

**Southwest Chief Commission (SWC Commission)
Meeting Minutes
January 7, 2016
Denver, CDOT - Headquarters**

Member	Representing via HB 14-1161	Yes	No
Sal Pace, Chairman	Resident of Pueblo or Huerfano County – public rail advocate	X	
Rick Klein, Vice Chairman	Resident of Las Animas, Otero, or Prowers County – public rail advocate	phone	
Elena Wilken	Public Rail Transportation Advocate	X	
Jim Souby	Tourist Industry in Colorado	X	
Pete Rickershauser	Freight Rail Industry	X	
Mark Imhoff	Colorado Department of Transportation Representative (David Krutsinger represented in absence)	X	
Ray Lang	Amtrak Representative	phone	

Additional Agency Attendees: Aaron Greco, CDOT, Rob Eaton, Amtrak; David Krutsinger, CDOT; Ron Papsdorf, CDOT
Phone Agency Attendees: John Maddox, KDOT; Frank Sharpless, NMDOT; Chris Herrick, KDOT; Mike Moriarty, KDOT

I. ATTENDANCE/EXCUSED

A. Call to Order/Roll Call/Opening Remarks

Chairman Pace called the meeting to order; around the table and over the phone roll call was taken.

B. Approval of Minutes (October 2, 2015)

Jim Souby moved to approve the meeting minutes of October 2, 2015. Rick Klein seconded, motion approved by all.

II. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Welcome from Chairman Pace

Chairman Pace welcomed everyone to the meeting.

B. Update and / or remarks from attending guests

None

C. TIGER Grant VI Progress – Chris Herrick

The rail work will begin in February 2016. This work is scheduled to be completed early May 2016. There was an on-site review by FRA. FRA seemed pleased with the progress and the documentation sent out on this project up to date. Chairman Pace noted there was a very positive article appearing in USA and the photographs were great. Jim Souby noted there has been great public relations information with a lot of positive response.

D. TIGER Grant VII Update – Rick Klein

A kickoff meeting was held resulting in an action list produced by David Krutsinger that has been very helpful in moving forward. Garden City provided a copy of the FRA agreement they have with FRA for TIGER VI to assist with TIGER VII. Invoices will be sent very soon for the TIGER match awards for TIGER VII.

E. TIGER Program – Ron Papsdorf

TIGER VIII grant is expected to move forward. It is not known when solicitations for grant applications will be requested. Typically April is the month for application submission for TIGER grants, but there is potential that a later date will apply this year.

There has not been any formal discussion on if or who might make application for TIGER VIII. The group discussed possible application via an agency from New Mexico. Rick Klein contributed that there has not been any direct communication regarding this possibility. The remaining track needs to be examined. It is understood that TIGER VI and TIGER VII address the sections of the track with the greatest need for repair. The rail between Trinidad and New Mexico consists of some repairs but the repairs need to be studied as repairs will likely not increase the speed of the train through a specific area. Ray Lang questioned if NMDOT would be comfortable with the application by an agency. Frank Sharpless did not anticipate an issue with this as long as the rail is in NM. Ray Lang will get some clarity on the remaining repairs required not covered by TIGER VI and TIGER VII. Ray will break up the remaining rail by state and communicate this information to the Commission and the three state DOT's. Pete Rickershauser will gather the same information regarding the remaining track repair needed from his side. The area of greatest repair must be determined before the applicant for TIGER VIII can be considered.

F. Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act – Ron Papsdorf (attachment)

A memorandum is attached as reference. Some of the highlights include:

- Amtrak funding
- State supported route committee
- Consolidated rail infrastructure and safety improvements
- Federal-State Partnership for state of good repair
- Restoration and enhancement grants
- Route and service planning decisions

Chairman Pace asked if the funding split for the NE Corridor and National Network is a concern. Ray Lang noted that his interpretation is that this split is more about clarity on the costs. There is ability to shift funds in the event of an emergency.

Pete Rickershauser reviewed the Act and believes there could be potential sources for SWC and members should give consideration as a source of revenue, primarily for the Pueblo route.

Rob Eaton asked if FRA would administer funds to DOT or Amtrak, Ron Papsdorf responded that it would be a DOT.

