



Pikes Peak Area
Council of Governments

Communities Working Together

Pikes Peak Council of Governments
Transportation Improvement Program
Policies and Procedures

Amended July 2026



PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW	4
INTRODUCTION	4
APPLICABILITY.....	4
HIERARCHY OF AUTHORITIES	5
MODIFICATION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	5
CONTINUATION AND AUTHORITY.....	5
COMPATIBILITY WITH STATE LEGISLATION	5
RELEVANT FEDERAL REGULATIONS.....	5
REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS	6
PPACG TIP POLICIES	7
<i>TIP Schedule</i>	7
TIP PO1.0	7
<i>TIP Development and Policies</i>	7
TIP PO2.0 (Fiscal Constraint)	7
TIP PO3.0 (Consistency with the LRTP).....	7
TIP PO4.0 (Project Selection in the First Year).....	7
TIP PO5.0 (Funding Requirements for Early Years)	7
TIP PO6.0 (Project Advancement)	8
TIP PO7.0 (Privately Funded Projects)	8
TIP PO8.0 (Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy and the Unscheduled Pool)	8
TIP PO9.0 (Programming by Phase).....	8
TIP PO10.0 (Non-Infrastructure Projects and Planning Studies)	9
<i>TIP Revisions</i>	9
TIP PO11.0 (TIP Revision Types and Process Overview)	9
TIP PO12.0 (LRTP Consistency Requirements for TIP Amendments).....	10
TIP PO13.0 (Capacity Projects and CMP/Conformity Requirements).....	10
TIP PO14.0 (Fiscal Constraint for Amendments and Modifications)	11
TIP FUNDS.....	11
TIP PO15.0 (Annual Availability of Federal Funds)	11
TIP PO16.0 (Timely Obligation and Roll Forwards).....	11
TIP PO17.0 (Notification of Unused Funds)	11
TIP PO18.0 (Return of Unused Project Funds).....	11
TIP PO19.0 (Regional Management Reserve).....	12
TIP PO20.0 (Cost Overruns: Definitions and Procedures).....	13
TIP PO21.0 (Advanced Construction Agreements)	13
TIP PO22.0 (Regional Prioritization of Funds).....	14
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT RESPONSIBILITIES	14
TIP PO23.0 (Sponsor Responsibilities)	14
TIP PO24.0 (PPACG Responsibilities)	15
TIP PO25.0 (Exception Management and Policy Compliance).....	16
PPACG PROCEDURES	17
<i>TIP Development</i>	17
TIP PR1.0 (Development of Federal Funding Estimates)	17
TIP PR2.0 (Call for Projects Issuance)	17
TIP PR3.0 (Draft Project List Development).....	18
TIP PR4.0 (Air Quality and Title VI Review).....	18
TIP PR5.0 (TIP Public Open House Scheduling).....	18
TIP PR6.0 (Public Comment and Final TIP Adoption).....	18
<i>TIP Amendment Procedures</i>	18



TIP PR7.0 (Amendment Procedure).....	18
TIP PR8.0 (TAC Review and Recommendation for Amendments)	19
<i>Appendix A: PPACG Acronyms (Updated 3.2023)</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Appendix B: TIP Project Prioritization and Scoring.....</i>	<i>26</i>



Purpose and Overview

These policies and procedures are designed to provide clarity, consistency, and transparency to the transportation planning and programming process in the Pikes Peak region. The policies establish a consistent decision-making framework that ensures all jurisdictions and transportation modes are treated consistently. The procedures outline the methods by which regional planning and programming are conducted, offering transparency to PPACG member jurisdictions and the public.

Introduction

Federal transportation planning regulations require the formation of a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in any urbanized area with a population exceeding 50,000¹. In regions where the population surpasses 200,000, the MPO receives the designation of a Transportation Management Area (TMA)² and becomes subject to additional federal requirements.

The Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) functions as both the MPO and TMA for the Colorado Springs Urbanized Area (UZA). Federal law requires the development of a Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for this area. The LRTP is a long-range policy and planning document, that is updated at least every five years for areas in attainment or four years for areas in nonattainment. The LRTP sets the region's transportation vision, goals, and investment priorities over a minimum 20-year horizon. The TIP is a short-range, fiscally constrained program of specific transportation projects covering at least four years. The TIP implements the LRTP by programming federal, state and local match funding for projects.

It is important to note that the federally defined UZA and MPO boundaries do not align exactly with the broader service area covered by PPACG in the organization's role as the regional Council of Governments, which includes El Paso, Park, and Teller Counties.

Colorado is divided into 15 Transportation Planning Regions (TPRs). The five MPOs in the state correspond to TPRs 1 through 5. The remaining areas of the state are covered by TPRs 6 through 15. The geographic area represented by PPACG includes the Pikes Peak MPO (TPR #1) as well as a portion of the Central Front Range TPR (TPR #14).

Applicability

These policies and procedures apply solely to the development of the TIP for the Pikes Peak MPO/TMA. Projects or programs located or operated outside the MPO boundary—but within Park, Teller, or El Paso Counties—are subject to the TIP development process established by the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) for Central Front Range TPR (TPR #14).

¹ 23 CFR 450.310(a)

² 23 CFR 450.310(c)



Hierarchy of Authorities

These TIP policies and procedures are aligned with all applicable federal transportation planning and programming regulations (3). Given the dual role of PPACG as both the MPO/TMA and TPR #1, these procedures are designed to complement CDOT's statewide TPR planning processes where applicable. In addition to compliance with federal and state regulations, the PPACG Board of Directors may adopt additional policies to meet regional needs. These policies must remain consistent with federal regulations and state statutes.

Modification of Policies and Procedures

Unless expressly delegated by the PPACG Board of Directors, modification, deletion, or addition of a policy shall require formal Board action. Procedures, by contrast, may be revised by PPACG staff or the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), provided those modifications do not conflict with existing direction from the Board, rules established by the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), or regulations issued by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Continuation and Authority

These TIP Policies and Procedures shall remain in effect unless formally amended by the PPACG Board of Directors or another duly authorized body. Additional procedural guidance may be introduced, modified, or removed by the Executive Director when acting in accordance with Board-approved policies. Revisions may also be required because of changes in FHWA or FTA policies or federal transportation legislation.

Compatibility with State Legislation

The Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.) already provide directions regarding Highway Users Tax Funds (HUTF) and related eligibility requirements. These Policies and Procedures do not alter or supersede statutory funding eligibility standards.

