

ATTACHMENT D

Date: July 20, 2010

To: Chair and Members of the Regional Transportation Committee

From: Todd Cottrell, Senior Transportation Planner
Steve Cook, MPO Planning Program Manager
Steve Rudy, Director, Transportation Planning and Operations

Subject: **Draft of the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation, Procedures for Preparing the 2012-2017 TIP***

REQUESTED ACTION

Motion to recommend to the Board of Directors the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation, Procedures for Preparing the 2012-2017 TIP*.

SUMMARY EXPLANATION

- The TIP Preparation Policy serves as the “rules” for all items relating to the TIP, including how the TIP will be developed, how DRCOG will select projects, how amendments will be processed, etc.
- The process of soliciting funding requests for the TIP is not started until the Preparation Policy document is adopted.
- Numerous technical and policy changes, both minor and more complex, are proposed for the 2012-2017 Policy on TIP Preparation.
 - The Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC) formed a work group, the TIP Policy Work Group (TPWG), which acted as the body that reviewed and recommended policy changes to the document, especially those dealing with sustainability-related topics.
 - Complex technical modifications to the TIP Policy were developed by DRCOG staff with the assistance of specialized technical workgroups comprised of experts on the applicable topics.
- The draft TIP Policy document is enclosed.
- A summary of all changes from the 2008-2013 TIP Policy is attached. While that summary is all-inclusive, DRCOG staff has highlighted the changes it feels are most significant; those that potentially have the greatest policy implications.
- At the RTC meeting, in the interest of time, **DRCOG staff will briefly present only some of the significant changes. DRCOG staff will respond to questions from RTC members about any of the changes proposed.**
- There are a couple of evaluation thresholds that have not yet been firmly established (pending some tests from the new DRCOG model). The outcomes will be presented at the meeting.
- The TPWG, TAC, and MVIC all reviewed the TIP Policy document, proposed some minor revisions, and have recommended it favorably with those revisions. Those revisions have been incorporated in this draft.

Regional Transportation Committee
July 20, 2010
Page 2

BACKUP INFORMATION

Attachment: Summary of Changes

Enclosure: Draft 2012-2017 Policy on TIP Preparation

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Should you have any questions regarding the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation for 2012-2017 TIP*, please contact Todd Cottrell at 303-480-6737 or tcottrell@drcog.org.

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

Overview

The 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy document has numerous modifications from the 2008-2013 document. Though many of the changes are minor, the more complex changes are either technical or policy-related, and are in response to workgroups held by DRCOG staff and direction provided by the TIP Policy Work Group (TPWG) and the Metro Vision Issues Committee (MVIC). The TPWG and MVIC references are to the meetings in which action was taken. Note that the document is still a draft; DRCOG staff will be working on correcting errors (if any), finalizing some as-yet unspecified thresholds, and reviewing the document to assure appropriate adherence to decisions made by the TPWG and MVIC.

The changes **highlighted** herein are the ones DRCOG staff believes are the most significant. Some of those significant changes show up several places in the document; in such instances, DRCOG staff only highlighted the location where the revision is most clearly evidenced.

Revisions Throughout

1. The new TIP Policy covers the TIP for fiscal years 2012-2017.
2. The previous long range plan basis was the 2035 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). An update to the Metro Vision 2035 RTP is currently under development and will incorporate Board-adopted sustainability principles, but is not due for adoption until early 2011. As a default, some figures from the existing (amended) 2035 Metro Vision RTP are referenced, along with networks/projects the DRCOG Board has recently accepted, at least initially, for the update (see next).
3. The 2012-2017 TIP will specifically identify and program projects for federal funding to implement the anticipated update to the 2035 Metro Vision RTP. The updated RTP “regional roadway network” has not yet been adopted but endorsement is anticipated concurrent with the TIP Policy adoption (July 2010). The projects that were adopted June 2010 for 2035 RTP conformity testing are those eligible for roadway capacity improvements.

Chapter I

1. Sponsors will now be allowed to request funding to be programmed over 4 years. (TPWG – April 29)
2. The TIP development schedule is updated to reflect the adoption schedule.
3. The TIP area map is updated to reflect: 1) **The addition of southwest Weld County to the MPO/TIP area**, and 2) that the plains area east of the MPO boundary and an area in the northwest portion of Boulder County, are both eligible for CMAQ funding only.

