VOLUME III, SECTION IV.
DRCOG: TIP CRITERIA AND RESULTING TIPS

The criteria used to determine TIP project eligibility and inclusion change over time, for reasons such as changes in federal statutory requirements, in the MPO's interpretation of statutory requirements, in MPO policies and goals, and in personnel on committees responsible for determining and applying appropriate criteria and, ultimately, for selecting projects for inclusion in the TIP. As criteria change, so too do the scope and impact of the resultant TIPs. This section outlines the evolution of DRCOG's criteria for project selection for inclusion in the TIP and the resulting TIPs covering the years 1988 through 2004.

1988-1992 TIP. This TIP was prepared prior to the ISTEA[1] and TEA-21[2] legislation, which allowed MPOs much greater flexibility in allocating federal funds to TIP projects and mandated minimum requirements for planning.[3] In 1988, federal funding was available only for projects meeting specific parameters that were outlined by the particular funding program employed.[4]

The criteria used for project selection in the 1988-1992 TIP were defined by DRCOG in two policy documents. The first is the "*Procedures for TIP Preparation"* adopted by the DRCOG Board of Directors in October 1979 and amended in September 1980.[5] This document includes the following: (1) regional strategies for project funding; (2) identification of project initiation responsibilities and sources of project; (3) basic criteria for evaluation of projects; (4) project selection process; (5) a description of how projects fit into overall transportation plans; and (6) amendment issues.

The second document essential to the 1988-1992 TIP process is the DRCOG Policy on Urban Systems Allocations adopted on January 16, 1985.[6] Point allocations for use in project selection and prioritization were based upon the guidelines contained therein. These guidelines, however, only applied to projects funded by Federal Urban System Funds (FAUS).[7] DRCOG did not become solely responsible for project falling under any other funding categories until the passage of the ISTEA legislation in 1991.[8] The establishment of objective measures at this early juncture helped DRCOG make the transition into the ISTEA era.

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the MPO's long-range transportation plan, was the guiding document in the TIP creation. All projects in the 1988-1992 TIP were

---

[1] 49 U.S.C. § 101. The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 [ISTEA].
[2] Pub. L. No. 105-178. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century of 1998 [TEA-21].
[3] Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, Conference Report, H.R. No. 102-404, 102nd Congress, (Nov. 27, 1991).
[4] Denver Regional Council of Governments (hereinafter DRCOG), 1988-1992 Transportation Improvement Program (hereinafter TIP), 5-7 (December 1987).
[5] DRCOG, Procedures for TIP Preparation, (October 1979, amended September 1980).
[6] DRCOG, Policy on Urban Systems Allocations, (January 16, 1985).
[7] DRCOG, Policy on Urban Systems Allocations, preface (January 16, 1985).
[8] DRCOG, 1993-1995 TIP, 1 (January 20, 1993).

selected specifically to implement both local and area wide priorities, consistent with the goals and policies of the RTP.[9] Therefore, it is important to evaluate the creation of, and the resultant RTP, and then evaluate its implementation, which the TIP represents.

The RTP (2010) was prepared by the DRCOG Board of Directors with direction provided by the Transportation Committee, comprised of key policy makers from the Colorado Department of Highways (CDOH, which is now CDOT), the RTD, and the DRCOG Board.[10] Technical advice and recommendations were provided by local transportation officials through DRCOG's Transportation Advisory Committee and by staff of DRCOG, CDOH, and RTD.[11] Numerous public meetings and other opportunities for community input were provided. Citizens, neighborhood organizations, and other interested groups made suggestions and offered comments on meeting the region's transportation needs.[12]

The process of the RTP development began with studies designed to gain current travel and roadway congestion data, transit usage, and projected population and employment figures for the year 2010. Based upon this data, future travel demand estimates were determined to test various plan alternatives submitted by local governments, the E-470 Authority, the CDOH, the RTD, and DRCOG. A plan was then selected based on defined goals and policies.[13] Input was received from all levels and jurisdictions in the creation of the RTP.

The RTP is implemented through the TIP. As with more recent TIPs, project selection was based upon consistency with the goals and objectives of the RTP, which were as follows for the RTP of 2010:

- Maintain or improve regional mobility
- Consider fiscal capabilities and cost-effectiveness
- Develop highways as a component of a multi-modal system
- Divert auto trips to other modes and increase auto capacity
- Promote transit usage, improve access to transit, and provide transit services to urbanized area
- Improve safety
- Improve mobility of low-income, elderly, and handicapped people
- Promote pedestrian/ bicycle ways
- Support regional growth and development plans
- Improve air quality
- Increase energy effectiveness[14]

[9]DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 1, 29 (December 1987).
[10] DRCOG, 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (hereinafter RTP), 3 (July 1987, amended December 1989).
[11] DRCOG, RTP, 3 (July 1987, amended December 1989).
[12] DRCOG, RTP, 3 (July 1987, amended December 1989).
[13] DRCOG, RTP, 3 (July 1987, amended December 1989).
[14] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 7-8 (December 1987).

Additionally, the deadlines for attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) set forth in the Clean Air Act was December 31, 1987.[15] That meant that projects included in the TIP that did not maintain air quality or make "reasonable efforts" to clean the air could be eliminated from funding by the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA).[16] Projects meeting the Clean Air Act requirements were also included in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

In implementing the RTP goals, the TIP included projects designed to improve mobility and accessibility.[17] To that end, selected projects included widening roadways, new construction, roadway improvements, resurfacing and reconstruction, and safety improvements. It also included improvements for pedestrians, the handicapped, and the elderly.[18] Alternate transportation projects included park-n-rides, the Regional Ridesharing Program, transit improvements, and the initiation of studies for transit and high occupancy vehicle (HOV) facilities in the North I-25 and Santa Fe corridors.[19]

This TIP included approximately 70 highway and transit projects within the Denver and Boulder urbanized areas.[20] Many of the projects selected were designed to address short-term needs, such as alleviating traffic congestion and air pollution, and promoting energy conservation (which are contained within the Transportation Systems Management (TSM) element of the RTP).[21] Few long-range elements from the RTP (2010) were included.[22] The reason cited for exclusion of long-range projects was a projection of severe shortfalls in funding.[23] Roughly 30% of the projects listed in the 2010 RTP were implemented. RTPs developed after the enactment of ISTEA required fiscal constraint, listing only those projects that could reasonably be expected to receive funding. Therefore, there is a greater coordination of short- and long-term goals between the later TIPs and RTPs.