TIP development within the Pikes Peak region will follow 2 Code of Colorado Regulations (CCR) 601-22⁴, Rules Governing the Statewide Transportation Planning Process and Transportation Planning Regions.

Administrative updates to this document will be made as needed to reflect changes in applicable state or federal regulations.

Relevant Federal Regulations

Below is a summary of the relevant federal regulations that apply to the transportation planning process in general or development of the TIP specifically. Appendix "A" contains the specific citations.

³ <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/23>

⁴ <https://www.coloradosos.gov/CCR/GenerateRulePdf.do?ruleVersionId=11562&fileName=2%20CCR%20601-22>



- The MPO shall conduct a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive performance-based multimodal transportation planning process.
- The metropolitan transportation planning process needs to be done in coordination with CDOT and the statewide transportation planning process.
- The MPO shall develop the plan in consultation with all interested parties.
- The MPO should include public participation as part of the transportation planning process.
- The MPO planning process shall incorporate performance measures and targets.
- The MPO, as a TMA, shall have a congestion management process incorporated into the planning process.
- The TIP shall cover a period of not less than 4 years.
- The TIP shall be updated at least every 4 years.
- The TIP may cover more than 4 years. FHWA and the FTA will consider the projects in additional years as informational.
- The TIP shall contain all regionally significant projects requiring an action by the FHWA or the FTA whether or not the projects are to be funded under title 23 U.S.C. Chapters 1 and 2 or title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 (e.g., addition of an interchange to the Interstate System with State, local, and/or private funds and congressionally designated projects not funded under 23 U.S.C. or 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53). For public information and conformity purposes, the TIP shall include all regionally significant projects proposed to be funded with Federal funds other than those administered by the FHWA or the FTA, as well as all regionally significant projects to be funded with non-Federal funds.
- The TIP shall include, for each project or phase, the following:
 - Sufficient descriptive material (*i.e.*, type of work, termini, and length) to identify the project or phase.
 - Estimated total project cost, which may extend beyond the 4 years of the TIP.
 - The amount of Federal funds proposed to be obligated during each program year for the project or phase (for the first year, this includes the proposed category of Federal funds and source(s) of non-Federal funds. For the second, third, and fourth years, this includes the likely category or possible categories of Federal funds and sources of non-Federal funds).
 - Identification of the agencies responsible for carrying out the project or phase.
- Each project or project phase included in the TIP shall be consistent with the approved LRTP.
- The TIP must be fiscally constrained by fund source by year.

Regionally Significant Projects

All regionally significant projects must be included in the TIP in accordance with federal regulations at 23 CFR 450.326(f)⁵. A project is considered regionally significant if it meets either of the following criteria:

⁵ <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/chapter-I/subchapter-E/part-450>



- 1). The project, regardless of funding source, requires approval or other action by FHWA or FTA.
- 2). The project is funded with federal funds not administered by FHWA or FTA or is funded entirely by non-federal sources but meets the definition of regional significance.

PPACG TIP Policies

TIP Schedule

TIP PO1.0 – PPACG adopts a new Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) every two years. The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) adopts a new Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) annually and maintains a 10-year project programming framework. PPACG and CDOT will coordinate on a regular basis to reconcile any discrepancies between the TIP and STIP, ensuring consistency between regional and statewide programming efforts.

TIP PO1.1 – Both CDOT and PPACG acknowledge the difference in programming cycles and continue to address this issue through collaborative statewide planning efforts and a formal Planning Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). Coordination is ongoing to ensure alignment between regional and statewide plans.

TIP Development and Policies

TIP PO2.0 (Fiscal Constraint) – The TIP must demonstrate fiscal constraint within each individual funding source for each of the first four years.

TIP PO3.0 (Consistency with the LRTP) – Only projects that are consistent with the region's adopted Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) may be included in the TIP. Projects must be described in sufficient detail in both the TIP and the LRTP to allow a reasonable determination of consistency.

TIP PO4.0 (Project Selection in the First Year) – Projects programmed in the first year of the TIP constitute the "agreed-to" list for selection purposes.

TIP PO4.1 – Any project in the first year of the TIP is automatically considered "selected," and no further action is needed.

TIP PO5.0 (Funding Requirements for Early Years) – Projects may not appear in the first two years of the TIP unless the programmed phase is fully funded and local match will be available in the programmed year.

TIP PO5.1 – Full funding for all phases must be reasonably foreseeable for any project to be considered for programming in the TIP



TIP P06.0 (Project Advancement) – In accordance with federal regulation, projects in the second, third, and fourth years of the TIP [23 CFR 450.332(a)]⁶ and STIP may be advanced in place of another project. To proceed with any project beyond the first year of the TIP, specific actions must be undertaken as outlined in P010.0 – P013.0.

TIP P07.0 (Privately Funded Projects) – Privately funded projects must provide documented evidence of financial commitment. The sponsoring jurisdiction must submit written confirmation to PPACG that the private funding is reasonably expected to be available in the programmed year of expenditure.

TIP P08.0 (Use-It-or-Lose-It Policy and the Unscheduled Pool) – Regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) Metro (STBG program), Carbon Reduction Program (CRP), and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) (STBG-set aside program) funds have a use it or lose it policy, unless CDOT expressly states that we may roll forward funds from previous years. Therefore, if those funds are not obligated in the year they are programmed, then that money could be lost from the region. To help mitigate the possibility of losing regional funds, the TIP shall have an appendix with a prioritized listing of regional projects for years 5-10, called the “Unscheduled Pool” which can be amended into the current TIP years if funding were to become available and other regional funding priorities have been met.

TIP P08.1 – The Unscheduled Pool will support long-term planning and allow jurisdictions to strategically phase and space projects. Projects in this pool will be prioritized using the same scoring criteria applied to the fiscally constrained four-year TIP and listed by year. Projects may include:

- 1). Projects submitted during the Call for Projects that could not be accommodated within the fiscally constrained four-year program.
- 2). Construction phases of projects already listed in the first four years of the TIP.

TIP P08.2 – While the Unscheduled Pool is not required to demonstrate fiscal constraint by individual year, a level of constraint should be maintained. Collectively, years 5 through 10 must remain constrained within the five-year allocation estimates defined in the LRTP.

TIP P08.3 – Inclusion in the Unscheduled Pool does not guarantee future funding. Projects must be resubmitted with updated scope and cost estimates when a new TIP is developed. Jurisdictions actively advancing their projects should be given strong consideration. Priority should be considered construction phases of projects that have received prior funding for preconstruction activities (e.g., design, NEPA, ROW).

