

4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Rm. 227 Denver, CO 80222

DATE: June 19, 2019

TO: Transporation Commission

- FROM:Sophie Shulman, Chief Office of Innovative Mobility (OIM)<br/>David Krutsinger, Director Division of Transit & Rail (DTR)<br/>Rebecca White, Director Division of Transportation Development (DTD)
- RE: SB 18-001 Multimodal Options Fund Update

# Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to review the recommendation prior to a proposed consent agenda vote.

# <u>Action</u>

Consent agenda vote on Thursday, June 20, 2019

## 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 spilt between CDOT (15% or \$14.13M) and local governments (85% or \$80.12M).

The legislation directs the TC to establish a distribution formula for the local portion. The distribution formula must be based on population and ridership. The legislation also states that recipients shall provide a match equal to the amount of the award. However, the Transportation Commission, per legislation, may create a formula for reducing or exempting the match requirement for local governments or agencies due to their size or any other special circumstance. An advisory committee ("MMOF Committee") to the TC was formed to work on and develop such recommendations. CDOT will use its share of the funds and seek to incentivize partnership projects such as mobility hubs.

The legislation mandates the distribution formula for the local portion be developed in consultation with the Transit and Rail Adivsory Committee (TRAC), the Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC), transit advocacy organizations, and bicycle and pedestrian organizations. In addition to these groups, the legislation also states that the Multimodal Options Fund should promote a complete and integrated multimodal system that benefits seniors by making aging in place more feasible; benefits residents of rural areas by providing them with flexible public transportation services; provides enhanced mobility for persons with disabilities; and provides safe routes to school for children.

The MMOF Committee held three meetings and developed the following general recommendations.

- 5% off the top (or \$4 Million of \$80.12) for administration, reporting, environmental/design reviews. To be adjusted later based on actual project selection.
- 81% of remaining \$76.12 to the five urban areas (MPOs), 19% to the ten rural planning regions (TPRs).
- Two sub-allocation formulas, one urban, and the other rural, to each of the fifteen areas of the state, with particular population and employment factors relevant to urban and rural areas.
- Match "relief" or reduction to be decided at the fifteen regions (TPRs) of the state. CDOT provided data to support that decision-making.
- General expectation that minimum transit project size of \$25,000, and minimum capital project size of \$150,000 would be observed for project selections, with resonable bundling of smaller projects encouraged to reach these minimums.

## <u>Details</u>

#### Administrative Set-Aside

Based on CDOT and the experience of many local agencies, simple projects such as the purchase of transit buses have wellestablished procurement processes and existing bus price-agreements, requiring relatively little staff time or oversight time to make them happen, estimated at about 2%. In contrast, larger construction projects typically take time to go through environmental clearances / permitting, construction bidding, and then construction itself. This process, if on a Federal Highway, often requires 20% of the total project cost to deliver. Sidewalks and bike paths are somewhere in the middle. The administrative set-aside anticipated a range of projects between 2% and 20%, with an estimate that the "average" project might require 5%. The MMOF Committee agreed to 5% set-aside, with the expectation that the amount would be revisited after projects had been selected in each of the fifteen TPRs.

#### Urban & Rural Allocations

The sources and definition of the data used in the analysis are shown in Table 1. The raw data are shown in Table 2. Note that the transit agency "Revenue Miles" was the indicator measure with the proportional distribution most favoring the rural areas of the state. There was a great deal of compromise in using this one indicator measure as the basis for the urban-rural share definition. It recognizes the fact that many urban residents travel to the rural areas of the state to visit family, to recreate, and to obtain some goods and services. Table 3 is the recommended allocation for all 15 regions.