The following is a summary of how funds were allocated by general project type:

Highway Projects – approximately $361 million

- Major reconstruction 37.6%
- New roadway construction 31.1%
- Widening/ capacity improvements 21.0%
- Resurfacing/ minor construction 7.2%
- Other 3.1%

Transit Expenditures – approximately $163 million

- Agency operating assistance 57.8%
- Operating & maintenance facilities 39.4%
- Vehicle maintenance & operations 1.4%

[15] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 8 (December 1987).
[16] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 8 (December 1987).
[17] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 29 (December 1987).
[18] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 29 (December 1987).
[19] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 29 (December 1987).
[20] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 1 (December 1987).
[21] DRCOG, RTP, 3 (July 1987, amended December 1989).
[22] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 1 (December 1987).

- Park-n-Ride construction 1.0%
- Transit vehicles 0.4%[24]

The TIP clearly explains that many of the long-range elements of the RTP could not be implemented due to insufficient funding.[25] Therefore, elements of the TSM were the focus of this TIP. For that reason, the TIP does not reflect the RTP to the extent that would otherwise be expected.

1993-1995 TIP. Major changes occurred in the TIP process with the passage of *The Intermodal Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991* [ISTEA].[26] In addition to this new federal legislation, the DRCOG Board of Directors adopted its *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program Preparation* on June 10, 1992.[27] The policy facilitates TIP preparation consistent with the new ISTEA requirements.[28] It also contains regional strategies for project selection, which have been used extensively to determine TIP project priorities within each ISTEA funding category.[29]

The ISTEA created a number of new funding categories and guidelines for project selection for inclusion in the TIP.[30] It also allowed for greater flexibility in transferring funds between categories, and it gave DRCOG primary responsibility for project selection within the Denver Metropolitan Area.[31] The DRCOG Board of Directors identified the following as the ISTEA requirement relating to TIP project selection:

- All projects in the TIP must be consistent with, and thus implement, the RTP.
- Maintenance of the existing system is prioritized over additional capacity for single-occupancy vehicles.
- Funding of environmentally sensitive projects contained in the approved SIP for air quality is mandated, and consideration of alternative modes of transportation is emphasized.
- DRCOG is now empowered to select all projects, excluding National Highway System and Bridge projects, for inclusion in the TIP.
- The TIP must be fiscally constrained by reasonable expectations of funding.
- The TIP must consist of a priority list of projects to be carried out within each three-year period after the initial adoption of the TIP.[32]

In creating the TIP, the ISTEA requires that 15 factors be considered.[33] These factors mirror policies adopted by DRCOG on June 10, 1992 (Regional Strategies for

---

[23] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 1 (December 1987).
[24] DRCOG, 1988-1992 TIP, 39 (December 1987).
[25] DRCOG, 1998-1992 TIP, 1 (December 1987).
[26] 49 U.S.C. § 101.
[27] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 1 (September 10, 1992).
[28] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 1 (September 10, 1992).
[29] DRCOG, 1993-1995 TIP, 3-4 (January 20, 1993).
[30] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 1 (September 10, 1992); DRCOG, 1993-1995 TIP, 1 (January 20, 1993).
[31] DRCOG, 1993-1995 TIP, 1, 3 (January 20, 1993); The Denver Metropolitan Area includes all or portions of Adams, Arapaho, Boulder, Denver, Douglas and Jefferson counties.
[32] DRCOG, 1993-1995 TIP, 1-2 (January 20, 1993).

Project Selection (RSPS)) and the goals and policies in the 2010 RTP.[34] The following is the list of factors and how they were considered in the preparation of the 1993-1995 TIP:

- **Preservation of existing transportation facilities and improving system efficiency to meet needs** – the maintenance of the existing system was given top priority.
- **Consistency with energy conservation programs, goals and objectives** – operational improvements to reduce delay and conserve fuel were given high priority.
- **Relieving current and preventing future congestion** – operational improvements which relieved then current congestion were given high priority
- **The effect of transportation decisions on land use development and consistency of the TIP with applicable short- and long-term land use and development plans** – the RTP based forecasts on land use activity.
- **The programming of funds for transportation enhancement activities** – The RSPS required consideration of multi-modal solutions to transportation needs.
- **The effects of all transportation projects in the area without regard to whether the project is publicly funded** – projects included in the TIP were developed based upon how they would affect the entire network.
- **Access to airports, intermodal facilities, major freight routes, national parks, recreation areas, monuments and historic sites, and military installations** – the new Denver International Airport (DIA) required that high priority be given to projects enhancing access to that facility.
- **The need for connectivity of area roads with roads outside the area** – the 2010 RTP required the transportation system to provide continuous facilities across large portions of the region.
- **Transportation needs as identified by the required management systems** – at the time this TIP was created, DRCOG was creating a Congestion Management System (CMS) to identify the regions of high-priority for inclusion in future TIPs.
- **Preservation and protection of rights-of-way for future transportation** – DRCOG's policy was to acquire rights-of-way that will accommodate expansion of roadways. For example, a minimum of six lanes was mandated for principal arterial roadways. Right-of-way requirements on all other classifications of roadways were in the process of being established at the time the 1993-1995 TIP was adopted. Acquisition of right-of-ways was given a low priority due to the constraints on funding.
- **Methods enhancing the efficient movement of freight** – airport access received high priority. Additionally, CDOT prepared a rail plan to maintain and upgrade rail freight service.
- **The use of life cycle costs in the design and engineering of bridges, tunnels or pavement** – the 2010 RTP requires that bridge structures be designed to serve projected traffic over their 30-year economic life.

---

[33] Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, Conference Report, H.R. No. 102-404, 102nd Congress, (Nov. 27, 1991).
[34] DRCOG, 1993-1995 TIP, 2 (January 20, 1993).