G. Pueblo Connection Update – *This agenda item was not discussed in order and is recorded in the order of discussion*

ii. Pueblo Funding – Chairman Pace

Pueblo County passed a resolution to grant \$95,000 to Southwest Chief Rail Line Economic Development, Rural Tourism and Infrastructure Repair and Maintenance Fund. The funding includes \$15,000 for a ridership study and \$80,000 for engineering work. Chairman Pace recused himself on this funding request. Chairman Pace brought the check from Pueblo County today with him to CDOT and this will be the first deposit on this account.

i. Amtrak Feasibility Study Process – Ray Lang (attachment)

Passenger train studies, rider and revenue analysis are expensive. Amtrak will work with BNSF on what the scope of work will contain. There is more than one rail agency operating between La Junta and Pueblo. Mark Imhoff asked if there is a missing piece relating to the speed criteria that should also be covered or asked if or how that factors in. Ray Lang said the engineer analysis should tie in closely with this and it is something that Amtrak would handle.

iii. Formal letter requesting Amtrak's approval – Chairman Pace

An agreement must be in place on what is expected to be produced from this study. A letter will be sent to Amtrak requesting a feasibility study and a meeting to discuss the finer points with BNSF. Union Pacific is the agency that owns the set of parallel rail between La Junta and Pueblo. Union Pacific will need to be involved at some point in the discussions. Jim Souby moved to send a letter asking for the study and a meeting including the host railroads. Chairman Pace seconded and all agreed passing to produce a letter in the next few days for SWC members to view and agree upon to be sent out.

v. Approval to spend on ridership and Engineering Contract – Chairman Pace

Jim Souby moved that SWC give approval to do the ridership study and Rick Klein seconded. Mark Imhoff added that we specify up to the \$15,000 as the cap approved amount. Rick Klein seconded the specification to add the cap amount noted to cover this study. Everyone is in favor, ridership study for up to \$15,000 was passed.

iv. Engineering RFP – Pete Rickershauser & Jim Souby

Sal noted \$80,000 is designated for the engineering study as specified by the Pueblo County Resolution. It was decided that it is premature to move forward on this study until the details of what improvements are needed have been established. David Krutsinger noted that CDOT/DTR has agreed to utilize their RFP process for this study. There are three levels of procurement that would fit:

1 – Under \$100,000.00, quick purchase order with an approximate 5 page scope of work and the process would require approximately 1-2 months' time to be accomplished.

2 – Medium level scope of work with a broader group of consultants and a low bid accepted with a timeline of approximately 4 months.

3 – Over \$100,000.00, full RFP with a complete board review and a timeline of approximately 6 months to hire a consultant for a study.

CDOT recommends the quick purchase order based on the cost and our timeline. Chairman Pace has a subcommittee (Pete Rickershauser, Jim Souby, and David Krutsinger) in place to track this process and progress so we are ready to proceed when the time comes. Mark Imhoff reiterated according to regulations we must stay under the \$100,000 limit to utilize this process. David will send out an example of this process for SWC Commission to review. CDOT will coordinate with BNSF and Amtrak on choosing the acceptable parties for this assignment.

H. Update from DOT's

i. Colorado – Mark Imhoff

A meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 22, 2016 for coordination of the TIGER VII Grant. Rick Klein thanked Mark Imhoff, CDOT, and David Krutsinger for the effort being made in complying with the TIGER VII Grant requirements.

ii. New Mexico – Frank Sharpless

In regards to SWC, New Mexico is working with Kansas and Colorado in the discussion for legal counsel. A meeting is scheduled with the bureau chief to examine what will be required for the scope of work and the budget. A meeting will also be necessary with the Bureau Chief for environmental review. It is expected that the work will be fairly simple consisting of tie replacement which should not produce bureaucratic delays.

iii. Kansas – John Maddox

Kansas DOT is moving forward with the TIGER VI work and passing on their gained knowledge and experience to assist in the TIGER VII process. The first set of invoices have been received for TIGER VI and they are being reviewed, preparing for payment.

I. Update from Agencies

i. Amtrak – Robert Eaton

Joe Boardman is retiring as Amtrak President and CEO on 9/30/16. No new information other than the FAST Act.

ii. BNSF – no additional information to report

J. Public Comment – no information to report

III. ADJOURN

Rick Klein moved to adjourn, Jim Souby seconded. The Commission approved, Chairman Pace adjourned the meeting.



