



COLORADO

Department of Transportation

Division of Transit & Rail

2829 W. Howard Place, 4th Floor
Denver, CO 80204

DATE: January 11, 2019

TO: Transit & Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC)

FROM: David Krutsinger, Director - Division of Transit & Rail

SUBJECT: SB 18-001 Multimodal Options Fund Committee

Purpose

Provide advice to T&I and TRAC representatives regarding further development of the Multimodal Options Fund, including allocations by Transportation Planning Region, matching requirements, and reporting requirements.

Action

For Discussion Only.

Background

SB 18-001 includes a provision that establishes a Multimodal Options Fund. The Multimodal Options Fund has \$96.75M in dedicated revenue. Of that \$96.75M, \$2.5M is dedicated to the Rail Commission. The remaining \$94.25M is split between CDOT (15% or \$14.13M) and local governments (85% or \$80.12M). To date, the Rail Commission has received \$0.9 M, but CDOT hasn't received any of funding from the Multimodal Options Fund. CDOT has made an appropriations request through the Joint Budget Committee (JBC) of \$71 million and should receive notification in the March/April 2019 timeframe.

In the meanwhile the Transportation Commission (TC) approved a Multimodal Options Fund Committee to work on and advise the TC on an allocation formula. The Transit & Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) had last worked on an allocation formula for the Transit Development Program, which formula anticipated only transit projects. So the consideration of bicycle, pedestrian, and other multimodal options could be an extension of or modification of that prior work.

Details

Committee Membership

After consultation with TRAC (11/9) and STAC (9/??, 10/??), the Transportation Commission approved (12/13) the following: 1) A committee structure to be used to meet the consultation requirements; 2) the committee be named the Multimodal Options Fund Committee; and 3) the committee size be 9 members and include the following representatives:

1. STAC (Urban) - *Elise Jones, Boulder/DRCOG*
2. STAC (Rural) - *Amber Blake, Durango*
3. TRAC - *David Johnson, RFTA*
4. CASTA (Transit Advocacy and Rural Public Transit) - *Ann Rajewski*
5. Bicycle Colorado (Bicycle Advocacy) - *Peter Picolo*
6. WalkDenver (Walking Advocacy) - *Jil Locatore*
7. Colorado Commission on Aging (Aging in Place) - *TBD*
8. Safe Routes to School Committee Representative (Safe Routes to School) - *Heather Sloop, Steamboat Springs*
9. Colorado Advisory Council for People with Disabilities (Enhanced mobility for Persons with Disabilities) - *TBD*

Allocation

In May 2018, considering only transit projects, in a separate transit-only conversation, a STAC and TRAC committee agreed on the following weighted scoring system (Table 1) resulting in a draft allocation outcome (Table 2) for the then expected Proposition 110.

Table 1: Allocation Criteria and Weighting of the Criteria

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Description</u>
30% - General Population	Estimated population based on 2010 Census
10% - Employment	Estimated number of jobs
20% - Disadvantaged Populations	Estimated population that are either senior (over 65), disabled, and/or low-income
10% - Zero-vehicle Households	Number of households with no access to a personal vehicle
15% - Transit Revenue Miles	Total Revenue Miles reported to National Transit Database (NTD)
15% - Transit Unlinked Trips	Total Unlinked Trips reported to NTD

