch suggested the work group make recommendations in the White Paper to add more to the Operational pot, and to have a First/Last Mile set-aside.
- Jeanne Shreve suggested acknowledging in White Paper that the work group had desire to have a re-evaluation of the off-the-top programs/pools.
- Kent Moorman suggested including a look at the new legislation in FAST Act.

- George Gerstle said the work group needs to meet February deadline for White Paper, but could make a recommendation to have further discussion on the previous suggestions.

## **6. Multimodal projects**

- Art Griffith spoke on issues he has encountered with sidewalk requirements. He suggested sponsors should not be penalized for omitting sidewalks at locations where pedestrian use may be inappropriate.
  - Ted Heyd noted Kansas City's MPO policy is "opt-out" (projects required to have multimodal elements from the beginning), not "opt-in" and jurisdictions are not penalized if they have legitimate reasons for opting-out.
- Kent Moorman said there ought to be a category for multimodal projects.
- Jeanne Shreve suggested taking a more holistic approach when considering a subregional model; more detailed conversations on the local level would be needed, as she felt local jurisdictions would know better what criteria is needed.
- Ted Heyd said there should be consideration of a Complete Streets policy that could be filtered down to the subregional level. Need more discussion on what would be a uniform "regional" set of criteria.
- George Gerstle summarized the work group's comments suggesting they are concerned the current criteria require illogical investments. We have to look at projects in a holistic context; may be better for subregions to do.
- Mac Callison said there is a need to address unique crossover communities, e.g., Colfax in both Adams and Arapahoe counties, or Longmont in both Boulder and Weld counties.
- Bryan Weimer suggested making a recommendation in the White Paper to identify Next Steps.

## **Conclusion**

- Doug Rex said the work group appears to be leaning towards consensus on exploring the subregional model.
- Janice Finch and Jeanne Shreve requested the work group's consensus to explore the subregional model be a strong recommendation to the Board.
- George Gerstle suggested acting on specific recommendations at the next meeting.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting ended at 10:42 a.m.

## **Upcoming schedule of meetings:**

- Fri., January 8
- Fri., January 22
- Wed., February 3

## ATTACHMENT B

To: TIP Review Work Group  
From: Douglas W. Rex, Transportation Planning and Operations Director  
303 480-6747 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
January 8, 2016	Action	3

### SUBJECT

Further discussion of the TIP purpose statement that was created last meeting.

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Finalize TIP project selection process purpose statement to include in the White Paper.

### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

### SUMMARY

At the December 18 meeting, the work group developed the following draft purpose statement for the TIP selection process to be included in the White Paper:

*The purpose of the TIP allocation is to leverage federal dollars to supplement other resources, that meet minimum federal requirements and the basic goals of Metro Vision and the Regional Transportation Plan, while allowing flexibility for local jurisdictions to equitably implement a balance of local and regional transportation priorities that meets today's needs, but leads to future multi-modal transportation requirements.*

Staff has attempted to "clean-up" the language and submits for the work group's consideration the following revised statement:

The purpose of the DRCOG TIP project selection process is to leverage federal transportation funds to equitably implement transportation priorities meeting the basic goals of Metro Vision and the Regional Transportation Plan, while allowing local flexibility to implement projects providing the most benefit to meet today's needs while advancing the region's multimodal transportation system.

### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[December 18, 2015](#) TIP Review Workgroup

### PROPOSED MOTION

Move to include TIP selection process purpose statement in the TIP White Paper.

### ATTACHMENTS

N/A

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Transportation Planning and Operations Director, at 303-480-6747 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org).

## ATTACHMENT C

To: TIP Review Work Group

From: Douglas W. Rex, Transportation Planning and Operations Director  
303 480-6747 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
January 8, 2016	Action	4

### SUBJECT

Discussion of TIP White Paper recommendations.

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Consensus of the Work Group.

### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

### SUMMARY

At the December 18 meeting, the work group participated in an exercise to determine the merits of two distinct project selection process models (regional model and regional/sub-regional model) in resolving the key issues identified by the work group. As a result of this exercise, the following possible White Paper recommendations have emerged:

- Develop project selection process purpose statement for the TIP.
- Further explore the Regional/Subregional dual project selection model.
- Evaluate off-the-top programs and projects.
- Explore opportunities for swap of CDOT and DRCOG federal funds.
- Create a project selection environment that places more emphasis on project benefits and overall values.

Staff would like to reach consensus from the work group on including these recommendations (as well as any other) in the draft White Paper to be presented at the January 22 work group meeting.

### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

[December 18, 2015](#) TIP Review Work Group

### PROPOSED MOTION

At the discretion of the work group.

### ATTACHMENTS

N/A

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Transportation Planning and Operations Director, at 303-480-6747 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org).

## ATTACHMENT D

To: TIP Review Work Group

From: Douglas W. Rex, Transportation Planning and Operations Director  
303 480-6747 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org)

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
January 8, 2016	Discussion	5

### SUBJECT

Draft White Paper outline

### PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

### ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

### SUMMARY

DRCOG staff is in the process of preparing the draft TIP White Paper for discussion by the work group at its next meeting on January 22. Staff anticipates having the draft available to the work group by January 15 to provide timely review.

The proposed White Paper outline is available for your review as Attachment 1.

### PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

### PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

### ATTACHMENT

1. White Paper Outline

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Transportation Planning and Operations Director, at 303-480-6747 or [drex@drcog.org](mailto:drex@drcog.org).

# Sample TIP White Paper Outline

---

## Introduction/Purpose

- Direction from Board of Directors to create White Paper
- Federal requirements for developing the TIP

## Existing TIP Process

- Summary of feedback received from TIP Forum, Board of Directors and TIP Survey
  - TIP process items that worked well
  - Areas requiring improvement

## Key Issues (Identified by Work Group)

- TIP purpose
- Metro Vision integration
- Geographic Equity
- Small vs. large communities
- Off-the-top programs and projects
- Multi-modal projects

## What are other MPOs doing?

- Summary of surveyed MPOs

## Regional vs. Regional/Subregional Models

- Exercise to evaluate how each can address the key issues

## Recommendations

- Develop project selection process purpose statement for the TIP.
- Further explore the Regional/Subregional dual project selection model.
- Evaluate off-the-top programs and projects.
- Explore opportunities for swap of CDOT and DRCOG federal funds.
- Create a project selection environment that places more emphasis on project benefits and overall values.