TIP P09.0 (Programming by Phase) – Federally funded projects must be programmed by phase unless all phases can be completed within one federal fiscal year. In all other cases, sponsors must request programming for preconstruction activities first. Funding for the construction

⁶ <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/chapter-I/subchapter-E/part-450/subpart-C/section-450.332>



phase may be requested once preconstruction is complete and cost estimates and scopes are updated.

TIP PO9.1 – Project evaluation and selection will consider the full scope and benefits of the project as part of the performance-based programming process.

TIP PO9.2 – Sponsors may apply for funding for the full project scope. If selected, the project should be programmed by phase, if applicable. Subsequent phases will be placed in out-years of the TIP or into the Unscheduled Pool until an updated application is submitted.

TIP PO9.3 – PPACG generally aims to fund the construction phase of a project when the preconstruction phase has been programmed. If construction cost estimates increase by more than 10%, the sponsoring jurisdiction is expected to coordinate with the TAC to discuss options for addressing the cost overage. Cost overruns will be managed in accordance with [Policy 20 \(Cost Overruns: Definitions and Procedures\)](#).

TIP PO10.0 (Non-Infrastructure Projects and Planning Studies) – Non-infrastructure programs or planning studies that are regional in nature must be included in both the TIP and the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

TIP PO10.1 – Requests for such projects must be submitted in writing to PPACG by January of the federal fiscal year prior to the requested funding year.

TIP PO10.2 – Annual programmatic funding for these projects is not guaranteed. No long-term commitments should be made by the jurisdiction beyond the first year of the TIP.

TIP Revisions

TIP PO11.0 (TIP Revision Types and Process Overview) – The TIP may be revised through either a formal amendment or an administrative modification.

TIP PO11.1 (Formal Amendments) – Amendments are major revisions that require a public comment period (as outlined in the Public Participation Plan), formal approval by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Community Advisory Committee (CAC), and the Board of Directors, followed by submission and approval by CDOT, under the authority delegated by the Governor. Amendments are required for:

- Addition or deletion of any federally funded project (except as outlined under administrative modifications)
- Addition or deletion of any regionally significant state or locally funded project (except as outlined under administrative modifications)



- Changes/adjustments to federal funds that are programmed by PPACG. (PPACG Board is the only body with the authority to remove or add regional funding to a project/program)
- Changes/adjustments to federal or state funds programmed or selected by CDOT (with approval from transportation commission or similar body)
- Significant changes to a project's scope (e.g., modifying the amount of traffic through lanes, altering termini, or adding/removing multimodal elements)
- Changes in a project's fund source(s) from non-federal to federal, or from federal to non-federal

TIP PO11.2 (Administrative Modifications) – Administrative modifications are minor revisions that may be made by PPACG staff without formal action by TAC, CAC, or the Board. Staff will update the TIP and notify relevant stakeholders. Updates will also be reflected in publicly available documents on the PPACG website. Administrative modifications include:

- Addition or deletion of any non-regionally significant state funded projects
- Addition or modification of projects funded through Emergency Relief programs
- Addition or modification of state or local regionally significant projects that have already been through their own public involvement and approval processes
- Minor scope changes that do not meet the threshold for formal amendments
- Changes in the project sponsor, provided both parties agree, and a formal agreement is signed by authorized representatives
- Changes are made to the existing project's amount of local funds, provided no other federal or state funding, scoping or termini changes are being made to the project and does not affect the local match requirement
- Reallocation of funds between preconstruction and construction phases
- Project roll forwards (moving a project within the programmed four years of the TIP) if:
 - Unable to obligate in current year of TIP and jurisdiction has provided adequate justification for the delay and
 - The obligation authority or apportionment has not lapsed, and funding is still available

TIP PO12.0 (LRTP Consistency Requirements for TIP Amendments) – Amendments may not add projects that are not consistent with the adopted LRTP.

TIP PO13.0 (Capacity Projects and CMP/Conformity Requirements) – Amendments may not add capacity-increasing projects unless they meet the applicable requirements of the Congestion Management Process (CMP) and regional air quality conformity rules.



TIP PO13.1 – Amendments that impact the conformity emissions analysis (capacity projects that must be modeled) require the same public notice and opportunity for comment as the original TIP document.

TIP PO13.2 – For the purposes of these policies and procedures, a capacity-increasing project is defined as one that adds an additional vehicular travel lane one mile or longer, per CMP guidelines. Projects such as turn lanes, road widening (that do not add travel lanes), bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects are not considered capacity-increasing under this policy.

TIP PO14.0 (Fiscal Constraint for Amendments and Modifications) – Amendments and administrative modifications must maintain fiscal constraint by fund type and by year.

TIP Funds

TIP PO15.0 (Annual Availability of Federal Funds) – Federal funds typically become available on an annual basis. The region will work cooperatively to ensure that obligations for the coming year are identified early, avoiding the loss of federal funds due to untimely obligation.

TIP PO16.0 (Timely Obligation and Roll Forwards) – Federal funds programmed in the current year of the TIP must be obligated before the end of the federal fiscal year to prevent loss to the region. However, if CDOT approves roll forwards for that year, projects and associated funds may be moved into the current TIP year. Jurisdictions must formally request this change through PPACG staff as an administrative amendment.

TIP PO17.0 (Notification of Unused Funds) – When a jurisdiction no longer needs funding for a project, it will notify PPACG that the funds are available for reprogramming.

TIP PO17.1 – Federal rules will dictate if previously expended funds shall be repaid to the region if a project is removed from the TIP or canceled after obligation.

TIP PO18.0 (Return of Unused Project Funds) – Project cost savings or funds that are not required to complete the original or approved scope of the project shall be returned to the regional fund balance for reprogramming to other projects.

TIP PO18.1 – Reprogramming of returned funds shall go through the regular TIP and/or cost overrun process.

TIP PO18.2 – Once a jurisdiction is aware of excess funding on a project, they must contact PPACG with the approximate time frame of the return and funding amount.

TIP PO18.3 – PPACG staff will notify all jurisdictions of the returned funds in an email that will serve as a “supplemental notice of funding availability.”



TIP PO18.4 – Jurisdiction returning the funds may be awarded those same funds for another project but shall be required to follow the same process as all the other jurisdictions requesting the returned funds. This follows the principle that funds are awarded to projects, not jurisdictions.

TIP PO19.0 (Regional Management Reserve) – To address annual federal funding reconciliation adjustments, changes in federal obligation limitation (OL), and other funding fluctuations, PPACG shall establish a Regional Management Reserve (RMR) for federal funding sources under PPACG programming authority.