Table 2: Draft TPR Allocation

TPR ID	TPR Name	Total Pop 2016	Total Jobs 2016	Disadvantaged Populations 2016	Zero-vehicle Households 2016	Revenue Miles 2016	Unlinked Trips 2016	Planning Alloc%
1	Pikes Peak Area	12.1%	10.0%	11.8%	9.9%	4.40%	2.62%	9.0%
2	Greater Denver Area	57.5%	64.3%	52.9%	62.5%	69.64%	80.45%	63.0%
3	North Front Range	8.8%	8.0%	9.2%	7.3%	4.68%	3.88%	7.3%
4	Pueblo Area	3.0%	2.3%	4.4%	4.8%	1.19%	0.72%	2.8%
5	Grand Valley	2.8%	2.6%	3.6%	2.8%	1.06%	0.62%	2.3%
6	Eastern	1.6%	1.0%	1.7%	1.5%	0.08%	0.03%	1.1%
7	Southeast	0.9%	0.6%	1.3%	1.0%	0.13%	0.03%	0.7%
8	San Luis Valley	1.2%	0.9%	1.9%	1.6%	0.08%	0.01%	1.0%
9	Gunnison Valley	1.9%	1.4%	2.6%	1.9%	5.01%	2.68%	2.6%
10	Southwest	1.8%	1.6%	2.1%	0.9%	1.24%	0.41%	1.4%
11	Intermountain	3.1%	3.5%	2.5%	1.7%	7.85%	6.39%	4.1%
12	Northwest	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%	0.8%	1.19%	1.29%	1.1%
13	Upper Front Range	1.9%	1.4%	2.1%	1.4%	1.03%	0.10%	1.5%
14	Central Front Range	2.0%	1.0%	2.3%	1.3%	2.29%	0.77%	1.8%
15	South Central	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.7%	0.16%	0.02%	0.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Weighting	30.0%	10.0%	20.0%	10.0%	15.0%	15.0%	

The prior work had the following advantages and disadvantages:

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers more than total population, consistent with SB 18-001 preamble to include seniors, persons with disabilities, and rural areas. • Population and ridership weighting help prevent rural areas from being under-represented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While population is a proxy indicator for bicycle and pedestrian need, there is no direct linkage yet made with the formula. • Did not directly address the matching question.

Matching Dollars

The SB 18-001 legislation stipulates that projects generally are required to be matched dollar-for-dollar: \$100 from the Fund, to be matched by \$100 from other sources. The legislation allows the Transportation Commission to reduce or exempt the match requirement due to size or other special circumstances. A \$200 project is 50% SB 1 fund money (\$100), and 50% money from another source (\$100), which this memo will refer to as a 50/50 match. The discussion, on this point, has a few options worth discussing:

- Require all projects to have a 50/50 match, without exception
- Waive the matching requirement entirely 100% Fund / 0% other on the basis that the funds are ultimately for local purposes.
- Exempt some projects from the 50/50 match
 - Exempt by size of project, on the basis that tracking the matching funds for very small projects is a burden more costly to administer, than worthwhile to obtain the match.
 - Exempt by type of project: such as ADA sidewalk curb ramps (safety) do not require a match, but other projects do.
 - Exempt for reasons of need / poverty / inability / size of agency on the basis that some areas of the state are economically disadvantaged, and might not be able to implement projects if a match is required.
- Use a sliding scale to alleviate some of the matching burden, but not take the match requirement to 0%. Again, this could be based on size or type of project, location within the state, or size/ability of agency to match.

Reporting Requirement

SB 18-001 requires that CDOT report to the legislature annually, how the funds are being used. The reporting requirement appears to have several dimensions: (1) to which regions of the state are the funds awarded, (2) within each region which projects were awarded funds, and (3) what is the status of the projects: not-started, started but not complete, or completed.

Method	Pros	Cons
<p>CDOT contracts with TPRs. TPRs select projects. TPRs required to do data assembly and reporting back to CDOT.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local control in selection of projects is maintained • CDOT has only 15 TPR reports to integrate, before reporting to the State Legislature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPR oversight of projects could be inconsistent. • Not all TPRs have the institutional capacity for on-going monitoring and reporting.
<p>TPRs select projects. After selection, CDOT contracts with individual communities / transit agencies who are individually required to report back to CDOT.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local control in selection of projects is maintained • TPRs have less responsibility for monitoring and reporting on projects which could be an advantage for smaller TPRs • Consistency of reporting is increased with a single agency doing the monitoring. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDOT responsibility is significantly increased and staff who monitor transit, bike, ped, and carpool projects are in three different Divisions. • Individual communities and transit agencies all must contract with CDOT and state-included provisions.
<p>Hybrid approach of the two above. TPRs self-select which approach they'd like to take.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local control in selection of projects is maintained • Each TPR also has choice of method. • Could reduce risks of inconsistency compared to the first method. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A little more complex and more work than the first method.

Next Steps

1. Convene the Multimodal Options Fund Committee (MMOC)
2. Ask that TRAC representatives of the MMOC report back to the TRAC on the outcomes of the meetings held before the March TRAC meeting.

Attachments

None