- **The overall social, economic, energy and environmental effects of transportation decisions** – of prime importance is the TIP's support of Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) contained in the approved SIP for air quality.
- **Methods expanding, enhancing and increasing the use of transit services** – in 1993, construction began on the first segment of a light rail system in downtown Denver. New transit service is given high priority.
- **Capital investments increasing security in transit systems** – such measures were under consideration by the RTD at the time of adoption of this TIP.[35]

Regional strategies for project selection were established by DRCOG in the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program Preparation*.[36] The strategies are consistent with the ISTEA and the Clean Air Act and were used to make the initial prioritization of subcategories of projects within each funding category.[37] The following is a list of the regional strategies and how the 1993-1995 TIP responded to them:

- **Maintain and improve the integrated, intermodal, metropolitan transportation system** – $25.9 million was programmed for various roadway maintenance and improvement projects.
- **Manage mobility to relieve traffic congestion** – $35.7 million was programmed for projects including intersection/ interchange improvements, traffic signal improvements and other measures to reduce delays on the roadway system.
- **Implement transportation control measures** - $191.3 million was programmed for Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) and air-quality-related projects. TCMs included transit improvements, ridesharing and bicycle facilities and an HOV lane on Santa Fe Drive. High-capital projects that supported transit included I-25/ I-70 construction to provide for HOV lanes and the widening of I-225 for an HOV lane between I-70 and US-6. Also included was a study to investigate the feasibility of rail transit or HOV construction.
- **Provide a continuous and complete transportation system** - $164.6 million was programmed for projects emphasizing the completion of the planned roadway network to minimize travel time and distance and reduce traffic congestion.
- **Consider multi-modal solutions to transportation needs** – A substantial number of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facility projects were included in the TIP. Also included were multi-modal projects.[38]

The following chart details the 11 funding categories and their subcategories. Subcategories are listed by priority (as determined by DRCOG), from highest to lowest in the following chart:[39]

[35] DRCOG, 1993-1995 TIP, 2, 44-47 (January 20, 1993).
[36] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 3 (September 10, 1992).
[37] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 3 (September 10, 1992).
[38] DRCOG, 1993-1995 TIP Selection of Projects, 3 (September 10, 1992).
[39] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 8, 13-16 (September 10, 1992).

Funding Category	Subcategory Prioritization
Interstate Completion	Only projects to complete Interstate
Interstate Maintenance	1. Rehabilitation 2. Interstate interchange reconstruction or reconfiguration 3. Addition of acceleration/ deceleration lanes 4. Other projects
National Highway System	1. Reconstruction, resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation 2. Operational improvements 3. New construction (for system continuity) 4. New construction (for capacity) 5. Other projects or studies
Surface Transportation Program	1. Same subcategories as NHS
STP Enhancement	1. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Projects 2. Other Projects
STP Safety	Safety Projects
Congestion Mitigation/ Air Quality	1. Regional Ride Sharing TCMs 2. Regional Traffic Signal Improvement TCMs 3. Other SIP TCMs 4. Other Mobility Management projects
Bridge	Bridge Reconstruction projects
Section 9	1. Transit system operation and maintenance 2. New bus service 3. Capital improvement projects 4. Other Mobility Management projects
Section 3	Discretionary transit programs
Section 18	Rural transit systems
Section 16(B)(2)	Capital assistance for elderly and handicapped projects

After initially prioritizing categories based upon regional strategy and funding subcategory, projects were put through a six-step process outlined in the policy on TIP preparation to determine priority within each subcategory.[40] The six steps include (1) candidate project lists/ project submittal; (2) project prescreening; (3) initial category assignment; (4) project evaluation; (5) draft priority selection; and (6) funding category assignment.[41]

[40] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 1 (September 10, 1992); one caveat is that carry-over projects from previous TIPs bypassed this process and were automatically included in the new TIP (see DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 1 (September 10, 1992)).[40]

[41] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 13-16 (September 10, 1992).

Step one is determined, in part, by Colorado law. [42] CDOT annually solicits submission of projects and priority recommendations from counties and municipalities through the County Hearing Process.[43] Projects submitted may include construction of roads and streets within their jurisdiction on the state highway system and all proposed projects not part of the state highway system but utilizing federal funding.[44] To avoid duplication of efforts, CDOT and DRCOG held a joint hearing on the draft TIP.

Step four was crucial in evaluating TIP criteria. It was there that project selection truly occurred.[45] Each project was assigned points to determine its priority within its subcategory.[46] The scores could not be compared across subcategories because each subcategory had a unique scoring system.[47]

The TIP process involved for 1993-1995 was an improvement over that of previous planning periods. Federal legislation played a role in many of the changes, because it outlined specific planning requirements and expanded the funding areas over which DRCOG could exert control.[48] The DRCOG Board of Directors also actively began to delineate more specific procedures for project selection. Future TIPs will show increased consistency and reliability within the process of project selection.

The following is a summary of how funds were allocated by general project type:

Highway Projects – approximately $386 million

- Interstate completion 7.0%
- Interstate maintenance 27.5%
- National Highway System 23.7%
- Bridge 3.9%
- Congestion Mitigation/ Air Quality 2.7%
- STP – Metro Denver 11.48%
- STP – Enhancement 2.1%
- STP – Safety 3.0%
- STP – Other 3.7%
- State Only 11.0%
- Local Match 4.0%

Transit Expenditures – approximately $556 million

- Section 3: Carryover 5.3%
- Section 3: Bus 2.9%
- Section 9: Carryover 0.8%
- Section 9: Urbanized Operating 3.9%

[42] Colorado Revised Statutes § 43-2-137-138.
[43] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 4 (September 10, 1992).
[44] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 4 (September 10, 1992).
[45] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 3 (September 10, 1992).
[46] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 4, 11 (September 10, 1992); carry-over projects were automatically given top priority and were not ranked. They are shown as having zero points.
[47] DRCOG, 1993-1998 TIP Selection of Projects, 6-11 (September 10, 1992).
[48] 49 U.S.C. § 101.

- Section 9: Urbanized Capital 3.4%
- Section 16: Elderly & Disabled 0.1%
- Section 18: Rural/ Small Urban 0.03%
- RTD 83.9%
- Region's Small Program Operators 0.1%

A comparison between expenditures programmed in the 1993-1995 TIP relative to the 1988-1992 TIP show a dramatic increase in funds programmed for transit. This is consistent with the general goal of shifting away from single-occupant vehicle use to alternative modes of transportation.

1995-2000 TIP. The federal requirements and elements of the ISTEA discussed in the 1993-1995 TIP remained the same for creating this TIP. Five new documents generated by DRCOG, however, changed the criteria used in project selection. The first document is the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Plan Preparation* (the *Policy*) adopted on December 15, 1993. The second is the *Transportation Improvement Program Procedural Manual: Project Evaluation and Priority Determination* (the *Procedural Manual*), also adopted on December 15, 1993. These two documents were intended to be used in conjunction by DRCOG in evaluating projects submitted by all prospective sponsors.[49] Third, the 2010 RTP was replaced by the Interim 2015 RTP.[50] Fourth, DRCOG adopted the *Pedestrian and Bicycle Element of the Regional Transportation Plan* in July 1994. Finally, in March 1994, the *Traffic Signal System Improvement Program* (TSSIP) was adopted by the Board.