TIP PO19.1 – The RMR shall apply to Surface Transportation Block Grant Metro (STP Metro), Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), and Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) funds.

TIP PO19.2 – During TIP development, PPACG shall reserve a percentage of the annual funding forecast provided by CDOT. The reserve percentage shall be established by the TAC and approved by the Board of Directors. The reserve percentage may range from 1.0 percent to 2.0 percent of the annual funding forecast. The reserve percentage is currently set at 1.5 percent.

TIP PO19.3– Funding identified as part of the RMR shall not be programmed to projects during initial TIP development and shall be maintained to preserve fiscal constraint until annual OL and reconciliation processes are completed.

TIP PO19.4– Following receipt of final OL and completion of the annual reconciliation process, PPACG staff shall evaluate available reserve balances and present recommendations to the TAC regarding the release of available reserve funding.

TIP PO19.5– Available reserve funding may be programmed through a [TIP formal amendment](#), project selection process, or other process approved by the TAC and Board of Directors.

TIP PO19.6– PPACG staff shall provide periodic reporting to the TAC regarding RMR balances, reconciliation adjustments, and available funding by program source.

TIP PO19.7– The TAC may recommend, and the Board of Directors may approve, modifications to the reserve percentage based on funding forecasts, obligation limitation trends, or other federal and state funding considerations.



TIP PO20.0 (Cost Overruns: Definitions and Procedures) – Cost overruns do not lend themselves to a simple definition, as they may occur under varying circumstances and levels of urgency. Examples include:

- Unexpected conditions during construction: A project is under contract and encounters unforeseen issues such as archeological finds, abandoned utilities, or unstable soils not identified during testing. While most projects include a contingency, the PPACG programming process may not be able to respond quickly enough to prevent delays.
- Pre-construction findings: During pre-construction activities, results from studies may necessitate additional work and costs, such as drainage redesign, right-of-way plan adjustments, or utility relocations. These activities can increase both the cost and timeline of a project.
- Fiscal constraint adjustments: A project is fully funded in the TIP but not yet ready for construction. To maintain fiscal constraint by fund source and year, a jurisdiction may voluntarily remove or delay project funding. Such projects may be considered eligible for a cost overrun call for projects.
- Partial withdrawal of requests: A jurisdiction requests funding for a new or existing project but voluntarily withdraws all or part of the request for fiscal constraint reasons. These projects may also be considered eligible under a cost overrun call for projects.

When a project is determined to be experiencing a cost overrun, project sponsors may address it through the following types of TIP modifications:

TIP PO20.1 – Project sponsors may overmatch using additional local funds. The TIP may be modified administratively.

TIP PO20.2 – Project sponsors may request additional federal money from unanticipated sources and project reconciliation. This requires an open, competitive process and formal TIP amendment and approval.

TIP PO20.3 – Project sponsors may request to change the scope of work or termini for a project in a way and to an extent that likely would not have resulted in a lower score during the TIP project selection process. This requires a formal TIP amendment request and approval.

TIP PO21.0 (Advanced Construction Agreements) – Nothing in the PPACG Policies and Procedures should be interpreted as prohibiting the practice of utilizing Advanced Construction Agreements (AC). Because PPACG does not directly manage funds, it cannot enter into an AC agreement with jurisdictions. However, if the jurisdiction and CDOT agree upon an AC agreement, it can expedite project delivery and safeguard against cost increases due to inflation.



Projects with an approved AC agreement in place shall be considered favorably in the cost overrun programming hierarchy, since both CDOT and the jurisdiction have committed to the project and initiated construction. By entering into an AC agreement, a jurisdiction must commit to covering any cost overruns necessary to complete the project. While additional federal funding may become available, it is not guaranteed, and the project must be completed with local funds if necessary.

TIP PO22.0 (Regional Prioritization of Funds) – Funds will be prioritized as follows:

- 1). Assist jurisdictions on projects that are experiencing cost overruns, provided the overruns are due to factors that were not reasonably foreseeable and NOT due to voluntary changes in the project scope identified in the project application.
- 2). Fully fund the construction phase of projects which are currently in preconstruction and have already had federal funds obligated to complete the project.
- 3). Fund any projects from the LRTP that can be ready to obligate in time.
- 4). Fund new transportation plans and studies, thereby requiring that these be amended into the Plan. Funding some plans and studies provides an opportunity for the smallest member jurisdictions to participate.
- 5). Flex all remaining funds to transit, making any necessary TIP amendments.

Project Development Responsibilities

TIP PO23.0 (Sponsor Responsibilities)

TIP PO23.1 – Complete project or project phases in a timely manner, project-level public involvement, project eligibility requirements, commitments made during the project development and programming process and notify the PPACG staff when the project will not meet program funding deadlines.

TIP PO23.2 – When a proposed project is programmed in the TIP, the project sponsor makes a commitment to complete it as defined in the project proposal. Substantive amendments to the scope of a project or the project cost during the obligation phase could cause the project to be reevaluated. This could cause the project to be reduced in priority and thus lose the programmed funds. Lead agencies are responsible for ensuring timely completion of the project as described in the project proposal.

TIP PO 23.3 – To access the programmed funds for a project, sponsors must meet all federal requirements. Sponsors must work with PPACG, CDOT, FHWA, FTA or other federal funding agencies to ensure that federal requirements are met in a time frame that ensure programmed funds can be authorized.



TIP PO23.4 – Project sponsors are required to provide semi-annual project status reviews to CDOT and PPACG (each March and September or as otherwise scheduled by PPACG in cooperation with the funding agencies). Failure by a sponsoring agency to provide this information may jeopardize the priority of their state or federally funded project(s) in the TIP. The following information shall be provided:

- 1). Do the funds programmed in the current fiscal year of the TIP have a reasonable expectation of being obligated or secured (based on the “project readiness” criteria)?
- 2). Does the project’s total programmed funding:
 - a. meet the total estimated project cost?
 - b. significantly exceed the total estimated project costs.
 - c. fall significantly short of the total estimated project costs?
- 3). How is any shortfall in programmed funds being addressed?
- 4). Are there any other project situations that affect timing, amount, or category of the programmed funds?
- 5). Have the project’s scope and termini changed from what is noted in the TIP?
- 6). A status report on federal funding for each project including:
 - a. What amount of federal funding has been obligated in this fiscal year (FY)?
 - b. What amount of federal funding is expected to be obligated in this FY?
 - c. What is the date(s) of obligation?
 - d. What funding category was obligated?
 - e. How much was not obligated and needs to “roll forward” into the next FY?