Title:
Location:
Date:

Southwest Chief Commission (SWC Commission)
CDOT, Headquarters - 4201 E Arkansas Ave, Aspen Conf Room, Denver
Thursday, January 7, 2016

Call in: 1-877-820-7831 Participant code: 418377#

Commission Members: Sal Pace, Chairman
Rick Klein, Vice Chairman
Elena Wilken
Jim Souby
Pete Rickershauser
Mark Imhoff
Ray Lang

Start	End	Time	#	Sub	Agenda Item(s)
10:00 AM	10:05 AM	0:05	I.		ATTENDANCE/EXCUSED
10:05 AM	10:10 AM	0:05		A.	Call to Order/Roll Call/Opening Remarks (Chairman Pace)
10:10 AM	10:15 AM	0:05		B.	Approval of Minutes (October 2, 2015) (Chairman Pace)
10:15 AM	10:15 AM	0:00	II.		REGULAR AGENDA
10:15 AM	10:20 AM	0:05		A.	Welcome from Chairman Pace
10:20 AM	10:25 AM	0:05		B.	Update and/or remarks from attending guests
10:25 AM	10:30 AM	0:05		C.	TIGER Grant VI progress (Pete Rickershauser)
10:30 AM	10:40 AM	0:10		D.	TIGER Grant VII update (Rick Klein)
10:40 AM	10:45 AM	0:05		E.	TIGER Program (Ron Papsdorf)
10:45 AM	10:50 AM	0:05		F.	*Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (Ron Papsdorf)
10:50 AM	11:10 AM	0:20		G.	Pueblo Connection Update i. *Amtrak Feasibility Study Process (Rob Eaton) ii. Pueblo Funding (Chairman Pace) iii. Formal letter requesting Amtrak's approval (Chairman Pace) iv. Engineering RFP (Pete Rickershauser & Jim Souby) v. Approval to spend on ridership and Engineering Contract
11:10 AM	11:30 AM	0:20		H.	Update from DOT's i. Colorado (Mark Imhoff) ii. New Mexico (Frank Sharpless) iii. Kansas (Chris Herrick)
11:30 AM	11:45 AM	0:15		I.	Update from Agencies i. Amtrak (Robert Eaton) ii. BNSF (Amtrak Rep and / or Peter Rickershauser)
11:45 AM	11:55 AM	0:10		J.	Public Comment
11:55 AM	12:00 PM	0:05	III.		ADJOURN
Total		2:00			(*attachment)