Distribution For	mula Factors			
Category	Criteria	Data	MEASURE:	INDICATOR FOR:
	Population 2016	2016 Population estimates	Percent of state's Population	Need
	Employment	2016 jobs count estimates	Percent of state's jobs	Need
		2016 population est Senior,	Percent of state's population that is	
	Disadvantaged Population	Disability, and/or Low-income	Disabled, Senior and/or Low-income	Need
Population		2016 Population aged 5-18 years, by		
	School Aged Children	county	Percent of School-aged population	Need
		Total crashes involving a bicycle,		
	Bike Crashes	2008-2017, by county	Percent of Bike crashes	Safety
		Total crashes involving a pedestrian,		
	Pedestrian Crashes	2008-2017, by county	Percent of Pedestrian crashes	Safety
		2016 est. Households w/zero		
	Vehicle Access	vehicles	Percent of state's zero-vehicle households	Need, Demand
	Revenue Miles	2016 Vehicle Revenue Miles (NTD)	Percent of Total Revenue Miles	Transit Demand
Ridership				
	Unlinked Trips	2016 Unlinked Passenger Trips (NTD)	Percent of Total unlinked passenger trips	Transit Demand
			Percent of population adjusted by the	
Othor	Household Affordability "Burden"	Percent of Household income	relative Household Affordability (HA)	
other	(pop adjusted by relative %	required for housing & transportation	burden;	
	housing & trans costs)	costs, by county	Pop x HA/statewide mean	Need/economy

#### Table 1: Sources and Definitions of Data Used in the Analysis

### Table 2: Raw Data Used in the Analysis

Raw Data										
TEP Name	Bon 2016	labs	Disadu Ban	Zero	Revenue	Unlinked	Pike Crash	Pedestrian	School Aged	Household Affordability "Population-Burden" SW mean of 58.6% [%income] relative burden (adjusted pop)
Pikos Pook Aroo	691 /60	220 449	176 500	22.002	4 029 002	2 272 /15	1 022	1 065	125 619	
Denver Area	3 194 552	1 423 872	793 646	139 306	4,036,002	103 706 782	9,018	10 699	572 799	[40.376] .02 (302,078)
North Front Range	494 257	177 374	137,776	16 198	4 289 976	4 996 971	1 773	718	94 855	[48,1%] 82 (405,773)
Pueblo Area	164 447	51 821	66 761	10,130	1 087 426	924 304	351	443	30,403	[58 2%] 99 (163 369)
Grand Valley	150.258	57,501	54,280	6.324	968,921	792,946	459	291	27.827	[55.3%] .94 (141.683)
Eastern	83 711	22,588	25.572	3,306	68 869	36,282	30	51	14 274	[60.0%] 1.02 (85.727)
Southeast	45.877	12,879	19,765	2,180	116,227	41,717	17	25	8.080	[67.4%] 1.15 (52.799)
San Luis Valley	65,282	19,928	27,824	3,588	72,866	10,551	66	55	11,837	[64.4%] 1.10 (71,736)
Gunnison Valley	101,461	32,100	39,206	4,214	4,601,273	3,454,368	143	104	17,608	[60.8%] 1.04 (105,264)
Southwest	96,918	34,712	31,235	1,986	1,135,382	531,895	30	56	8,731	[57.5%] .98 (95,073)
Intermountain	168,963	76,758	37,313	3,768	7,204,028	8,233,278	375	377	35,743	[51.8%] .88 (149,323)
Northwest	60,750	25,432	15,178	1,700	1,089,777	1,660,293	91	73	10,898	[51.2%] .87 (53,110)
Upper Front Range	105,196	30,653	32,252	3,154	945,211	122,673	255	141	21,335	[50.4%] .86 (90,457)
Central Front Range	100,483	22,255	34,846	2,834	2,099,140	987,255	95	115	15,163	[55.0%] .94 (94,228)
South Central	20,616	5,972	9,144	1,666	145,790	29,072	11	29	3,120	[64.3%] 1.10 (22,625)
Total Statewide	5,534,240	2,214,293	1,501,307	223,026	91,760,059	128,900,802	13,737	14,242	1,008,292	
Rural Share	15.3%	12.8%	18.1%	12.7%	19.0%	11.7%	8.1%	7.2%	14.6%	
Urban Share	84.7%	87.2%	81.9%	87.3%	81.0%	88.3%	91.9%	92.8%	85.4%	