Chapter II

1. A new funding category is added to CDOT’s list; FASTER (bridge, safety and transit).
2. Details outlining applicants that are eligible for TIP funding is moved to Chapter III.

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

3. It is noted that the TIP is being prepared under SAFETEA-LU, since a subsequent transportation authorization has not been enacted.
4. A section discussing freight is added (TPWG – April 1).
5. Commitment to implement projects text is modified slightly and some elements are moved to Chapter III.
6. The document identifies that the TIP public involvement process also serves as the public involvement process for RTD's Program of Projects using FTA Section 5307 funding.

Chapter III

1. Funding requests requiring concurrence by RTD are amplified.
2. Eligible Applicants (moved from Chapter II) - Independent Transit Management Organizations (TMOs)/Transit Management Associations (TMAs) will be allowed as eligible applicants to submit certain Air Quality Improvement (AQI) projects only (with letters of support from affected local governments) for consideration in the TIP. The TMOs/TMAs that are eligible applicants are listed individually. (TPWG – April 15)
3. The population or employment threshold for jurisdictions that are allowed to submit projects is revised. The maximum threshold for jurisdictions that can only submit 2 projects is increased from 9,999 to 12,499, to be consistent with a revised definition of very small communities for second phase (see later comment) recommendation. The minimum threshold for jurisdictions that can submit 4 projects is increased from 10,000 to 12,500 (the change from 10,000 to 12,500 impacts Federal Heights and Superior—each would now only be eligible to submit two projects).
4. The number of submittals for “other” agencies that are allowed to submit is revised and the “other” agencies are listed by type.
5. Table 2 is updated to reflect numerous changes in eligible project types.
 - Bus Service – expanded service is now eligible.
 - Bicycle/Pedestrian – now will be reflected in two separate tables- New projects and Upgrade/Reconstruction projects.
 - Studies –
 - Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) and Passenger Rail/Bus Transit studies will now be eligible (TPWG – June 10) - listed under roadway/transit studies;
 - Urban center studies now eligible (MVIC – April 7) - combined with station area master plans into a new table;
 - DRCOG-submitted and RAQC-submitted studies will now be eligible and combined into a new table. (TPWG – June 10)
 - Pools - Reference is added that certain “pool-type” projects may be eligible for submittal as AQI projects.
6. Table 3 is modified to change the population and employment estimates from 2006 to 2008. This results in an increase in the number of submittals for Broomfield from 8 to 12 and a decrease for Glendale from 4 to 2. The table also now includes all southwest Weld County communities, and Deer Trail which is eligible for CMAQ funding only.

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

7. The minimum amount of federal funds that can be submitted is revised; additional detail, some increases to the minimums. (TPWG – April 29)
8. The commitment to implement project and project delays discussion is expanded here in Chapter III (see also Chapter II, number 4).
9. If sponsors believe their projects are “complex”, they will now be able to request funds over a 4-year period. (TPWG – April 1)
10. Project delays. (TPWG – April 15)
 - An entire project or single project phase will now only be allowed to be delayed once by the project sponsor.
 - Expanded text of what DRCOG considers a delay.
 - Sponsors that receive a one year delay must appear before the Board and seek approval to continue, without further appeal.
 - After a delay is encountered, a formal multi-party meeting will take place to explain the delay, resulting in an action plan. For sponsors with a project phase delay, the sponsor must report on the status of all of their federally-funded projects.
11. Sponsors will now be required to attend a training session to be eligible to submit for funding. (TPWG – May 27)
12. Applicants will now be required to submit project implementation schedules with their TIP applications. (TPWG – April 1)
13. Since the 8-13 and 12-17 TIP’s are each programmed with 4 years of funding, very few projects will be considered “carryover” projects (mostly CDOT/RTD) from the previous TIP. Carryover language has been slightly modified.
14. Special requirements for major projects is expanded, including a new requirement that implementation funding can only be requested after a NEPA disclosure document is signed. (TPWG – April 1)
15. Congestion Management Programs/ Pools funding is revised to reflect the new funding levels approved for the first 4 years of the 2012-2017 TIP. (TPWG – June 10) (MVIC—March)
16. Certain TDM and traffic signal system/coordination projects will now be eligible to be submitted under the AQI project type, under certain circumstances. (TPWG – April 15 for TDM and April 29 for TSSIP)
17. Other commitments.
 - The funding commitment to FasTracks is revised to reflect the second commitment made by the Board in 2008.
 - A funding commitment is established to fund station area master plans/urban center planning studies. (MVIC – April 7)
 - A funding commitment of \$330,000 is established to fund CDOT assistance to sponsors with projects from the time the TIP is approved to the time an IGA is signed. (TPWG – May 27)
 - References to an intent to fund the Travel Behavior Survey is deleted.
18. Funding target percentages for first phase selection by funding category are specified. The target for CMAQ is revised due to the moving of station area/urban center studies to “off-the-top.” (TPWG – June 10, June 24).
19. Clarifies that carryover projects will be funded as part of the first phase target.