**Feasibility Report on Proposed Amtrak Service
Chicago-Milwaukee-LaCrosse-Twin Cities-(St. Cloud)**



**M.W. Franke
Senior Director
State Government Contracts**

**W.L. Lander
Principal Officer – Corridor Planning**

**B.E. Hillblom
Senior Director – State Partnerships**

**R. J. Rogers
Business Planning and Analysis Manager**

**Amtrak
Chicago, Illinois
May 6, 2015**

Exhibit 1
AMTRAK FEASIBILITY STUDY PROCESS

ITEM	TASK	TASK ACTIVITY
1	STUDY REQUEST & CONTRACT	Amtrak is formally requested by one or more recognized state agencies (typically the state DOT) to perform a feasibility study for intercity passenger train service within a specified corridor, and the state(s) and Amtrak begin negotiations for the development of study contract terms, statement of work, and study fee. The state(s) provide to Amtrak the route(s) to be studied, the desired station stop cities, the desired frequency of service, and the desired maximum authorized speed (MAS) for the route. Specific station site locations within each station stop city is not required to perform the study, but can be helpful to the study team.
2	HOST RAILROAD NOTIFICATION	Host railroad notifications are made to host railroads that would be involved in or affected by the proposed operation of intercity passenger train service within the requested study corridor. The purpose and parameters of the study are outlined, and follow-up meetings are suggested to plan inspection trips, gather data, and estimate the level of capacity analysis that will be required.
3	ROUTE HISTORY & DEMOGRAPHICS	Upon completion of a feasibility study contract, Amtrak will begin gathering information on route history and on local demographics of the municipalities to be served by the proposed intercity passenger train service. States will typically provide to Amtrak any past studies or data that may be relevant to the feasibility study.
4	DATA COLLECTION	Amtrak will begin to work with the host railroads to collect employee timetables, track charts, and other infrastructure and operating data needed for report preparation.
5	ROUTE INSPECTION	Amtrak arranges with host railroads to make a physical inspection, including hi-rail trips where appropriate, of the proposed corridor route. During the inspection trip Amtrak and the host railroad will begin a dialogue about the impact of new or expanded passenger train service on the corridor and the infrastructure improvements needed to meet both freight and passenger train operational goals.
6	PROVISIONAL TRAIN SCHEDULES	Amtrak will develop a provisional passenger train schedule based on the route and city station stops selected by the state(s), the number of frequencies and approximate departure times selected by the state(s), and a passenger train maximum authorized speed (MAS) agreed to by the state(s) and host railroads. The term "provisional", within the context of this study, implies the schedule will be realistic and doable; however, it is understood that the schedule may not be fully optimized due to the inherent time constraints and depth of research limitations of a feasibility study.
7	CAPACITY ANALYSIS	Host railroads will typically perform RTC modeling of the proposed service and route to evaluate the impact of proposed new passenger train operations on the existing and future freight train operations. This work may be done in-house by the host railroad or contracted to a consultant. The cost of RTC modeling is passed through to the states. Upon receipt of capacity analysis results from the host railroads, Amtrak, in cooperation with the host railroads, will technically analyze the results and assess whether the proposed infrastructure improvements (and costs) appear reasonable and whether adjustments to train schedules could reduce infrastructure costs.
8	AMTRAK FINANCE & OPERATIONS	Provisional schedules, frequency of service, and number of trainsets for the proposed service is forwarded to Amtrak's Financial and Operations Groups. Finance and Operations jointly identify the quantity and costs for equipment, train and on-board crews, crew new hires and crew training. Amtrak Finance undertakes a ticket pricing study, which includes identification of Amtrak's total operating costs and required ticket prices.
9	REVENUE RIDERSHIP ANALYSIS	Amtrak utilizes a qualified consultant to develop ridership and revenue estimates based on the provisional schedule, service frequency, and the Amtrak-verified host railroad capacity analysis results, all of which are developed prior to the revenue/ridership analysis.
10	ROLLING STOCK & EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	Based on provisional train schedules, agreed upon by the host railroads, and train consists developed from ridership data, Amtrak will develop a plan for equipment rotation, servicing, maintenance, and layover facilities, and will identify the associated capital costs required for implementation.
11	INFRA-STRUCTURE	AMTRAK will work with Host Railroads and their consultants to identify infrastructure improvements, and an associated "order of magnitude" capital cost estimate, necessary to meet requirements of PRIIA, Section 207, for on-time performance and train delay standards.
12	DRAFT REPORT FOR AMTRAK REVIEW	Amtrak incorporates the relevant comments into the draft report and circulates it internally for review and approval. This process usually takes about 30 days.
13	DRAFT REPORT FOR STATE REVIEW	Upon completion of the internal Amtrak review, the draft report is forwarded to the state(s) for review and approval with or without comments and/or changes. Typically 30 days is allowed for review and approval of the draft report by the state.
14	FINAL REPORT	Once Amtrak receives the state's comments on the draft report, a Final Report is prepared and submitted to the state(s). The Final Report will incorporate appropriate comments and/or changes from the State's review of the Draft Report, provided the comments/changes do not substantially alter the key components of the report, such as route, schedule, station stops, infrastructure capital, operating costs, etc.



COLORADO

Department of Transportation

Office of Policy and Government Relations

MEMORANDUM

TO: SOUTHWEST CHIEF COMMISSION
FROM: RON PAPSDORF, FEDERAL AFFAIRS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT LIAISON
DATE: JANUARY 6, 2016
SUBJECT: FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION (FAST) ACT - PASSENGER RAIL HIGHLIGHTS

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed into law the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. The FAST Act authorizes Federal highway, transit, and rail programs for five years from 2016 to 2020 and represents the first long-term comprehensive surface transportation legislation since 2005.