The *Policy* established MPO policies for the development of the TIP and the selection of its projects, outlining general project eligibility requirements, eligible projects by funding source, and project development and evaluation.[51] The general project eligibility requirements focus on implementation of the Interim 2015 RTP and its associated elements (such as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the elderly and disabled services plan).[52] Projects must include TCMs from the approved SIP for air quality wherever possible,[53] must have committed local/ state financial support, and must meet specific eligibility requirements defined in the *Policy*.[54]

The *Policy* identifies projects within each funding source that are eligible for inclusion in the TIP.[55] If the submitted project is not included in the list, it will not be considered for inclusion in the TIP.[56] The *Policy* also notes a change in primary regional strategies. While the regional strategies identified in the 1993-1995 TIP[57] carried over to this new TIP, one additional strategy was added from the Interim 2015 RTP:

[49]DRCOG, TIP Procedural Manual, 1 (December 15, 1993).
[50] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP (adopted October 13, 1993; updated September 20, 1995).
[51] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 1 (December 15, 1993).
[52] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 7-9 (December 15, 1993).
[53] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 7 (December 15, 1993).
[54] DRCOG, TIP Procedural Manual, 5-20 (December 15, 1993).
[55] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 25-28 (December 15, 1993).
[56] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 25-28 (December 15, 1993).
[57] DRCOG, 1993-1995 TIP, 37 (January 20, 1993).

implementation of TCMs.[58] The 2015 RTP required that priority be given to the funding of TCMs adopted by the SIPs for air quality.[59] The 1995-2000 TIP implemented the regional strategies as follows:

- **Maintain and improve the integrated, intermodal, metropolitan transportation system** – $107 million was programmed for rehabilitation, maintenance and improvement projects.
- **Manage mobility to relieve traffic congestion** – $103 million was programmed for projects including intersection/ interchange improvements, traffic signal improvements, safety and other measures to reduce delays on the roadway system.
- **Implement TCMs** – $160 million was programmed for TCMs, included in the approved SIP for air quality, included transit improvements, ridesharing, bicycle facilities, an HOV lane on Santa Fe Drive, north I-25 to US 36 Bus/ HOV corridor management, and construction of the I-25 direct connection for buses.
- **System continuity and completion** - $181 million was programmed for projects which fill in gaps or extend the transportation system. By far, the largest allocation was for the Southwest corridor rapid transit project.[60]

A comparison of the 1993-1995 TIP shows significant increases in programmed funding of projects implementing the first two strategies, while programmed funding of the other categories remained largely unchanged. This show an increased emphasis on maintaining and improving the existing transportation network.

The *Policy* sets out important restrictions regarding project recommendations. While each municipality and county (and other potential sponsors) may submit project applications for activities that those jurisdictions have determined to be both in conformity with the RTP and significant to local interests, such sponsors are limited in the number of project requests allowed for each TIP period.[61] Limitations are based upon DRCOG's latest estimate of population as follows:

- Four projects for communities with a population up to 9,999
- Eight projects for communities with population between 10,000 and 49,999
- Twelve projects for communities with population between 50,000 and 999,999
- Sixteen projects for communities of 100,000 or more[62]

This process rewards counties, for example, with many municipalities located within them. For example, in 1995, the total recommendations allowed for all jurisdictions within and including Boulder County was 84, compared with a maximum of 28 for all jurisdictions within and including Douglas County, or with 32 for the City and County of Denver.[63]

[58]DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 6 (December 15, 1993).
[59] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 6 (December 15, 1993).
[60] DRCOG, 1995-2000 TIP, 63 (adopted September 10, 1995, amended November 22, 1995).
[61] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 12 (December 15, 1993).
[62] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 12 (December 15, 1993).
[63] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 13-14 (November 15, 1995).

Finally, the *Policy* summarizes 10 activities that are eligible for federal funds as Transportation Enhancements under the ISTEA.[64] The ISTEA requires that enhancement projects be related to a transportation project or the area to be served by a project.[65] The FHWA suggests three tests for eligibility: function, proximity or impact.[66] Only one of the three tests must be met to apply for funding.[67] Additionally, eligible projects must go beyond activities customarily, or required to be, incorporated into highway and transit projects.[68] The eligibility requirements for enhancement activities, developed by the CDOT, are as follows:

- **Provisions for facilities for pedestrians and bicycles** – Projects must be consistent with the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.[69]
- **Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites** – easements must be in proximity to a designated Scenic Byway or qualifying historic site, or listed in the State or National Registers of Historic Places. The applicant must certify that the significant scenic or historic values of the acquired property will be maintained.
- **Scenic or Historic Highways Program** – projects include those that will protect and enhance the scenic, historic, cultural, natural, archaeological integrity or visitor appreciation of these roadways. Funding is also available for planning and development of the state scenic byway program.
- **Landscaping and other scenic beautification** – Approval under this category of projects requires significant enhancement of the aesthetic or ecological resources along transportation corridors. Water conservation features such as xeriscape and water harvesting is strongly encouraged.
- **Historic preservation** – This includes identification, evaluation, recordation, documentation, curation, protection, management, interpretation or maintenance of any historic site, building, structure, landscape, or object; and the rehabilitation, restoration or stabilization of properties included in the State or National Registers of Historic Places. Preservation projects must be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Officer prior to submission of an application for funding.
- **Rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures and facilities** – These projects include the rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures or facilities that are listed in the State or National Registers of Historic Places. Projects must be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Officer prior to submission of an application for funding.
- **Preservation of abandoned railway corridors** – Only corridors authorized for abandonment by the Interstate Commerce Commission are eligible.

[64] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 35 (December 15, 1993).
[65] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 38 (December 15, 1993); the FHWA interprets "area served" to mean that a proposed enhancement activity must have a "direct relationship to the intermodal transportation system, but not necessarily to a currently planned highway project."
[66] For a description of the three tests, see DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 38 (December 15, 1993).
[67] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 38 (December 15, 1993).
[68] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 38 (December 15, 1993).
[69] DRCOG, Pedestrian and Bicycle Element of the RTP (July 1994).

- **Control and removal of outdoor advertising** – Funds used to remove existing signs, displays and devices must be made according to a legal process that bases payment on an equitable appraisal. Priority is given to removal of signs, displays and devices along designated scenic or historic roadways.
- **Archaeological planning and research** – This category includes archaeological planning and research in site preservation, interpretation and excavation. Also included are research projects and interpretation of sites associated with roads and other transportation facilities, planning displays, and public education materials related to highways and public transportation. Prior to submission of an application for funding, projects must be reviewed by the State Archaeologist.
- **Mitigation of water pollution due to highway run-off** – These projects are limited to mitigation of pollution from storm-water run-off from existing transportation facilities. Projects include design and construction of new storm water treatment devices and research addressing run-off problems. Projects must be designed to be compatible with existing wetlands in the project vicinity. Projects demonstrating aesthetic and ecological methods for mitigation or contribute to replenishing the groundwater are given priority.