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

20. Identifies that 2% of the first phase roadway capacity target will be taken off-the-top to be directed to the regional TDM pool. (TPWG – May 27, MVIC – June 2)
21. Second phase selection criteria is revised. (TPWG – June 10, MVIC – July 7)
 - Cost savings from merging projects is removed.
 - Project readiness for construction is removed.
 - Very small communities threshold is increased from 10,000 to 12,500 (Superior and Federal Heights would now be considered in the TIP as very small communities from this change; Glendale would now be a very small community due to decrease in employment and/or this change).
 - Adds that project types that reduce GHGs will be a specific consideration in the second phase; identifies the project types along with data to be reported.
22. The following changes are incorporated within all of the project tables:
 - Scoring thresholds are adjusted slightly to make it easier for applicants to “intuitively” estimate their scores in many criteria (i.e., 1 point for a “round number” change in the criterion).
 - Data sources are identified throughout.
 - Project-related Metro Vision implementation:
 - Urban center point structure is revised. (TPWG - May 27)
 - Overall points are increased to 18 by adding four supporting urban center criteria. (TPWG – May 27)
 - Simplifies and clarifies proximity definition. (TPWG - May 27)
 - Sponsor-related Metro Vision implementation: Some criteria are eliminated; overall points are reduced to 8. (TPWG – May 27)
 - Overmatch: Overall points are reduced from 12 to 9. (TPWG - May 27)
Thresholds adjusted.
 - Environmental justice (EJ) areas: Creates a new evaluation criterion, where projects will be awarded 3 points (from reduction in overmatch) if the project is located within a RTP-defined EJ area AND the benefits and disbenefits to the EJ community are identified AND the sponsor provides evidence that the project was taken through a public process that gave credence to the project being a benefit to the EJ community. (TPWG - April 29)
23. Table 4 – Roadway Capacity Projects:
 - Eligibility criteria: States that sponsors may submit only for design and/or NEPA (if needed) in the project’s “first” TIP cycle. The sponsor must have a signed disclosure document (EIS, EA) prior to TIP submittal for future phases beyond design and NEPA. Project eligibility list in Appendix D is revised. (TPWG–April 1)
 - Current congestion: Updates congestion scores from 2006 to 2008 and reduces overall points from 12 to 10. Adjusts thresholds.
 - Safety: Evaluation criterion is renamed to “Crash Reduction”. Points are allocated based on a simplified formula and range that eliminates consideration of the weighted statewide crash ranges. (Roadway Safety Technical Work Group)
 - Cost effectiveness: Current estimate of daily PMT is now based on 2009, not 2005. Adjusts thresholds.
 - Condition of major structure. Adjusts thresholds.

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

- Long range plan score: Reduces overall points from 15 to 12. Adjusts thresholds.
- Multimodal connectivity: **Revises point structure to a total of 15 points** (2 from Current Congestion and 3 from Long Range Plan Score). Eliminates 1 point for TDM. **Adds and revises features and adds variable point values. One key revision discussed at MVIC is to include points for redesignating existing general purpose travel lanes to serve transit/HOV only.**
- (TPWG – May 27, June 10, MVIC – July 7) **<Note: similar treatment in Tables 5 and 6.>**