The FAST Act is a five year (FY 2016 - FY 2020) \$300 billion highway, transit, highway safety and rail bill. It provides approximately \$225 billion in contract authority over five years for the Federal-aid Highway program, increasing funding from \$41 billion in FY 2015 to \$47 billion in FY 2020. The bill continues to distribute nearly 93 percent of all Federal-aid Highway program contract authority to State DOTs through formula programs. The bill creates a new National Highway Freight program (approximately \$1.2 billion a year) that is distributed to the States by formula and creates a new discretionary program for Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects (approximately \$900 million a year). The FAST Act gradually increases the percentage of the Surface Transportation Program that is suballocated by population from 50 percent in FY 2015 to 55 percent in FY 2020. The bill also includes a \$7.6 billion rescission of unobligated Federal-aid Highway contract authority in FY 2020.

The FAST Act provides approximately \$61 billion over five years for Federal transit programs including \$48.9 billion in Highway Trust Fund contract authority and roughly \$12 billion in funding from the General Fund. For highway safety the bill provides \$4.7 billion for NHTSA (\$3.7 from the HTF) and \$3.2 billion for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. The FAST Act authorizes approximately \$10 billion over five years for the Federal Railroad Administration and Amtrak.

For Colorado, the bill increases highway formula funding from \$516 million in 2015 to \$542 million in 2016 and grows to \$592 million in 2020. On the transit side, funding increases from \$111.5 million in 2015 to \$114.6 million in 2016 and grows to \$124.8 million in 2020. A funding summary by program area is attached.

Passenger Rail Provision Highlights

Amtrak Funding

For the first time, Amtrak funding is separated into the Northeast Corridor and the National Network. The bill directs the creation of at least two distinct accounts for the Northeast Corridor and the National Network to assign all revenues, appropriations, grants and other forms of financial assistance, compensation, and other sources of funds, including operating surplus, commuter payments and state payments. If Amtrak determines that a transfer between the accounts is necessary, Amtrak may transfer funds between the Northeast



Corridor and National Network accounts if Amtrak notifies the Amtrak Board of Directors, including the Secretary, at least 10 days prior to the expected date of transfer. The National Network is funded at \$5.454 billion over five years while the Northeast Corridor is funded at \$2.596 billion.

State Supported Route Committee

The Act directs the Secretary of Transportation to establish the State-Supported Route Committee to promote mutual cooperation and planning pertaining to the rail operation of Amtrak and related activities of trains operated by Amtrak on State-supported routes.

Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements

This grant program is funded at \$1.103 billion over five years with an 80-20 Federal-State split. At least 25% is reserved for projects in rural areas. Funds may be used for the following project types:

- Deployment of safety technology, including positive train control and rail integrity inspection systems.
- Capital projects identified by the Secretary as being necessary to address congestion challenges affecting rail service.
- Highway-rail grade crossing improvements, including installation, repair, or improvement of grade separations, railroad crossing signals, gates, and related technologies, highway traffic signalization, highway lighting and crossing approach signage, roadway improvements such as medians or other barriers, railroad crossing panels and surfaces, and safety engineering improvements to reduce risk in quiet zones or potential quiet zones.
- Rail line relocation and improvement projects.
- Capital projects to improve short-line or regional railroad infrastructure.
- Preparation of regional rail and corridor service development plans and corresponding environmental analyses.
- Any projects the Secretary considers necessary to enhance multimodal connections or facilitate service integration between rail service and other modes.
- Development and implementation of a safety program or institute designed to improve rail safety.
- Any research the Secretary considers necessary to advance any particular aspect of rail-related capital, operations, or safety improvements.

Federal-State Partnership for State of Good Repair

Provides \$997 million over five years for this grant program. The Act directs the DOT to give preference to projects for which Amtrak is not the sole applicant, applications submitted jointly by multiple applicants, and projects with a proposed Federal share of less than 50%. Funds may be used for capital projects that:

- Replace existing assets in-kind.
- Replace existing assets with assets that increase capacity or provide a higher level of service.
- Ensure that service can be maintained while existing assets are brought to a state of good repair.
- Bring existing assets into a state of good repair.

Restoration and Enhancement Grants

This new program provides \$100 million (\$20 million per year) over five years for restoration and enhancement of passenger rail service. Grant applications must include a capital and mobilization plan that includes an operating plan that describes the planned operation of the service, including the identity and qualifications of the train operator; service frequency; the planned routes and schedules; the station facilities that will be utilized; projected ridership,



revenues, and costs; and details on the equipment that will be utilized, how such equipment will be acquired or refurbished and where such equipment will be maintained.