The *Procedural Manual*, developed for use in conjunction with the *Policy*, was developed in accordance with ISTEA and defines project evaluation and priority determination procedures to be used in TIP preparation.[70] The *Procedural Manual* changed project evaluation and ranking from a six-step, to a five-step process. The five steps are (1) candidate project lists/ project submittal; (2) project type assignment; (3) project evaluation; (4) draft priority selection; and (5) funding category assignment.[71]

The *Procedural Manual*, while still utilizing the "relative scale" point allocation in many instances, allowed for a more objective allocation procedure.[72] Not only was the "relative scale" more sharply defined (requiring interpolation to determine point allocation), but also projects were allocated points based upon specific criteria. These changes eliminated some of the subjective determinations that were made in the previous TIP. Therefore, allocation of points to projects could be more easily predicted. Project sponsors could structure their projects to maximize the probability that they would be included in the TIP. This was a benefit to the region because more projects included multiple elements of the ISTEA requirements and the RTP goals and policies.

The third document that significantly changed the transportation planning process was the 2015 Interim RTP that was prepared in response to the ISTEA. It was meant to serve as the region's long-term plan until a 2020 plan could be prepared.[73] This RTP was far more comprehensive than the 2010 RTP, providing a definition of the most needed projects that could and should be built over the two-decade period it covered.[74]

[70] DRCOG, TIP Procedural Manual, 1 (December 15, 1993).
[71] DRCOG, TIP Procedural Manual, 1 (December 15, 1993).
[72] DRCOG, TIP Procedural Manual, 1 (December 15, 1993).
[73] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, i (October 13, 1993).
[74] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, i (October 13, 1993).

The creation of the 2015 Interim RTP included the following steps: (1) defining the region's intermodal and multimodal goals and policies; (2) evaluating travel demand, financing, and social, environmental and energy factors; (3) comparison of six alternative transportation and land use scenarios; (4) identification of congested travel corridors and potential multimodal improvements and management options were considered; and (5) determining whether capacity increases and/or congestion management activities would be most appropriate for a given problem, and including those conclusions in the plan.[75] The process involved cooperation with the CDOT, the RTD, the RAQC, and the Air Pollution Control Division (APCD) of the State Health Department.[76]

The RTP significantly affects TIPs covered during the period. Projects eligible for funding in TIPs are defined in the RTP.[77] Therefore, the decision-making process must be closely examined with respect to fairness in the process to ensure that regional, rather than local transportation needs are being met.

To help ensure an inclusive regional perspective, a number of committees are involved in the regional planning process, including: (1) the Transportation Policy Committee which consists of board members interested in transportation policy, representatives of the private sector and interested citizens; (2) the Transportation Committee, comprised of policy representatives of the major regional and state agencies concerned with transportation and air quality planning (DRCOG, CDOT, RTD, RAQC, and APCD); (3) the Transportation Advisory Committee which consists of transportation planners and engineers from each of the local governments in the region and federal and state representatives; and (4) specialized task forces and committees, such as the Pedestrian/ Bicycle Transportation Plan Task Force and the Advisory Committee on Specialized Transportation.[78] The DRCOG Board of Directors is the final decision-making body, taking recommendations and advice from the various committees and task forces.[79]

While DRCOG is charged with developing the regional plans, CDOT is required, by state and federal law, to develop a comprehensive statewide plan. CDOT integrated the 2015 Interim RTP into that state plan.[80] Additionally, coordination of planning with the SIP for Air Quality is accomplished through involvement by the responsible air quality agencies at policy and technical levels in the process.[81] Finally, the Regional Planning Advisory Committee assists in the planning process by reviewing the land development assumptions used to forecast travel demands.[82]

[75] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 2 (October 13, 1993).
[76] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 2 (October 13, 1993).
[77] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 6 (October 13, 1993).
[78] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 6 (October 13, 1993).
[79] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 6 (October 13, 1993).
[80] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 2 (October 13, 1993).
[81] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 6 (October 13, 1993).
[82] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 6 (October 13, 1993).

Generally, the goals and policies of the 2015 Interim RTP reflect the need to reduce congestion, support economic development, and preserve the environment.[83] The RTP focuses on management techniques aimed at decreasing peak period demand and increasing efficiency, and expanding highway and rapid transit systems to relieve congestion. The investment strategy in the Denver area, under this plan, shifts toward a greater emphasis on transit and HOV facilities.[84] Economic development is supported by congestion relief that will aid in the movement of people and goods, reducing travel costs for businesses. Further, provisions for rapid transit facilities will provide additional accessibility to downtown Denver.[85] The environment is preserved where the RTP is successful in providing alternative-mode capacity that allows a shift away from single-occupant vehicles to alternative modes.[86]

In addition to setting goals and policies, the RTP must also set objectives for the six management systems mandated by ISTEA:

- Pavement Management System - identifies cost-effective actions and priorities for providing and maintaining pavements
- Public Transit Facilities Management System - identifies and implements management actions to provide and maintain public transit services, facilities, equipment, and rolling stock in a cost-effective manner
- Bridge Management System – identifies cost-effective maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation actions for bridges and bridge elements using life-cycle cost analysis and identifying priority bridge improvements
- Safety Management System – develops a cost-effective, comprehensive approach to reduce the number and severity of highway accidents, and identify priority improvements.
- Congestion Management System – identifies candidate corridors for capital and/ or management actions and prioritizes management improvement. Identifies cost-effective travel demand reduction and operational actions to manage new and existing facilities so that traffic congestion is reduced and the mobility of persons and goods is enhanced.
- Intermodal Management System – integrates transportation facilities and systems, and improves coordination in planning and implementation of air and surface transportation systems. Identifies cost-effective capital and/ or management acts and prioritizes improvements.[87]

The fourth document affecting the 1995-2000 TIP selection process was the *Pedestrian and Bicycle Element of the Regional Transportation Plan*. The emphasis on alternative transportation modes resulted in a significant increase in funding for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The *Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan* is broad, leaving specific details to be addressed at the local level due to their primarily local nature.[88]

[83] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 13-16, 43 (October 13, 1993).
[84] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 43 (October 13, 1993).
[85] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 43 (October 13, 1993).
[86] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 43 (October 13, 1993).
[87] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 16-17 (October 13, 1993).
[88] DRCOG, Pedestrian and Bicycle Element of the RTP, 1 (July 1994).