24. Table 5 – Roadway Operational Improvement Projects:

- Eligibility criteria: **Clarification of eligible projects that contain the addition of through lanes and projects around interchanges.** Regional roadway system reference made to upcoming Board action. (TPWG – June 10)
- Current congestion: Updates congestion scores from 2006 to 2008.
- Safety:
 - Evaluation criterion is renamed to “Crash Reduction”. Points are allocated based on a simplified formula and range that eliminates consideration of the weighted statewide crash ranges. (Roadway Safety Technical Work Group)
 - Reduces overall points from 7 to 5.
- Delay reduction: **A new evaluation criterion is added, separating out from cost-effectiveness and eliminating usage. Sponsors will be required to identify the AM and PM peak hour VHT reduction to be eligible to submit as a roadway operational project. 12 points are possible.**
- Cost effectiveness: VHT reduction is now based on AM plus PM peak hour, instead of just one peak hour of the sponsor’s choice. Reduces points to 10 and adjusts thresholds.
- Multimodal connectivity: Revises point structure to a total of 15 points (2 from Crash Reduction and 5 from Cost-Effectiveness). Eliminates 1 point for TDM. Adds and revises features and adds variable point values. (TPWG – May 27, June 10)

25. Table 6 – Roadway Reconstruction Projects:

- Eligibility criteria:
 - **16th Street Mall: clarifies future projects are eligible, will be scored using reconstruction criteria, and may contain non-traditional reconstruction techniques.** (TPWG – April 1)
 - Adds definition of Roadway Reconstruction. (TPWG – April 1)
- Pavement conditions: Adjusts condition index thresholds.
- Safety: Evaluation criterion is renamed to “Crash Reduction”. Points are allocated based on a simplified formula and range that eliminates consideration of the weighted statewide crash ranges. (Roadway Safety Technical Work Group)
- Cost effectiveness: Reduces points and adjusts thresholds.
- Usage: Reduces points and adjusts thresholds.
- Multimodal connectivity: Revises point structure to a total of 15 points (2 from Usage and 6 from Cost-Effectiveness). Eliminates 1 point for TDM. Adds and revises features and adds variable point values. (TPWG – May 27, June 10)

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

26. Table 7 – Rapid Transit Projects

- Adds details explaining both FasTracks commitments.

27. Table 8 – Transit Passenger Facilities Projects

- **Air quality benefits:** Increases percentage of regional total from .3% to .4%. (Air Quality Technical Work Group) <Note: similar threshold increase for air quality benefits in all project types.>

28. Table 9 – Bus Service Projects (*previously called “New Bus Service Projects”*)

- Table 9 is renamed to “Bus Service Projects”, due to expanded eligibility.
- **Eligibility criteria:** Besides new bus service, expanded bus service (operations only, not capital improvements) is added as eligible per change in federal CMAQ guidance. Sponsor and transit agency coordination updated. (Transit Technical Work Group).
- **Usage and Cost-effectiveness:** Points are reduced to 13 points each, from 16 and 15 respectively. (Transit Technical Work Group)
 - **Air quality (VMT):**
- Points are increased to 13 from 8. (Transit Technical Work Group)
- Increases percentage of regional total from .3% to .4%.

29. Table 10 – Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects

- Existing bike/ped table is split into 2 tables - new and upgrade/reconstruction. Table 10 is now new bicycle/pedestrian projects only. See Table 11 for Upgrade/Reconstruction Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects.
- **Eligibility criteria:** New requirement for all multi-use projects; required to be constructed to a minimum of 8 feet in width for the entire length of the project. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group)
- **Project Type:** Eliminates the 3 points given to all new bicycle/pedestrian projects versus 0 points for upgrade/reconstruction criterion (points for both project types are revised to total 100). (TPWG – June 24)
- **RTP Priority Corridors:** Increases maximum point value by 1 from eliminating Project Type.
- **Safety:** Increases point for relevant crash history and decreases point for facility lighting.
- **Connectivity:** Increases overall points from 17 to 19 from the elimination of Project Type.
- **Connectivity-barrier elimination:** Distinguishes eliminating a barrier that provides a continuity of motion from those that do not; increases maximum point value by 1.
- **Connectivity-transit:** Transit definition is modified to include only those transit types defined in the scoring instructions that will be or anticipated to be completed by no later than the end of 2016. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group, TPWG – June 24) Clarifies definition of “direct” and increases maximum point value by 1.
- **Multiple enhancements:**
 - To receive the additional 2 points for constructing a facility to a minimum width of 10 feet, the 10 feet minimum width now must be for 90% or greater of the length of the project. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group)