Table 3: Recommended Allocation by Transportation Planning Region

					Zero	Revenue	Unlinked		Pedestrian	School Aged	Household Affordability "Population-Burden" (pop adjusted by relative % housing &			
	TPR Name	Pop 2016	Jobs	Disadv Pop	vehicles	Miles	Trips	Bike Crash	Crash	Children	trans costs)	Alloc%	٩	Ilocation\$
	Pikes Peak Area	12.3%	10.0%	11.8%	9.9%	4.4%	2.6%	7.4%	7.5%	13.5%	12.2%	9.5%		\$6,865,226
	Denver Area	57.7%	64.3%	52.9%	62.5%	69.6%	80.5%	65.6%	75.1%	56.8%	54.4%	62.4%	\$	45,292,984
Urban	North Front Range	8.9%	8.0%	9.2%	7.3%	4.7%	3.9%	12.9%	2.0%	9.4%	8.8%	7.7%		\$5,591,491
	Pueblo Area	3.0%	2.3%	4.4%	4.8%	1.2%	0.7%	2.6%	3.1%	3.0%	3.6%	2.9%		\$2,128,884
	Grand Valley	2.7%	2.6%	3.6%	2.8%	1.1%	0.6%	3.3%	2.0%	2.8%	3.1%	2.4%		\$1,773,755
	Eastern	1.5%	1.0%	1.7%	1.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%	1.4%	1.9%	1.1%		\$1,031,838
	Southeast	0.8%	0.6%	1.3%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.8%	1.1%	0.7%		\$664,017
	San Luis Valley	1.2%	0.9%	1.9%	1.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%	1.2%	1.6%	1.0%		\$961,989
	Gunnison Valley	1.8%	1.4%	2.6%	1.9%	5.0%	2.7%	1.0%	%2.0	1.7%	2.3%	2.5%		\$2,355,869
0.110	Southwest	1.8%	1.6%	2.1%	0.9%	1.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	%6.0	2.1%	1.3%		\$1,247,368
Nula	Intermountain	3.1%	3.5%	2.5%	1.7%	7.9%	6.4%	2.7%	2.6%	3.5%	3.3%	3.9%		\$3,751,566
	Northwest	1.1%	1.1%	1.0%	0.8%	1.2%	1.3%	0.7%	0.5%	1.1%	1.2%	1.0%		\$993,003
	Upper Front Range	1.9%	1.4%	2.1%	1.4%	1.0%	0.1%	1.9%	1.0%	2.1%	2.0%	1.6%		\$1,492,904
	Central Front Range	1.8%	1.0%	2.3%	1.3%	2.3%	0.8%	%2.0	0.8%	1.5%	2.1%	1.7%		\$1,617,326
	South Central	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%		\$345,780
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	\$	76,114,000
	Urban Formula wt	20.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%				
	Rural Formula wt	20.0%		15.0%	10.0%	15.0%	10.0%	5.0%	5.0%	10.0%	10.0%	100.0%		
											CDOT Region 1	53.0%	\$	10,347,649
											CDOT Region 2	15.3%	ډ ډ	1,621,234
											CDOT Region 3	10.9%	\$	8,285,226
											CDOT Region 4	17.2%	ډ ډ	3,061,567
											CDOT Region 5	3.7%	\$	2,798,324
											Administrative	N/A	\$	4,006,000

## SubAllocations

The urban areas (MPOs) wanted funds allocated with 20% based on population, and 10% each based on all the other factors listed in Table 3, but not inclusive of the "affordability" data. The rural areas did not see jobs as being as relevant a factor, but did include "affordability" as a factor due to the high cost of housing in resort counties. Bicycle and pedestrian crash data were de-emphasized, compared to the urban formula, because there is less total data, and of the total, less reliable data in rural areas. The previously mentioned Table 3 shows the conclusions for each TPR, and the MMOF Committee agreed to these amounts.

## Match Relief

Most of the available data to analyze need, poverty vs. wealth, ability to pay, disadvantaged, and similar factors are available at the County level. See Table 4. While there are some truly poor & deserving Counties, the Committee for the Multimodal Option Fund discussion felt that many of the "need" and "ability to pay" distinctions might occur at the city/town level, and would be less likely compelling at the County Level. Further some of the "deserving counties" are clustered in single TPRs, which meant at the TPR level "need" and "ability to pay" could be rendered useless for making decisions within TPRs. Some "wealthy" counties would, similarly, be skewed by towns that are wealthy within them, while many other parts of such counties, if taken alone, might easily be as "deserving" as nearby counties. Fixing the inconsistencies and vagaries of the data could easily take many more months to resolve, which would, in turn, delay the distribution of the funds. Finally some TPRs/MPOs have already done a call for projects, anticipating these MMOF funds, so formulizing the match relief decision appeared to be moot and irrelevant for about 50 percent of the dollars. Given all of these reasons, the MMOF Committee recommended that match relief be delegated to the TPR decision makers themselves. The legal opinion from the Colorado Attorney General's office, however, was that the CDOT Transportation Commission may not delegate such a decision. The formula is therefore:

### Eligibility

- Counties of 50,000 or smaller population (as of 2015), and poverty rate of 12% (median) or higher; or
- Cities/Towns of 20,000 or smaller population (as of 2015), and poverty rate of 12% (median) or higher; or
- A County or City/Town which meets the population threshold of either of the above, but not the poverty threshold, but can document other extraordinary circumstances (some other indicator of high need or highly disadvantaged population)

### Decision Approved by Transportation Commission

Transportation Planning Region decisions which intend to award such match relief must also have the match relief decisions for those projects approved by the CDOT Transportation Commission.

### Minimum Project Size

The discussion on project size revolved around the ease of administration and reporting for the funding. CDOT is responsible for reporting on how the funding is spent, in all cases. By simple math, if many small projects of \$10,000 were awarded, the number of projects could be overwhelming (\$1 Million x 100 projects per Million\$ = \$,100 projects). Limiting the funds to only large projects of half a million or more ( $\$0.5 M \rightarrow 162$  projects), especially with match requirements, ran the risk of biasing the distribution of funds toward wealthier cities, counties, or transit agencies, and disadvantaging smaller ones. Members of the Committee argued that while there are expensive bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects, a \$0.5 Million minimum size would have obstructed the implementation of many worthy projects of smaller size: buying a single transit van (\$40,000 - \$0,000 each), repairing pedestrian/wheelchair ramps (\$6,000 each), striping bicycle lanes (\$5,000 to \$10,000 per mile), and so forth. The compromise position was to set the minimums at \$25,000 for transit (existing and accepted CDOT standard for transit pass-through funding) and \$150,000 for infrastructure projects, with bundled projects strongly encouraged. Thus maybe 15 miles of bike lanes in a county or region is bundled as a single \$150,000 contract. This compromise position was helped by the administrative set-aside above. If there are a high number of projects or the projects require lots of environmental clearance work, the administrative percentage could go up. If the projects are bundled, ready-togo, and don't require as much environmental work, then less administrative set-aside might be required.

