TIP Review White Paper

- **Board Direction (August 2015 Meeting)**
  - ……to address TIP process, funding allocation and any other criteria mentioned by this Board, including looking at other MPOs around the country and bringing it back to the Committee in six months (February 2016).

- **Staff established Work Group of TAC members**
  - 22 members
  - Met *eight times* from October 16, 2015 to February 3, 2016
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Federal Requirements for the TIP

- Cover no less than four years and be updated at least every four years
- Fiscally constrained by funding program
- Consistent with RTP
- Identify criteria and process used for prioritizing projects
- Consideration and implementation of projects/programs consistent with the federal planning factors
- Flexibility to MPOs in how it may select projects
Review of existing TIP Process

- Comments derived from
  1. TIP Open Forum (June 2015)
  2. Board comments (August 2015)
  3. TIP Review Work Group Survey

- Summary of feedback
  - Positive and feedback requiring further discussion
Summary of Feedback

**Positive:**
- TIP training
- Web-based call for projects
- Two-phased selection process

**Needing further discussion:**
- Creation of TIP policy development work group
- Adequacy of project types
- Eligible project components
- Assigning a project score to studies
- Max. number of TIP submittals
- Minimum funding request
- Funding swap with CDOT
- Points for Metro Vision criteria
- Multimodal Connectivity points – Roadway Projects
- Call for projects frequency
## Other MPOs

### APPENDIX 2

TIP Project Selection Procedures Matrix

**MPO Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPOs</th>
<th>Approximate Annual STP &amp; CMAQ Funding</th>
<th>Subregional Selection Process?</th>
<th>Considers Geographic Equity?</th>
<th>Special Project Selection Committee?</th>
<th>Selection Based Purely on Points?</th>
<th>Engineering Rigor in Application?</th>
<th>Selected by Project Type or Funding Type?</th>
<th>What Projects are in RTP before TIP?</th>
<th>Are PL/Design Phases Eligible?</th>
<th>Years between Solicitation</th>
<th>Number of Entites in MPO Area</th>
<th>Total Expenditures (Over Four Year TIP)</th>
<th>Interstates Funded with MPO Allocations?</th>
<th>Funding Targets for Last TIP?</th>
<th>Minimum Project Size</th>
<th>Does the MPO Use Set Aside?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver Regional Council of Governments</td>
<td>$65 m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Regionally Significant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56 municipalities</td>
<td>$3.7 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$100 k</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Regional Commission</td>
<td>$99 m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No funding</td>
<td>All Projects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>15 counties</td>
<td>$1.2 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Area MPO (Austin, TX)</td>
<td>$23.3 m²</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>44 entities</td>
<td>$0.6 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning</td>
<td>$230 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes funding</td>
<td>Major Capital Projects</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Depends on selection</td>
<td>384 municipalities</td>
<td>$3.1 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>$63 m²</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes funding</td>
<td>Regionally Significant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35 municipalities</td>
<td>$5.0 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$250 k</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council (Minneapolis/St. Paul)</td>
<td>$75 m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Regionally Significant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136 municipalities</td>
<td>$3.2 b</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$575 k - $51 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-America Regional Council (Kansas City)</td>
<td>$35 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No funding</td>
<td>Regionally Significant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119 municipalities</td>
<td>$2.8 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$25 k</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (Columbus)</td>
<td>$51 m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>All Projects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79 local entities</td>
<td>$2.1 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$259 k</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Region Metropolitan Planning Organization (Albuquerque)</td>
<td>$25 m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No funding</td>
<td>Major Projects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 entities</td>
<td>$0.6 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Front Range MPO (Ft Collins)</td>
<td>$7.5 m</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No funding</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13 municipalities</td>
<td>$0.1 b</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$100 k</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (Colorado Springs)</td>
<td>$7.5 m²</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No funding</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9 municipalities</td>
<td>$0.93 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$25 k</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Regional Council (Seattle)</td>
<td>$80 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No funding</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88 entities</td>
<td>$5.6 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch Front Range Council (Salt Lake City)</td>
<td>$55 m</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No funding</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 entities</td>
<td>$1.9 b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 for CMAQ selection process only  
2 STP figures include NDOT funding swap  
3 Construction only for STP, all phases for CMAQ  
4 For programs and outreach, $50 k for CMAQ, capital, No minimum for STP  
5 Recommended minimums  
6 STP-Metro Only  
7 Definitions per the MPO
Key Issues

- **Incorporation of Metro Vision in the TIP Process**
  - How best to incorporate?
  - Level of flexibility?

- **Geographic Equity**
  - Does the current formula accurately reflect the primary user/benefactor of facility?
  - Should geographic equity be a factor in project selection?
  - Would subregional allocation of funds be more effective?
  - What funding types (i.e. DRCOG, CDOT and RTD) should be considered in the formula?
Key Issues (cont.)

- **Small vs. Large Communities**
  - Can small communities compete with the larger entities?
  - Should community size be a consideration?

- **Off-the-top program/project funding**
  - Make sure programs are beneficial
  - Develop procedures and criteria for project selection

- **Multimodal projects**
  - Holistic approach to project development
  - Current project types too rigid and don’t offer the flexibility to submit projects that are truly multimodal
Two Models

- **Regional Model**
  - DRCOG’s current model
  - Centralized process – all applications submitted to MPO

- **Regional/Subregional Model (Dual Model)**
  - Seattle, Chicago
  - Has both regional and subregional allocation elements
Model Comparison Exercise

- **MV Incorporation**
  - **Regional Model:**
    - More evenly applied in project selection
    - **Challenge:** Comparing similar projects from different parts of the region
  
  - **Dual Model:**
    - More flexibility: Project criteria more in-tune with local values while still being consistent with MV
    - **Challenge:** Meaningful oversight to make sure selection process in consistent with MV
Model Comparison Exercise (cont.)

- **Geographic Equity**
  - **Regional Model:**
    - Possible to fine-tune to better depict “users”
    - **Challenge:** Still difficult to gauge true equity
  
  - **Dual Model:**
    - “Proportionately” allocates funding to smaller level of geography
    - **Challenge:** How to distribute the funds
Model Comparison Exercise (cont.)

- **Small vs. Large Communities**
  - **Regional:**
    - Set-aside for smaller communities
    - **Challenge:** Should smaller communities also be eligible for general call for projects?
  - **Dual:**
    - Competing against smaller pool of communities
    - May encourage local partner funding opportunities
    - **Challenge:** Competing for fewer dollars
Model Comparison Exercise (cont.)

- **Off-the-top programs/projects**
  - Regional Model:
    - Conducted before general call for project (current model)
  - Dual Model:
    - Could be drawn from regional allocation

- **Multimodal Projects**
  - No clear difference
Recommendations

- Develop a project selection process purpose statement
  - Develop specific goals for each TIP

- Further explore the Regional/Subregional dual project selection model
  - Continue work group
  - No fatal flaws – needs a more comprehensive evaluation
Recommendations (cont.)

- Create a project selection process that places more emphasis on project benefits, overall value, and return on investment
  - Quantifiable performance metrics

- Explore opportunities to exchange CDOT state funds with DRCOG federal funds
  - Create a pilot project
Recommendations (cont.)

- Evaluate off-the-top programs and projects
  - Thorough review all set-aside programs
  - Develop a clear process for the evaluation of large off-the-top project funding requests
QUESTIONS/COMMENTS