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

- Bike “lockers or racks” are replaced with bike “spaces”, with additional requirements placed upon them for points to be awarded. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group)
 - Air quality benefits: Increases percentage of regional total from .3% to .4%.
 - User base: Points will now be based on DRCOG model results of the number of walk and bike origins and destinations within .5 and 1.5 mile radius of the project respectively. The minimum and maximum thresholds are adjusted to equal the approximate range of scores from previous TIP submittals. The specific model year has not yet been finalized. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group)
 - Cost effectiveness: Points will be based on cost per Person Miles Travelled (PMT), and not cost per user base. The minimum and maximum thresholds are adjusted to equal the approximate range of scores from previous TIP submittals. The specific model year has not yet been finalized. (TPWG – May 27)
30. Table 11 – Upgrade/Reconstruction Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects
- Existing bike/ped table is split into 2 tables - new and upgrade/reconstruction. See Table 10 for new bicycle/pedestrian projects only.
 - Eligibility criteria: New requirement for all multi-use projects; required to be constructed to a minimum of 8 feet in width for the entire length of the project. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group) Clarified reconstructing existing grade-separations not eligible for this TIP.
 - Project Type: Eliminates the criterion that gave 0 points to all upgrade/reconstruction bicycle/pedestrian projects versus 3 for new. The points possible are revised to 100. (TPWG – June 24)
 - RTP Priority Corridors: Increases maximum point value by 1 from eliminating Project Type.
 - Safety:
 - Increases point for relevant crash history and decreases point for facility lighting.
 - To receive the additional 2 points for constructing a facility to a minimum width of 10 feet, the 10 feet minimum width now must be for 90% or greater of the length of the project. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group)
 - Connectivity: Increases overall points from 13 to 15 from the elimination of Project Type.
 - Connectivity-barriers: Distinguishes upgrading grade separations that provide a continuity of motion from those that do not; increases maximum point value by 1.
 - Connectivity-transit: Transit definition is modified to include only those transit types defined in the scoring instructions that will be or anticipated to be completed by no later than the end of 2016. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group, TPWG – June 24) Clarifies definition of “direct” and increases maximum point value by 1.
 - Multiple enhancements: Bike “lockers or racks” are replaced with bike “spaces”, with additional requirements placed upon them for points to be awarded. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group)
 - Existing users: Adjusts thresholds.

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

- User base: Points will now be based on DRCOG model results of the number of walk and bike origins and destinations within .5 and 1.5 mile radius of the project respectively. The minimum and maximum thresholds are adjusted to equally approximately the range of scores from previous TIP submittals. The specific model year has not yet been finalized. (Bike/Ped Technical Work Group)
- Cost effectiveness: Points will be based on cost per Person Miles Travelled (PMT), and not cost per user base. The minimum and maximum thresholds are adjusted to equal the approximate range of scores from previous TIP submittals. The specific model year has not yet been finalized. (TPWG – May 27)

31. Table 12 – Other Enhancement Projects

- Benefits:
 - Decreases points from 32 to 30.
 - Adjusts points and adjusts/deletes some scoring instructions.
 - Adds scoring instructions for vehicle-caused wildlife mitigation projects.
- Cost effectiveness:
 - Increases points from 30 to 32.
 - Establishes a new methodology, comparing the annual estimated economic benefit in the next five years to the annualized cost of the project.

32. Table 13 – Air Quality Improvement (AQI) Projects

- Eligibility Criteria:
 - Mention made of eligibility of freight-related projects. (TPWG – April 1)
 - TDM projects with a minimum federal funding request of \$200,000 will now be eligible to be submitted in this category. (TPWG – April 15)
 - “Large” signal system/coordination projects will also be eligible to be submitted in this category, if they receive endorsement and approval to be submitted for TIP funding by the traffic signal stakeholders, TAC, and MVIC. (TPWG – April 29)
- GHG Reduction: Adds new evaluation criterion; 0-6 points based on project reducing up to .4% of the regional emissions total for CO₂. (TPWG – May 27)
- Benefits:
 - Renames evaluation criteria to “Other Air Pollution Reduction. (Air Quality Technical Work Group)
 - Revises .3% threshold of regional pollutant budget to .4%. (Air Quality Technical Work Group)
- Benefits and Cost effectiveness: Reduces both evaluation criteria by 3 points each to accommodate addition of GHG Reduction evaluation criterion. (TPWG – May 27)

33. Table 14 – Roadway/Transit Studies (previously called “Studies”)

RTP-defined urban center studies are now eligible for funding and are merged with Station Area Master Plan studies into a new table. For further details, see Table 15 – Station Area/Urban Centers Studies

- Removes Station Area Master Plan studies from this table and moves to Table 15; renames Table 14 to “Roadway/Transit Studies”