TIP PO23.5 - Based on the information provided and other information, the sponsoring agency will request that the TIP be revised, if necessary, according to procedures for TIP Revisions.

TIP PO24.0 (PPACG Responsibilities)

TIP PO24.1 – PPACG acts as a resource to member governments to facilitate the project development process.

TIP PO24.2 – PPACG will help to ensure funds will be obligated in the year they were programmed through the following process:

- Initial Letter/email of awarded project notice of inclusion in the TIP and outline of jurisdiction responsibilities. Will include documentation that



outlines the process for obligating funds with CDOT's Region 2 Local Agency team.

- Six months prior to the FY the project is listed, PPACG sends email to inform jurisdictions of upcoming project/funds.
- PPACG will check back three months prior to FY the project is listed to ensure forms are started or complete.
- Quarterly check in meetings on project status between PPACG and CDOT and project sponsor.
- Six months prior to the end of the FY the project is listed in, there will be an evaluation of progress to determine if the project needs to return funds or possibly needs to be rolled forward.
- Three months prior to the end of the FY the project is listed in the TIP, PPACG will hold a progress evaluation and recommendation meeting with jurisdiction project managers.

TIP PO24.3 – PPACG staff will hold semiannual status workshops as needed for TAC regarding the status of programmed projects in the region.

TIP PO24.4 – If projects are unable to proceed to funding obligation according to the schedule outlined in the TIP, this information must be brought to the attention of PPACG staff at the earliest opportunity. PPACG staff will then follow the policies outlined in TIP PO15.0-PO20.0 regarding TIP funds.

TIP PO24.5 – Every other year, as part of the adoption of the new TIP, PPACG staff will review the status of all current and programmed projects with each project sponsor to determine if there are any projects that may need to be amended into the new TIP. Unobligated funds and associated projects are not guaranteed to be amended into a new TIP adoption, and all efforts should be made to make funds in the year a project is programmed.

TIP PO24.6 – Annually, if FHWA and CDOT have determined funds are available for roll over, PPACG staff will take appropriate TIP actions.

TIP PO25.0 (Exception Management and Policy Compliance) – Policy compliance is the responsibility of PPACG staff and all committee members. However, individual jurisdiction requests may at times require an exception to be made to one or more policies. Having a robust and well-managed set of policies on how to deal with requested exceptions allows the committee(s) to be proactive, rather than reactive, when it comes to compliance management.

TIP PO25.1 – Following any proposed new TIP funding request(s) or amendment(s) to an already approved TIP, PPACG staff shall conduct a compliance review in advance of any TAC meeting scheduled to consider the request(s) and to present compliance management considerations for the committee's discussion.



TIP P025.2 – Upon completion of compliance management review, any individual funding request that requires an exception to established policy, procedures or manner for inclusion in the TIP shall require a waiver request by the jurisdiction’s TAC representative. PPACG staff will seek the Community Advisory Committee (CAC)’s review and recommendation prior to the request being considered by the Board of Directors.

PPACG Procedures

TIP Development

TIP PR1.0 (Development of Federal Funding Estimates) – To start a new TIP process, completed every other year, PPACG staff shall develop the annual federal funding estimate for the upcoming TIP. Development of these estimates shall be done in conjunction with FHWA and the State of Colorado. These estimates shall reconcile previous estimates of federal allocations vs. actual revenues to develop the estimated amount for the new TIP years.

TIP PR1.1 – PPACG staff shall present the fund estimates to the TAC for their review and recommendation. PPACG staff should adjust the estimates based on the recommendations of the TAC as appropriate for the development of the bi-annual Notice of Funding Availability/Call for Projects.

TIP PR1.2 – A competitive selection criteria based on federal guidance, applicable performance measures and regional priorities, shall be used by TAC and PPACG staff to score and select projects for inclusion in the TIP.

TIP PR2.0 (Call for Projects Issuance) – PPACG staff shall issue Call for Projects, which outlines the instructions and funds available over the upcoming TIP period, by fund source.

TIP PR2.1 – The Call for Projects will include the “Year of Expenditure” (YOE) factor to be used in the calculation of expenditures anticipated in future years of the TIP.

TIP PR2.2 – Cost overruns on existing programmed projects shall be prioritized above the selection of new projects during a Call for Projects. Jurisdictions requesting additional funds for approved projects must provide documentation of the overage, and TAC will evaluate these requests before considering new project applications. This policy is intended to ensure the successful completion of projects already underway and maintain fiscal responsibility within the TIP.

TIP PR2.3 – The Call for Projects shall include the due date for receiving funding requests/applications from project sponsors.

TIP PR2.4 – PPACG shall make available, as attachments or web postings, all the necessary forms associated with the Call for Projects.



TIP PR3.0 (Draft Project List Development) – The TAC is tasked with development of a draft project list. TAC will review the application scores matrix prepared by PPACG staff, and public involvement results prior to the TIP Development Meeting. Based on the technical knowledge and expertise of those reviewing the score matrix, the scores may be adjusted, as appropriate. Scores act as a guide to prioritizing projects; however, the TAC is to use their best judgement in developing the recommended project list.

TIP PR3.1 – After reviewing the funding available, by fiscal year and fund source, TAC shall prioritize the funding requests by fund source and by fiscal year.

TIP PR3.2 – Annual fiscal constraint must be achieved in the first four years of the TIP by program year.

TIP PR4.0 (Air Quality and Title VI Review) – Once a proposed project list has been drafted, it will be modeled for air quality conformity, if applicable, Title VI compliance.

TIP PR5.0 (TIP Public Open House Scheduling) – Development of draft TIP materials shall be scheduled so that TIP public open house(s) to review the proposed project list and the results of the air quality conformity process can occur in February.

TIP PR6.0 (Public Comment and Final TIP Adoption) – After development of the draft TIP, PPACG is required to solicit public comment for at least 30-days. The Public Participation Plan (PPP) requires that the full public comment results then be made available to the TAC at least 30 days *before* recommendation (in the case of TAC and CAC) or approval (Board) of a draft TIP is sought. Both the public comment period and the PPACG committee process shall culminate in a PPACG Board meeting where the TIP is properly notified for adoption.

TIP Amendment Procedures

TIP PR7.0 (Amendment Procedure) – When a TIP amendment is requested by a jurisdiction, PPACG staff will first determine if the request follows policies that govern TIP amendments. If so, the request will be presented as described in the PPP at the next TAC meeting for a recommendation.