				INDICA	TORS					
	Population Change	Pop. change Labor Force	* Single Large Employer	* Local Government	* Agriculture % of total emp	Employment Growth	%Bachelors+	* %Poverty +	Total	Graduated
County	(1990-2017) SDO	Age (2010-17) SDO	(in 2017) QCEW	(in 2017) QCEW	(in 2017) SDO	(2002-17) SDO	ACS13-17	ACS13-17 and SDOV17	Percentile Rank	Match
MIN 1 ot Quartila	-1.0%	-4.6%	1.8%	3.7%	0.0%	-23.8%	9.5%	15.0%	0%	00/
2nd Quartile	1.2%	0.3%	7.5%	17.4%	5.8%	10.9%	20.0%	31.1%	<u>25%</u> 50%	10%-40%
3rd Quartile	2.3%	1.4%	11.6%	25.0%	15.8%	19.2%	41.2%	38.4%	75%	50%
MAX	6.5%	4.9%	29.0%	57.6%	47.2%	81.2%	60.4%	57.0%	100%	50%
Adams County	2.4%	1.6%	4.0%	9.1%	0.8%	46.8%	22.4%	22.3%	90.4%	50.0%
Alamosa County	0.7%	0.8%	7.1%	12.3%	7.8%	9.6%	25.8%	41.3%	46.0%	40.0%
Arapanoe County	1.8%	1.5%	2.4%	8.7%	0.2%	22.5%	40.7%	22.6%	98.4%	50.0%
Baca County	-0.9%	1.4%	18.1%	57.6%	35.1%	-6.8%	21.8%	44 6%	3.1%	0.0%
Bent County	-0.6%	-1.6%	21.8%	38.5%	17.6%	-23.8%	9.5%	42.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Boulder County	1.3%	0.3%	5.4%	9.1%	0.5%	18.4%	59.3%	26.7%	82.5%	50.0%
Broomfield County	2.8%	3.3%	5.8%	3.7%	0.1%	53.7%	52.5%	18.4%	100.0%	50.0%
Chaffee County	1.7%	1.1%	5.7%	18.4%	2.5%	25.8%	34.4%	34.2%	68.2%	50.0%
Clear Creek County	-1.0%	-1.4%	0.4%	<u> </u>	0.3%	-0.5%	23.3%	26.0%	20.3% 52.3%	50.0%
Conejos County	0.3%	0.5%	12.8%	34.2%	21.1%	3.8%	18.3%	40.1%	14.2%	0.0%
Costilla County	0.6%	4.9%	20.7%	37.5%	25.3%	24.2%	20.0%	57.0%	31.7%	10.0%
Crowley County	0.0%	-2.0%	28.0%	16.2%	20.4%	0.6%	10.2%	38.1%	4.7%	0.0%
Custer County	3.3%	1.7%	9.8%	19.8%	10.3%	0.3%	29.4%	46.6%	44.4%	30.0%
Delta County	1.4%	-1.4%	9.3%	24.4%	10.0%	10.1%	19.6%	41.6%	28.5%	0.0%
Deriver County	1.5%		2.0%	39.2%	21.8%	19.5%	45.7%	20.0%	90.0%	0.0%
Douglas County	6.5%	0.0%	6.4%	10.6%	0.8%	81.2%	57.5%	15.0%	93.6%	50.0%
Eagle County	3.4%	0.8%	7.7%	9.3%	0.7%	22.1%	45.0%	18.5%	85.7%	50.0%
Elbert County	3.6%	1.1%	10.1%	25.0%	13.3%	12.9%	32.8%	20.6%	63.4%	50.0%
El Paso County	2.2%	1.2%	1.8%	10.0%	0.4%	20.1%	36.6%	23.5%	92.0%	50.0%
Fremont County	1.2%	-3.4%	15.1%	12.9%	3.0%	1.5%	16.4%	36.9%	33.3%	10.0%
Gamela County	2.0%	-0.6%	4.3%	8.6%	2.0%	-11 2%	29.1%	21.0%	79.3% 58.7%	50.0%
Grand County	2.4%	0.0%	11.2%	15.3%	3.0%	11.2%	37.2%	29.9%	57.1%	50.0%
Gunnison County	2.0%	1.5%	6.3%	15.3%	2.5%	15.9%	52.6%	26.8%	77.7%	50.0%
Hinsdale County	1.7%	1.0%	13.5%	29.2%	5.5%	-3.7%	40.9%	40.8%	38.0%	20.0%
Huerfano County	0.3%	-1.6%	22.3%	23.2%	13.0%	-13.5%	26.0%	45.8%	6.3%	0.0%
Jackson County	-0.5%	-1.5%	9.4%	19.4%	24.1%	0.7%	19.1%	35.5%	9.5%	0.0%
Kiowa County	-0.7%	1.3%	18.4%	46.2%	47.2%	14.3%	20.2%	34.4%	11.1%	0.0%
Kit Carson County	0.0%	-1.9%	5.1%	24.5%	23.1%	-3.6%	13.8%	30.5%	19.0%	0.0%
Lake County	0.9%	2.7%	16.0%	25.0%	0.4%	19.7%	30.9%	26.6%	61.9%	50.0%
La Plata County	2.1%	0.1%	3.3%	15.2%	2.7%	22.6%	43.0%	26.1%	80.9%	50.0%
Larimer County	2.3%	1.9%	5.1%	9.2%	1.0%	30.7%	45.3%	27.6%	87.3%	50.0%
Las Animas County	0.0%	-2.0%	5.2% 14.6%	20.1%	0.4%	-0.1%	13.9%	40.0%	22.2%	0.0%