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

- Adds Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) studies, with certain conditions. (TPWG – May 27)
 - Adds Regional (connecting to a major metropolitan area outside the TIP area) Passenger Rail/Bus Transit corridor studies. Defines eligibility that the other MPO(s) is required to participate in the study, specifics to be provided in the submittal. (TPWG – May 27 and June 24)
 - Current congestion: Updates congestion scores from 2006 to 2008.
 - Usage: Changes data source to sponsors. Adjusts thresholds.
 - Other criticality criteria: Current estimate of daily PMT is now based on 2009, not 2005. Adjusts thresholds. Adds scoring instructions for passenger rail/bus transit studies.
 - Environmental justice. “Standard” discussion language is modified for studies.
34. Table 15 – Station Area/Urban Center Studies (*new*)
- New table; removes station area master plan studies from Table 14 and merges with urban center studies into new table. (MVIC – April 7)
 - Eligibility:
 - Combines station area and urban center requirements; allows the horizon year to be specified. (TPWG – June 24); removes language giving priority to initial station area master plans and corridor-wide TOD workshops versus station area master plan “next step” studies. (TPWG – May 27)
 - Environmental justice: Existing EJ threshold is revised and “standard” EJ discussion is modified for studies.
 - Other evaluation criteria: new and/or adjusted evaluation criteria shown; a mix of previous station area master plan criteria and new DRCOG model-based outputs. (TPWG – May 27) Thresholds and model years have not yet been established for two criteria.
35. Table 16 – Additional Studies (*new*)
- New table; the following studies will now be eligible to submit. (TPWG – May 27)
 - “study” efforts (land use, modeling, etc) submitted by DRCOG staff (upon approval by the DRCOG Board), and
 - “study” efforts (SIP modeling, etc) submitted by RAQC staff (upon approval by the RAQC Board).
 - Projects in this table will not be scored and will be considered in second phase project selection only.

Chapter IV

1. 7th Pot funding program text is revised to reflect an absence of funding
2. Additional funding programs managed by CDOT are incorporated (FASTER).

Chapter V

1. Text on funding requests related to FasTracks implementation is expanded to include additional details for each FasTracks commitment made by the Board.
2. Text is enhanced to include details about the required training.
3. The threshold as to the funding level amounts of administrative modifications to the TIP is increased to \$4 million from \$3 million.

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy

Changes as of July 13, 2010

4. The appeals process for denial of a TIP project revision is described.
5. Voluntary deferral steps are split—without and with incentives.
6. Text for involuntary deferrals is clarified.

Appendix A

1. Revises projects types and enhances descriptions for CMAQ in response to revised CMAQ guidance.

Appendix B

1. Reconstruction/upgrade added to eligible bicycle/pedestrian enhancement activities.

Appendix C

1. Changed title.

Appendix D

1. List from June 2010 approval for testing inserted.

Appendix E

1. Revises “safety” to “crash reduction” throughout.
2. Suggests a length of 1/10 mile for each approach leg when reviewing intersection crashes.
3. Removes the statewide average weighted crash rate table.
4. Simplifies the crash rate formula, representing the annualized weighted crashes per 1,000 ADT per mile.
5. Revises the table on how criteria points are awarded.
6. Adds an improvement characteristic and percentage reduction for centerline rumble strips in Table E-1.
7. Eliminates Figure E-1, Urban Area (criteria is removed from Appendix E, making this figure no longer needed).

Appendix F

1. Revises project location points regarding urban centers. (MVIC – June 2)
2. Adds new criteria for scoring features of urban centers (zoning, parking, housing, funding). (TPWG May 27)
3. Revises total points to 18. (TPWG – May 27)
4. Revises proximity definition and adds additional definitions pertaining to urban center criteria. (TPWG – May 27)
5. Revises Figure F-1 to include SW Weld County and better show the strategic rapid transit corridors.

Appendix G

1. Removes many of the evaluation criteria. Increases points for signing the Mile High Compact to 2. (TPWG – May 27, June 24)

Summary of Changes to the 2012-2017 TIP Preparation Policy
Changes as of July 13, 2010

2. Reduces overall points possible to 8. (TPWG – May 27)

Appendix H

1. Minor previously-known corrections to the Strategic Corridor map are made.

Appendix I

1. Adds expanded bus service, not just new.
2. Mentions other scheduled public transit providers, not just RTD.
3. Adds VMT computations as a required detail.