TIP PR7.1 – Member jurisdictions must submit a justification letter so that PPACG staff can include sufficient information in the TAC memo. The letter shall describe how the amendment will change the project from what was originally described in the project's application. It is expected that members will be present at TAC meetings to defend their request.

TIP PR7.2 – If the amendment causes funding to be returned to the region or cancelation of a project, an email Notice of Funding Availability will be sent out to all eligible jurisdictions letting them know the funding has been returned to the region and is



available for reprogramming. The email will contain information about what type of funding is available, how much and when it needs to be obligated.

TIP PR8.0 (TAC Review and Recommendation for Amendments) – TAC will review proposed TIP amendments and make recommendations to the Board. When reprogramming funding has been returned to the region, the TAC shall consider the regional priorities outlined in PO20.0.



Appendix A: PPACG Acronyms (Updated 3.2023)

AAA	Area Agency on Aging
AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials
ACOE	Army Corps of Engineers
ACT	Accessible Coordinated Transportation
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act (1990)
AICUZ	Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (Study)
AF CURE	Arkansas Fountain Coalition Urban River Evaluation
AFB	Air Force Base
AFS	Air Force Station
AMPO	Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations
AOA	Administration on Aging (U.S.)
APA	American Planning Association
APCD	Air Pollution Control Division (Colorado)
AQCC	Air Quality Control Commission (Colorado)
AQTC	Air Quality Technical Committee (PPACG)
ARCH	Adult Resources for Care and Help
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
AVO	Average Vehicle Occupancy
AVR	Average Vehicle Ridership
BAH	Basic Allowance for Housing
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BLS	Bureau of Labor Statistics
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BRAC	Base Closure and Realignment
BRO	Off-System Bridge Program
BIO	Bridge Inspection Program
BTS	Bureau of Transportation Statistics
C4A	Colorado Association of Area Agencies on Aging
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAB	Combat Aviation Brigade
CAC	PPRTA Citizen Advisory Committee
CAC	Community Advisory Committee (PPACG)
CAD	Computer Aided Drafting
CARC	Colorado Association of Regional Councils
CBEF	Center for Business and Economic Forecasting
CCI	Colorado Counties, Inc.
CDHS	Colorado Department of Human Services
CDOT	Colorado Department of Transportation
CDPHE	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
CEDIS	Colorado Economic and Demographic Information System
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement
CML	Colorado Municipal League
CMP	Congestion Management Process



CO	Carbon Monoxide
CONO	Council of Neighbors and Organizations
COPs	Certifications of Participation
COS	Colorado Springs
CPG	Consolidated Planning Grant
CPI	Consumer Price Index
CRP	Carbon Reduction Program
CRS	Colorado Revised Statutes
CSU	Colorado Springs Utilities
CTAB	Citizens' Transportation Advisory Board (Colorado Springs)
CVHT	Congested Vehicle Hours Traveled
CVMT	Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWCB	Colorado Water Conservation Board
CWP	Clean Water Plan
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise
DBMS	Data Base Management System
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DMDC	Defense Manpower Data Center
DMTF	Defense Mission Task Force
DNR	Division of Natural Resources (State of Colorado)
DOD	Department of Defense (U.S.)
DOE	Department of Energy (U.S.)
DOLA	Colorado Department of Local Affairs
DOT	Department of Transportation (U.S.)
DRCOG	Denver Regional Council of Governments
DRMAC	Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council
DTD	Division of Transportation Development (CDOT)
DUS	Denver Union Station
E&D	Elderly and Disabled
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.)
EPC	El Paso County
EV	Electric Vehicle
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FASTER	Funding Advancements for Surface Transportation & Economic Recovery
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FMVECP	Federal Motor Vehicle Emission Control Program
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FR	Federal Register
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FY	Fiscal Year
GIS	Geographic Information System



GPS	Global Positioning System
HAC	Highway Advisory Commission (El Paso County)
HB	House Bill
HBA	Housing and Building Association
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HFMCM	Peak Military Care Network
HMA	Housing Market Analysis
HOT	High Occupancy Toll
HOV	High-occupancy Vehicle
HPMS	Highway Performance Monitoring System
HSIP	Highway Safety Improvement Program
HUTF	Highway Users Trust Fund
ICMA	International City/County Management Association
IGA	Intergovernmental Agreement
IPA	Integrated Plan Assessment
ISDS	Individual Sewage Disposal System
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (1991)
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System
JARC	Job Access/Reverse Commute
LOS	Level of Service
LRP/LRTP	Long-Range Plan/Long-Range Transportation Plan
LRT	Light Rail Transit
MAC	Military Affairs Committee
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (latest federal legislation)
MCC	Mobility Coordinating Committee (PPACG AAA)
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOBILE6	EPA Approved model to predict pollutant emissions from vehicles
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area
MUTCD	Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways
N4A	National Association of Area Agencies on Aging
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NARC	National Association of Regional Councils
NCEA	National Center on Elder Abuse
NCOA	National Council on Aging
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act NEPA Documents (part of the “NEPA process”):
Cat Ex	Categorical Exclusion
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FONSI	Finding of no Significant Impact
ROD	Record of Decision
NFRMPO	North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization
NFRQPA	North Front Range Water Quality Planning Association
NHFP	National Highway Freight Program
NHPP	National Highway Performance Program



NHS	National Highway System
NORAD	North American Aerospace Defense Command
NOx	Nitrogen oxides
NWCCOG	Northwest Colorado Council of Governments
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
O3	Ozone
OAA	Older Americans Act (1969)
OEA	Office of Economic Adjustment
OSD	Office of Secretary of Defense
OST	Office of the Secretary of Transportation
P3	Public-Private Partnership
PACOG	Pueblo Area Council of Governments
PCS	Permanent Change of Station
PM10	Particulates/fine dust less than 10 microns in size
PM2.5	Particulates/fine dust less than 2.5 microns in size
PPAAA	Pikes Peak Area Agency on Aging
PPACG	Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments
PPAR	Pikes Peak Association of Realtors
PPK	Block Grant Stimulus
PPM	Parts Per Million
PPRTA	Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority
RAC	Area Agency on Aging Regional Advisory Committee (PPACG AAA)
RAISE	Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (Federal grant program)
RAMP	Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships
RAQC	Regional Air Quality Council
RFP	Request for Proposal
RFQ	Request for Qualifications
RGP	Regional Growth Plan
RIMS	Regional Input-Output Modeling System
ROD	Record of Decision
ROI	Return on Investment –or– Region of Influence
ROW	Right of Way
RPP	Regional Priorities Program
RSA	Regional Statistical Area
RTD	Regional Transportation District (Denver)
RTDP	Rural Transit Development Plan
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
SAF	Small Area Forecast
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (2005)
SB	Senate Bill
SIP	State Implementation Plan (for Air Quality)
SMART (goals)	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results oriented, Time bound
SOV	Single Occupant Vehicle
SPR	Statewide Planning and Research
SRP	Short-Range Plan
SRTS	Safe Routes to School Funds