DRCOG's responsibilities include ensuring that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are considered in projects implemented through the TIP; encouraging continuity of facilities; providing technical assistance to local governments; and encouraging the provision of bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities.[89] There are, however, no federal funds specifically dedicated to bicycle and pedestrian projects.[90] These projects must compete with other roadway and transit projects for ISTEA, state and local transportation funds, and with parks and recreation projects for lottery funds.[91]

Finally, the TSSIP is a guide for the implementation of cost-effective traffic signal timing and coordination improvements within the DRCOG TMA.[92] It is a support document for the signal system improvements proposed for inclusion in the 1997-2002 TIP.[93] Three types of projects are included: (1) capital improvements to signal systems in the region; (2) timing and coordination work; and (3) improvements to current operating procedures and practices.[94]

The 1995-2000 TIP lists a number of priority considerations in project selection (under the section of "regional strategies"), including the following: multi-modal solutions to transportation needs; alternatives to single-occupant vehicle use through transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facility projects; and airport access.[95]

The following is a summary of how the 1995-2000 TIP responds to the 15 ISTEA factors that must be considered during preparation of the TIP:

- **Preservation of existing transportation facilities and, where practical, ways to meet transportation needs by using existing transportation facilities more efficiently** – the TIP makes this a top priority in project selection. Projects intended to increase efficiency of the existing system include the DRCOG traffic signal coordination program, improved transit service, and traffic engineering improvements.
- **The consistency of transportation planning with applicable federal, state, and local energy conservation programs, goals, and objectives** – operational improvements to reduce delay and conserve fuel are given a high priority in project selection. The TIP emphasized HOV facilities and transit improvements.
- **The need to relieve congestion and prevent congestion from occurring where it does not yet occur** – operational improvements which relieve current congestion are given high priority. A major factor in project selection dealt with identification of congested corridors.
- **The likely effect of transportation policy decisions on land use and development and the consistency of transportation plans and programs with**

[89] DRCOG, Pedestrian and Bicycle Element of the RTP, 1 (July 1994).
[90] DRCOG, Pedestrian and Bicycle Element of the RTP, 79 (July 1994).
[91] DRCOG, Pedestrian and Bicycle Element of the RTP, 79 (July 1994).
[92] DRCOG, Traffic Signal System Improvement Program (hereinafter TSSIP), 1, 5 (August 21, 1996).
[93] DRCOG, TSSIP, 1 (August 21, 1996).
[94] DRCOG, TSSIP, 1 (August 21, 1996).
[95] DRCOG, 1995-2000 TIP, 70 (adopted September 10, 1995, amended November 22, 1995).

the provisions of all applicable short- and long-term land use and development plans – one of the three primary goals of the 2015 Interim RTP is to "integrate planning for transportation, air quality, and regional development." The effect of changing transportation investments on land use development patterns was a consideration in project selection.

- **The programming of expenditures on transportation enhancement activities as required in Section 133** – this TIP emphasized bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements in the allocation of enhancement funding.
- **The effects of all transportation projects to be undertaken within the metropolitan area, without regard to whether such projects are publicly funded** – TIP projects were selected based upon entire network effects.
- **International border crossings and access to ports, airports, intermodal transportation facilities, major freight distribution routes, national parks, recreation areas, monuments and historic sites, and military installations** – ground transportation alternatives to the new DIA (which opened in February 1995) were of primary importance in TIP preparation.
- **The need for connectivity of roads within the metropolitan area with roads outside the metropolitan area** – connecting regional roadways to the remainder of the state was an important consideration in TIP preparation.
- **The transportation needs identified through use of the management systems required by Section 303 of Title 23** – ISTEA defines six management systems. While the RTP commits to develop these systems, recommendations were not available at the time of this TIP creation.
- **Preservation of rights-of-way for construction of future transportation projects, including identification of unused rights-of-way which may be needed for future transportation corridors and identification of those corridors for which action is most needed to prevent destruction or loss** – RTD land-banked significant rights-of-way identified in the 2015 Interim RTP.
- **Methods to enhance the efficient movement of freight** – the TIP allocation funds for studies aimed at solving the existing congestion problems that impede freight operations.
- **The use of life-cycle costs in the design and engineering of bridges, tunnels, or pavement** – the six management systems under development will address the use of life-cycle costs. As those systems are eventually implemented, the use of life-cycle costs will become part of the regional planning process.
- **The overall social, economic, energy, and environmental effects of transportation decisions** – a primary consideration in TIP creation is support of TCMs contained in the approved SIP for air quality.
- **Methods to expand and enhance transit services and to increase the use of such services** – this TIP identifies transit and HOV improvements to be constructed, and funds three major corridor studies.
- **Capital investments that will result in increased security in transit systems** – this TIP includes enhanced communications systems to improve safety.[96]

[96] DRCOG, 1995-2000 TIP, 70, 72-74 (adopted September 20, 1995, amended November 22, 1995).

The creation process of the 1995-2000 TIP is an improvement over the previous TIP project selection process, primarily due to the improved project ranking criteria. Additionally, the DRCOG Board of Directors was actively involved in standardizing this process by outlining specific procedures, adopting an Interim RTP, and various elements of that RTP. This TIP reflects the continued shift toward congestion management, network preservation, and alternative transportation modes and away from single-occupant vehicle use.

1997-2002 TIP. At the time this TIP was created, the ISTEA was still the controlling federal legislation guiding the process, as was the Interim 2015 RTP at the regional level. One new DRCOG document, the *Policy on Transportation Improvement Program Preparation* (the *1995 Policy*) (adopted November 15, 1995), changed the TIP process slightly from that used in the creation of the 1995-2000 TIP.

The *1995 Policy* synthesizes, with the following changes, the *Procedural Manual* and the *Policy* of December 15, 1993. The first change relates to funding. Flexing funds could now only be used for rapid transit projects and park-n-Ride lots. However, where flex funds were used for park-n-Ride lots, those facilities were required to be open for use by both public and private carriers.[97] The second change is that where project sponsors chose a project from the 2015 Interim RTP, additional points were allocated during the project ranking so that the probability of selection of projects listed in the RTP was increased, and sponsors were encouraged to support the long-range regional goals and policies.[98] Third, general-purpose transit projects had to be submitted through RTD's local government process.[99] Fourth, the project evaluation method was changed back to six steps by adding a final step evaluating project readiness.[100] Fifth, increases in project costs now had to be borne by the project sponsor. Sixth, congested corridors were identified.[101] Seventh, qualified enhancement activities were more clearly defined than in the 1993 *Policy*. [102] Finally, the scoring system was changed. The number of points allocated changed for various selection criteria, and new selection criteria were added. For example, under the category of widening projects, air pollution reductions and projects on the RTP priority list were now given additional points.[103]

The 1997-2002 TIP implemented regional strategies as follows:

- **Maintain and improve the integrated, intermodal, metropolitan transportation system** - $142,330,000 was programmed for rehabilitation, maintenance and improvement projects.