The Act directs the DOT to give preference to projects that:

- Restore service over routes formerly operated by Amtrak or would provide daily or daytime service over routes where such service did not previously exist;
- Provide service to regions and communities that are underserved or not served by other intercity public transportation;
- Fosters economic development, particularly in rural communities and for disadvantaged populations; and
- Enhance connectivity and geographic coverage of the existing national network of intercity rail passenger service.

The Act limits Federal operating assistance to three years, gradually lowering it from 80% in the first year to 40% for the third year.

Route and Service Planning Decisions

Amtrak shall obtain the services of an independent entity to develop and recommend objective methods for Amtrak to use in determining what intercity rail passenger routes and service it should provide, including the establishment of new routes, the elimination of existing routes, and the contraction or expansion of service or frequencies over such routes. The Amtrak Board of Directors shall consider the adoption of each recommendation and transmit a report explaining the reasons for adopting or not adopting each recommendation to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.



Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act

Funding Summary for Colorado

Highway Programs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
National Highway Performance Program	\$297,705,132	\$304,312,514	\$310,098,755	\$316,507,189	\$323,099,910	\$1,551,723,500
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program	\$137,015,364	\$140,516,942	\$143,558,486	\$146,342,615	\$149,830,157	\$717,263,564
Surface Transportation Block Grant Set-aside	\$10,486,329	\$10,486,329	\$10,703,299	\$10,703,299	\$10,703,299	\$53,082,555
STBGP Set-aside:						
Recreational Trails Program	\$1,591,652	\$1,591,652	\$1,591,652	\$1,591,652	\$1,591,652	\$7,958,260
Highway Safety Improvement Program	\$29,431,653	\$30,085,816	\$30,649,742	\$31,201,622	\$31,834,485	\$153,203,318
Railway-Highway Crossings Program	\$3,236,539	\$3,308,462	\$3,380,386	\$3,452,309	\$3,524,232	\$16,901,928
CMAQ Program	\$42,132,383	\$43,067,485	\$43,886,376	\$44,689,751	\$45,597,422	\$219,373,417
Metropolitan Planning	\$5,266,924	\$5,373,578	\$5,486,478	\$5,604,275	\$5,734,725	\$27,465,980
National Freight Program	\$15,546,723	\$14,870,779	\$16,222,667	\$18,250,501	\$20,278,334	\$85,169,004
Total	\$542,414,715	\$553,615,574	\$565,579,859	\$578,345,232	\$592,196,236	\$2,832,151,616
Transit Programs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
5303: Metropolitan Planning	\$1,807,282	\$1,844,151	\$1,882,878	\$1,922,795	\$1,963,558	\$9,420,664
5304: Statewide Planning	\$372,263	\$379,857	\$387,834	\$396,056	\$404,452	\$1,940,462
5307+5340: Urbanized Area Formula	\$74,345,208	\$75,863,206	\$77,506,323	\$79,505,365	\$81,219,297	\$388,439,399
5329(3): State Safety Oversight Program	\$536,630	\$547,362	\$558,857	\$570,704	\$582,803	\$2,796,356
5310: Enhanced Mobility for Adults and People with Disabilities	\$3,781,419	\$3,857,047	\$3,938,045	\$4,021,532	\$4,106,788	\$19,704,831
5311+5340: Non-urbanized Area Formula	\$11,158,622	\$11,408,398	\$11,674,316	\$11,948,201	\$12,228,030	\$58,417,567
5311(b)(3): RTAP	\$158,456	\$161,625	\$165,019	\$168,518	\$172,090	\$825,708
5311(c)(1): Indian Reservation Formula	\$182,995	\$182,995	\$182,995	\$182,995	\$182,995	\$914,975
High Intensity Fixed Guideway	\$13,880,464	\$14,116,715	\$14,360,514	\$14,607,801	\$14,859,341	\$71,824,835
High Intensity Motor Bus	\$420,108	\$427,258	\$434,634	\$442,121	\$449,735	\$2,173,856
5339: Bus and Bus Facilities Formula	\$6,225,267	\$6,382,263	\$6,550,237	\$6,723,078	\$6,899,443	\$32,780,288
5339: Statewide Allocation	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$8,750,000
Total	\$114,620,730	\$116,922,894	\$119,393,670	\$122,241,185	\$124,820,552	\$597,988,941