STAC	State Transportation Advisory Committee
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
STBG	Surface Transportation Block Grant Program
STBG - Urban	Surface Transportation Block Grant Program - Urbanized areas
SW	Space Wing (Air Force)
SWMP	Stormwater Management Plan
TAC	Transportation Advisory Committee (PPACG)
TAP	Transportation Alternatives Program
TAZ	Traffic Analysis Zone
TCD	Traffic Control Device
TCM	Transportation Control Measure
TDM	Transportation Demand Management
TDP	Transportation Development Plan
TEA	Transportation Enhancement Activity
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (1998)
TELUM	Transportation Economic Land Use Model
TES	PPACG Transportation Enhancements Subcommittee
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TMA	Transportation Management Area
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TMO/TMA	Transportation Management Organization/Transportation Management Agency
TOD	Transit Oriented Development
TPR	Transportation Planning Region
TRB	Transportation Research Board
TRS	Technical Review Subcommittee (for the AAA RAC)
TSM	Transportation System Management
TSSIP	Traffic Signal System Improvement Program
TTI	Travel Time Index
UAS	Unmanned Aircraft System
UCCS	University of Colorado - Colorado Springs
UFAS	Uniformed Federal Accessibility Standard
UGB/A	Urban Growth Boundary/Area
UPH	Unaccompanied Personnel Housing
UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program
USAF	United States Air Force
USAFA	United States Air Force Academy
USC	United State Code
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
USFS	United States Forest Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UZA (UA)	Urbanized Area (Census)
V/C	Volume-to-capacity ratio
VHA	Veterans Health Administration
VHT	Vehicle Hours Traveled
VMS	Variable Message Sign
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds
WQCC	Water Quality Control Commission (Colorado)



Pikes Peak Area
Council of Governments
Communities Working Together

WQCD
WQMC

Water Quality Control Division (Colo Dept. Public Health & Env)
Water Quality Management Committee (PPACG)



Appendix B: TIP Project Prioritization and Scoring

Development of the TIP will follow established processes developed as part of the 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan, including project prioritization. Eligible entities will submit projects for inclusion in the TIP and provide the corresponding LRTP project and the project scoring utilized for the LRTP will be brought forward to the TIP process. A project must be consistent with the LRTP to be eligible for the TIP.

The project scoring criteria were based on the federal planning factors, the PPACG vision and goals, and system performance. The scoring methodology and criteria weighting were then verified and adjusted through engagement with the PPACG committees and Regional Transportation Plan Advisory Committee (RTPAC). The scoring methodology as developed with the TAC and adopted by the Board of Directors uses the following criteria and scoring.

PPACG 2050 LRTP Scoring Criteria

CRITERIA	MEASUREMENT	MAX. SCORE
Safety – improving safety in the area for all users	Points awarded based on the crash data (all incidents) – 5 points per crash within project limits in most recent 5 years of available crash data, per PPACG crash data: https://ppacg.maps.arcgis.com/apps/mapviewer/index.html?webmap=a88118a53b524b60909e71edd245da10	15
Safety – improving safety in the area for vulnerable users	Points awarded based on the crash data (bicycle/ pedestrian incidents) – 5 points per crash within project limits in most recent 5 years of available crash data, per PPACG crash data	5
Maintenance – preserving investment in the system	Road – based on the predominant classification used by the jurisdiction (OCI, PMA, etc.) of the segment or segments and normalized to a consistent scale. Bridge – based on average sufficiency rating of bridges if multiple bridges in project Transit – (use MMT Asset Management Plan conditions) (based on average condition of items if multiple items are in a project) Note: If data is unavailable, points will be awarded based on an estimation of asset condition per the local jurisdiction's engineering expertise	10



Operation Enhancement – making the transportation system work more efficiently	Turn lane addition/roundabout addition/other intersection improvement - 3 pts Addition of acceleration/deceleration lanes - 3 pts Reduction in congestion supported by previous study or internal analysis - 3 pts Rideshare/carshare programs - 3 pts Bicycle and pedestrian intersection improvements - 3 pts Dedicated bicycle/pedestrian route/lane - 3 pts Traffic incident management (TIM) program - 3 pts Communications network and roadway monitoring - 3 pts Traffic signal/control modernization - 3 pts Improved transit stations/stops/park and rides - 3 pts Enhanced transit corridors/express bus service/dedicated transit travelway - 3 pts New transit route - 3 pts Roadway signage improvements - 3 pts Geometric improvements - 3 pts Roadway widening - 3 pts New arterials - 3 pts Other demonstrated methods to improve corridor speed and/or reduce waiting time at intersections - 3 pts each	15
Environment – incorporating environmentally friendly concepts in project	Awarded 2 points per environmental element identified in the project application. These elements may include (but are not limited to) transit, sidewalks/bike lanes/multiuse shoulders, green stormwater infrastructure*, erosion mitigation/reduction, reduces dust pollution by eliminating gravel road, pedestrian encouraging solar canopies, solar lighting, resiliency, or GHG-combating vegetation.	10
Mobility – reducing congestion and supporting movement throughout the region	Points awarded based on the congestion map provided by PPACG in the CMP OR based on a local plan/professional engineering judgement from the jurisdiction and discussed within the application. (See mobility tab.)	20
Connectivity – facilitating connections and redundancy throughout the region	This may be based on connections with the strategic corridor maps as originally identified in the CMP and/or a local plan or jurisdiction 0 – does not provide additional connectivity or redundancy 10 – provides new connectivity for the transportation system 20 – connects to a PPACG strategic corridor OR eliminates a connectivity gap as defined by a local plan or jurisdiction OR provides redundancy	20
Priority Project – prioritizing needs throughout the region	Selected by jurisdiction; each jurisdiction can designate one project as its top priority	5



MAXIMUM TOTAL SCORE	100
* Per the EPA, “stormwater runoff is a leading cause of water pollution in urban environments. ‘Green’ stormwater infrastructure is designed to mimic nature and capture rainwater where it falls. Green infrastructure reduces and treats stormwater at its source.” Some jurisdictions have or are working on green stormwater infrastructure design criteria. * Per the EPA, “stormwater runoff is a leading cause of water pollution in urban environments. ‘Green’ stormwater infrastructure is designed to mimic nature and capture rainwater where it falls. Green infrastructure reduces and treats stormwater at its source.” Some jurisdictions have or are working on green stormwater infrastructure design criteria.	