Logan County	0.3%	2.0%	9.6%	13.7%	9.7%	-6.3%	16.7%	33.7%	36.5%	20.0%
Mesa County	1.8%	-0.7%	5.0%	9.6%	2.9%	18.9%	26.1%	34.3%	66.6%	50.0%
Mineral County	1.1%	3.9%	29.0%	16.9%	3.6%	19.0%	42.5%	44.6%	53.9%	50.0%
Mottat County	0.5%	-1.4%	7.3%	15.5%	7.5%	0.2%	18.9%	25.1%	39.6%	20.0%
Montrose County	2.0%	-1 0%	<u>4.8%</u> 5.9%	<u></u> 17 6%	ზ.5% 6.0%	0.2%	21.0%	38.1% 40.2%	49.2% 47.6%	40.0%
Morgan County	0.9%	-0.2%	16.8%	14.5%	9.8%	9.6%	16.1%	24.8%	41.2%	30.0%
Otero County	-0.4%	-0.1%	5.4%	19.1%	8.5%	-10.9%	17.1%	42.8%	23.8%	0.0%
Ouray County	2.7%	-3.1%	4.9%	19.2%	6.8%	33.9%	54.5%	37.2%	65.0%	50.0%
Park County	3.4%	0.4%	9.2%	28.0%	3.5%	13.8%	30.5%	26.0%	60.3%	50.0%
Phillips County	0.1%	-1.9%	9.2%	34.1%	26.9%	6.0%	20.4%	30.5%	15.8% 73.0%	0.0%
Prowers County	-0.4%	0.0%	5.4%	22.8%	15.3%	-16.7%	15.4%	35.5%	20.6%	0.0%
Pueblo County	1.1%	-0.1%	4.7%	10.9%	1.5%	12.1%	21.2%	37.9%	55.5%	50.0%
Rio Blanco County	0.2%	-4.6%	5.7%	33.9%	12.6%	0.9%	21.8%	26.9%	30.1%	10.0%
Rio Grande County	0.2%	-1.5%	6.1%	15.6%	23.1%	-5.2%	22.6%	37.8%	26.9%	0.0%
Routt County	2.1%	1.3%	7.7%	10.3%	3.6%	13.0%	49.4%	25.3%	76.1%	50.0%
Saquache County	1.4% _0.1%	2.3% _0 2%	<u>୪.୪%</u> ହ በ%	29.4% 10.1%	32.0%	U.6% 11 8%	25.5%	42.9% 27 Q%	34.9% 50.7%	50.0%
San Miguel County	2.9%	-1.1%	10.7%	14.3%	1.5%	16.5%	55.1%	24.1%	74.6%	50.0%
Sedgwick County	-0.6%	-0.6%	15.3%	40.0%	32.0%	-3.3%	19.8%	43.2%	1.5%	0.0%
Summit County	3.2%	4.3%	6.0%	10.5%	0.3%	17.4%	49.9%	23.3%	95.2%	50.0%
Teller County	2.5%	0.5%	5.5%	15.4%	1.2%	12.2%	32.6%	28.3%	71.4%	50.0%
Washington County	0.0%	0.2%	10.7%	36.1%	34.0%	-9.4%	16.0%	30.0%	7.9%	0.0%
Yuma County	3.2% 0.4%	3.0% 0.6%	3.2% A 7%	23 4%	4.1% 32.1%	40.3% 7 Q%	20.8% 21 <i>A</i> %	23.1%	08.8% 42.8%	30.0%
ruma county	0.4%	0.0%	4.1%	∠۵.4%	32.1%	1.9%	∠1.4%	33.2%	42.0%	30.0%

Table 4: Economic	: Need/Risk	Factors and	Match	"Relief"	Data
-------------------	-------------	-------------	-------	----------	------

# Policy Options

- 1. Accept the recommendations of the MMOF Committee and approve the distribution process. This is the staff recommendation, and is also supported by a review of the STAC and TRAC.
- 2. Largely accept the recommendations of the MMOF Committee, with minor supporting and/or clarifying language. This runs the risk of overriding some of the work done by the MMOF Committee.
- 3. Refer questions back to the MMOF Committee and delay the approval of the funding. This would not run the risk of overriding the work done by the MMOF Committee, but would delay the distribution of the funds by at least several months. Not recommended.

## Next Steps

- TC Meeting vote on Consent Agenda, or if Policy Option #2, with additional discussion.
- If approved, CDOT would begin the contracting process to get the funds flowing for selected projects.
- If approved, for areas where the call-for-projects has not been completed, CDOT Engineering Region Staff, and/or other CDOT staff, would facilitate the call-for-project process.