[97] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 11 (November 15, 1995).
[98] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 11 (November 15, 1995).
[99] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 12 (November 15, 1995).
[100][100] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 16 (November 15, 1995).
[101] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 37 (November 15, 1995).
[102] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 12 (November 15, 1995).
[103] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 17-30 (November 15, 1995).

- **Manage mobility to relieve traffic congestion** - $85,590,000 was programmed for intersection/ interchange improvements, traffic signal improvements, safety and other measures to reduce delays on the roadway system.
- **Implement transportation control measures** – $175, 059,000 was programmed for specific TCMs included in the SIP for Air Quality, including transit improvements, ridesharing and bicycle facilities and an HOV lane on Santa Fe Drive.
- **System continuity and completion** –$117,602,000 was programmed for projects that fill in gaps or extend the transportation system.
- **Other needs** – Airport access needs were a primary focus of this TIP. Funding was allocated to projects a number of major projects designed to improve access.[104]

As with the previous TIP, this TIP continues to increase programmed funding for maintaining the existing transportation system. Funding for relief of traffic congestion, however, did not increase as it had in the previous TIP. Funding for system continuity and completion had similarly decreased. The combination of the two shows a decreased emphasis on relieving current and preventing future traffic congestion. Counterbalancing that, on the other hand, was increased funding for TCMs, which is consistent with the strategies of improving transit and encouraging alternative modes of transportation.

The 1997-2002 TIP responded to the 15 ISTEA factors the same way as it had in the 1995-2000 TIP, except that the Pavement Management System and the Congestion Management System were installed. These systems were instrumental in evaluating projects selected for pavement reconstruction or for operational improvements.[105]

1999-2004 TIP. A number of changes affected the creation of this TIP. First, TEA-21[106] was enacted, changing the federal requirements. Also, the Metro Vision 2020 RTP (September 16, 1998) was adopted by the DRCOG Board of Directors.

The TEA-21 legislation makes changes in funding levels, yet retains planning provisions similar to those in the ISTEA.[107] This TIP was developed based upon ISTEA, not TEA-21, because TEA-21 was enacted in June 1998, midway in the preparation of the TIP, and it was not yet clear as to how the new funding levels would affect the RTP.[108] The following is a summary of specific federal requirements in the preparation of this TIP:

- All projects in the TIP must be consistent with the region's transportation plan.
- The maintenance of the existing system is emphasized and the addition of capacity for single-occupant vehicles is discouraged. Generally, all alternatives

[104] DRCOG, 1997-2002 TIP, 61, 66 (adopted February 19, 1997, amended April 30, 1997).
[105] DRCOG, 1997-2002 TIP, 66, 68-70 (adopted February 19, 1997, amended April 30, 1997).
[106] The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century of 1998, Pub. L. No. 105-178.
[107] DRCOG, 1999-2004 TIP, 1 (September 16, 1998).
[108] DRCOG, 1999-2004 TIP, 1 (September 16, 1998).

must be exhausted before significant capacity is added for single-occupant vehicles unless the project is part of an approved congestion management system.

- Funding of environmentally sensitive projects contained in the approved SIP for air quality is mandated.
- DRCOG and CDOT are empowered to select projects for inclusion in the TIP. With the exception of Interstate, National Highway System and Bridge projects, DRCOG, in consultation with CDOT, is responsible for selecting projects. The state selects the excepted projects cooperatively with DRCOG.
- The projects in the TIP must be fiscally constrained by reasonable expectations of available revenue.[109] The TIP must consist of a priority list of projects to be carried out within each three-year period after the initial adoption of the TIP.[110]

TEA-21 replaced the ISTEA's 15 factors with seven, which need to be considered in TIP preparation. The following describes how these factors were considered:

- **Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency** – several projects were included in this TIP to improve access to DIA.
- **Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users** – safety is a factor in the evaluation criteria for both highway and bicycle/ pedestrian projects.
- **Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and for freight** – this TIP includes plans for both a Southwest and a Southeast Corridor Light Rail Transit line.
- **Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life** – proposed transit and highway projects were evaluated for their environmental impact at the system level. If projects are selected for inclusion in the TIP, they must then pass appropriate environmental reviews. Project evaluation criteria include the change in volume to capacity ratio, reduced delay, reduced pollutants and reduced vehicle miles of travel. Energy conservation is stressed throughout the TIP by closing gaps in the existing system to reduce delays and congestion. This improved mobility also serves economic vitality and thereby promotes quality of life.
- **Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight** – The TIP policy gives priority to highway projects that improve intermodal connections to freight terminals and also for provisions for bus stops and other transit amenities. Bicycle/ pedestrian projects that provide a connection to transit are given high priority in the TIP
- **Promote efficient systems management and operation** – project evaluation criteria were used to promote efficient system management and operation. Projects selected include traffic signal coordination projects, RTD efforts to improve transit service, and traffic-engineering improvements made by CDOT and local governments to the freeway and arterial network.
- **Emphasize the preservation of the existing system** – maintenance of existing systems is given top priority. Projects included replacing and repairing essential

[109] DRCOG, 1999-2004 TIP, 1-2 (September 16, 1998).
[110] DRCOG, 1999-2004 TIP, 2 (September 16, 1998).

bridges and roadways within the Metropolitan area. Transit buses were replaced as well.[111]

The *Policy on TIP Preparation* (the *1999 Policy*) (March 30, 1999) incorporates the new TEA-21 and the Metro Vision 2020 RTP requirements into the planning process.[112] The transportation objectives in the Metro Vision 2020 RTP include: implementation of rapid transit; reconfiguration of the bus network to serve the rapid transit system; improvement of the bus service to serve markets not served by the rapid transit system; restoration and maintenance of transportation facilities; provisions for high-capital transportation facilities; increased use of non-motorized modes in serving non-recreational travel; improved multi-modal freight and passenger travel and connections throughout the state; and seeking increased funding.[113]

Strategies are identified in the *1999 Policy* to provide direction for the selection of TIP projects that implement the objectives listed in the above paragraph.[114] The following is a summary of those strategies listed in priority order:

- **Maintain and improve the integrated, multi-modal metropolitan transportation system** – maintenance of the existing transportation system is also a key focus of the TEA-21. These projects include highway reconstruction and resurfacing, transit vehicle rehabilitation and replacement, and bridge reconstruction and replacement.
- **Implement TCMs to meet air quality goals** – projects included those in the approved SIP for air quality.
- **Manage mobility to relieve traffic congestion** – project types include safety, highway and transit operational improvements, interchange reconstruction, and Congestion Reduction/ Air Quality improvement measures.
- **Provide a continuous and complete multi-modal transportation system** – projects include roadway widening, new roads, new interchanges, and new transit facilities. Projects must be consistent with transportation management requirements.
- **Enhance the transportation system** – top priority is given to nonmotorized travel modes. Projects include continuous pedestrian and bicycle networks within travel sheds.[115]

Projects are submitted by each municipality, county and other sponsors within the MPO jurisdiction, subject to the same limitations described in the *1993 Policy*.[116] Project selection begins with meeting basic eligibility requirements. The *1999 Policy* mandates that projects be in conformity with the 2020 RTP and also lists

[111] DRCOG, 1999-2004 TIP, 65, 68-69 (September 16, 1998).
[112] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 1 (March 30, 1999).
[113] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 2, 4 (March 30, 1999).
[114] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 4 (March 30, 1999).
[115] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 4-5 (March 30, 1999).
[116] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 14 (March 30, 1999); DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 7-9 (December 15, 1993).

additional requirements by project type.[117] Some project types (such as rapid transit capacity, highway widenings, new roadways, and new interchanges) may only include projects specified in the 2020 RTP.[118] If a sponsor wishes have a project considered which is not on the list, an amendment must be made to the 2020 RTP.[119] Carryover projects must be resubmitted. If the project scope or federal funding request is unchanged, the project will automatically be included in the TIP. If there have been changes, however, the project must be reevaluated, using the selection criteria of the *1999 Policy*.[120] Other general requirements include sufficient local/ state financial support, minimum financial requirements needed to implement the project, and air quality conformity.[121]

Certain projects listed in the RTP are given priority over all others.[122] These include TCMs included in approved SIPs for air quality.[123] Other projects must be scored within each project type to determine priority ranking. DRCOG staff does the initial scoring, which is then reviewed by the Transportation Advisory Committee. The results are then reported to the TPC who may direct that revisions be made to the project evaluation.[124]

The project scoring and ranking method was changed in the *1999 Policy* to ensure consistency with the Metro Vision 2020 RTP and the TEA-21.[125] For example, credit is given to highway projects that incorporate Transportation Systems Management and multimodal components such as bicycle paths, and also for overmatching funds. Further, the *1999 Policy* recognizes the relationship between transportation and development in project evaluation.[126] Conformity with *Metro Vision 2020* requires jurisdictions to formally adopt urban growth boundaries.

TEA-21 changed funding categories and subcategories, which changes project eligibility to some degree.[127] An emphasis is placed on environmental factors, such as air quality, and a shift is continued toward transit use and away from single-occupant vehicle use. For example, capacity and accessibility projects using TEA-21 funding may not cause an increase in carrying capacity of single occupant vehicles unless those projects are part of an approved CMS.[128] TEA-21 also places general

[117] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 8-11 (March 30, 1999).
[118] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 7 (March 30, 1999).
[119] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 7 (March 30, 1999).
[120] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 16 (March 30, 1999).
[121] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 16-17 (March 30, 1999).
[122] For the roadway capacity improvement prioritization scoring system, see DRCOG, Metro Vision 2020 RTP, 99-120 (September 16, 1998).
[123] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 11 (March 30, 1999).
[124] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 18 (March 30, 1999).
[125] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 19-41 (March 30, 1999).
[126] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 5 (March 30, 1999).
[127] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, Appendix A (March 30, 1999).
[128] DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, 48 (March 30, 1999).

restrictions on enhancement projects. For a new enhancement project to be eligible, it must fall into one or more of ten broad categories.[129]

The *Metro Vision 2020 RTP* more closely examines land use and transportation interrelationships, and travel reduction and management activities than the previous RTP.[130] The 2020 RTP calls for more efficient development that supports transit, protects recreation areas and open space, protects the environment, and provides diversity in community and housing choices.[131]

Metro Vision 2020 has six core elements: (1) control of urban development; (2) preservation of open space; (3) separation of free-standing communities; (4) balancing a multi-modal transportation system with rapid transit, regional bus networks, regional beltways, bike and pedestrian facilities, and improvements to the existing roadway system; (5) development of urban centers; and (6) preservation of the environment.[132]

The following is a summary of how regional strategies were implemented by the 1999-2004 TIP:

- **Maintain and improve the integrated, intermodal, metropolitan transportation system** - $272,373,000 was programmed for various rehabilitation, maintenance and improvement projects.
- **Implement TCMs to meet air quality goals** – $68,420,000 was programmed for TCMs, including transit improvements, ridesharing and an HOV lane on Santa Fe Drive. It also includes highway capital projects that support transit, such as constructing the I-25 direct connection for buses and HOVs, as well as transportation management organizations.
- **Manage mobility to relieve congestion** - $257,330,000 was programmed for intersection/ interchange improvements, traffic and transit operational improvements, safety and other measures to reduce delays on the roadway system.
- **Provide a continuous and complete multi-modal transportation system** - $319,141,000 was programmed to fill in gaps or extend the transportation system.

Other needs

- **Multimodal solutions to transportation needs** – a substantial number of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facility projects are listed in the TIP. Also, highway

[129] The 10 qualifying activities include the following: (1) provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists; (2) acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites; (3) scenic or historic highway programs; (4) landscaping and other scenic beautification; (5) historic preservation; (6) rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities (including historic railway facilities and canals); (7) preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including the conversion and use thereof for pedestrian or bicycle trails); (8) control and removal of outdoor advertising; (9) archaeological planning and research; and (10) mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff. DRCOG, Policy on TIP Preparation, Appendix B (March 30, 1999).
[130] DRCOG, 2015 Interim RTP, 1(October 13, 1993).
[131] DRCOG, Metro Vision 2020 RTP 21 (September 16, 1998).
[132] DRCOG, Metro Vision 2020 RTP 21 (September 16, 1998).

projects were given credit and priority if sidewalks and bicycle facilities were included under the project selection criteria.

- **Airport access** – a number of high capital projects were continued in this TIP to improve access to the Denver International Airport.[133]

Programmed funding for all but implementation of TCMs was sharply up. The reason is completion of high-capital projects, such as HOV lanes. The largest increases in programmed funds were for congestion management and system completion, probably reflecting the significant population growth in the Denver Metropolitan Area.

[133] DRCOG, 1999-2004 TIP, 59, 65 (September 16, 1998).