Mobility Scoring Detail

Score	Mobility Criteria
20	Located on a congestion corridor AND in an area of heavy congestion
16	Located on a congestion corridor AND in an area of sparser congestion
12	Located on a congestion corridor but NOT in an area of congestion
8	Located in an area of heavy congestion but NOT on a congestion corridor
4	Located in an area of sparser congestion but NOT on a congestion corridor
0	NOT located on congestion corridor nor in an area of congestion

Maintenance Scoring Detail

Road	Bridge	Transit
0 - not a maintenance project	0 – not a maintenance project	0 – not a maintenance project
1 – 90 to 100	1 – 90-100	1 – condition 4.51 to 5.00
2 – 80 to 89.9	2 – 80-89.9	2 – condition 4.01 to 4.50
3 – 70 to 79.9	3 – 70-79.9	3 – condition 3.51 to 4.00
4 – 60 to 69.9	4 – 60-69.9	4 – condition 3.01 to 3.50
5 - 50 to 59.9	5 – 50-59.9	5 – condition 2.51 to 3.00
6 – 40 to 49.9	6 – 40-49.9	6 – condition 2.01 to 2.50
7 – 30 to 39.9	7 – 30-39.9	7 – condition 1.51 to 2.00
8 – 20 to 29.9	8 – 20-29.9	8 – condition 1.01 to 1.50
9 – 10 to 19.9	9 – 10-19.9	9 – condition 0.51 to 1.00
10 – 0 to 9.9	10 – 0-9.9	10 – condition 0 to 0.50



Multimodal Transportation and Mitigation Options Fund (MMOF) Scoring Criteria

If Multimodal Transportation and Mitigation Options Fund (MMOF) becomes available to PPACG the following scoring criteria will be used, unless staff is otherwise directed by the TAC.

The MMOF program established by the state has specific goals and each project receiving funding should address one or more of those goals. The following scoring criteria were developed by the PPACG TAC in alignment with these goals to support decision making in the project award process. TAC also developed additional criteria focused on good stewardship of these funds.

During application, each project sponsor should score their own project per the attached spreadsheet. These scores and the justification, along with project details, will be discussed during a TAC Workshop to determine recommendations for funding.

- Benefits seniors by making aging in place (20 possible points)
- Benefits residents of rural and Disproportionately Impacted (DI) Communities (20 possible points)
- Enhances mobility for persons with disabilities (20 possible points)
- Provides safe routes to school (20 possible points)
- Reduces emissions of air pollutants and Greenhouse Gases (GHG) (20 possible points)
- Project is listed within an existing regional or local plan and has local support (10 possible points)
- Budget is well defined, has the necessary local match, etc. (10 possible points)
- Project sponsor has a positive history of using funds in a timely manner and reporting properly (10 possible points)
- Project is well laid out and implementation schedule and tasks are feasible (10 possible points)

The following outlines the methodology for awarding points.

MMOF Scoring Methodology

Evaluation Criteria	Possible Points
Meets goals of MMOF	
<i>Benefits seniors aging in place</i>	20
<i>Project's primary purpose is to serve seniors aging in place - 20</i>	
<i>Project is primarily intended for seniors aging in place but is not solely for seniors 10</i>	
<i>Project may benefit seniors but is not specifically for seniors - 5</i>	
<i>Project does not serve seniors - 0</i>	
<i>Benefits residents of rural areas and Disproportionately Impacted communities - flexible options</i>	20
<i>Project's primary purpose is to serve rural/DIC residents - 20</i>	



<i>Project is primarily intended for rural/DIC residents but is not solely for these residents - 10</i>	
<i>Project may benefit rural/DIC residents but is not specifically for these residents - 5</i>	
<i>Project does not serve seniors - 0</i>	
Enhances mobility for persons with disabilities	20
<i>Project's primary purpose is to serve persons with disabilities - 20</i>	
<i>Project is primarily intended for persons with disabilities but is not solely for persons with disabilities - 10</i>	
<i>Project may benefit persons with disabilities but is not specifically for these residents - 5</i>	
<i>Project does not serve persons with disabilities - 0</i>	
Provides safe routes to school	20
<i>Project's primary purpose is to serve children traveling to school - 20</i>	
<i>Project serves children traveling to school but is not solely for this purpose - 10</i>	
<i>Project does not serve children traveling to school - 0</i>	
Reduces emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases	20
<i>Project will reduce single occupancy vehicle trips (e.g., rideshare, transit, bike/ped) - 20</i>	
<i>Project supports alternative transportation but may not directly replace trips (e.g., improving existing sidewalks) - 5</i>	
<i>Project will not reduce air pollutants - 0</i>	
Project within an existing regional or local plan and has local support	10
<i>Project is listed in the LRTP, transit plan, active transportation plan, PlanCOS, etc. -5</i>	
<i>Project supported by the jurisdiction in which it will be conducted - 5</i>	
<i>Project is not listed in any planning efforts and there is not evidence of support - 0</i>	
Budget (Is there local match, letter of support from admin., is budget well defined)	10
<i>Budget is well defined and sponsor has a full 50% cash match - 10</i>	
<i>Budget needs further refinement and/or sponsor has a 25% cash match - 5</i>	
<i>Budget is not well defined and/or sponsor is seeking a full waiver of the match - 0</i>	
Project sponsor history (Were previous funds used in a timely manner, was reporting done properly, etc.)	10
<i>Previous funding was spent in a timely manner and reporting was accurate - 10</i>	
<i>Issues with previous funding and/or reporting was reported but solved - 5</i>	
<i>Previous funding was not spent in a timely manner and/or there were issues with reporting - 0</i>	
Project implementation (Is the schedule feasible and timely, were proper CDOT reviews held)	10
<i>Project is feasible within the given budget and schedule and has the required reviews - 10</i>	
<i>Cost, schedule, or scope issues are possible but are being mitigated - 5</i>	
<i>Cost, schedule, or scope issues are anticipated and/or CDOT reviews were not completed - 0</i>	