

**Transportation Commission of Colorado
Transit and Intermodal Committee Meeting**

**Meeting Agenda
Thursday, March 20, 2014 10:30-11:00
4201 East Arkansas Avenue
Denver, Colorado**

**Debra Perkins-Smith, Director
Division of Transportation Development**

**Mark Imhoff, Director
Division of Transit and Rail**

**Ed Peterson, Chair
District 2, Lakewood**

**Kathy Connell
District 6, Steamboat Springs**

**Kathy Gilliland
District 5, Livermore**

**Shannon Gifford
District 1, Denver**

**Bill Thiebaut
District 10, Pueblo**

- **Introductions and Approve minutes of January Transit and Intermodal Committee Meeting - Ed Peterson - 5 minutes ...Page 02**
- **Bike-Friendly State: Strategies to be #1 - Debra Perkins-Smith and Betsy Jacobsen - 15 minutesPage 03**
- **Safe Routes to School: Projects for FY 14 - Debra Perkins-Smith and Leslie Feuerborn - 15 minutesPage 08**
- **Adjourn**

THE AGENDA MAY BE ALTERED AT THE CHAIR'S DISCRETION.

Transit & Intermodal Committee Meeting Minutes
January 16, 2014

Committee Members Attending: Ed Peterson (Chair), Shannon Gifford, Kathy Gilliland, Kathy Connell, and Bill Thiebaut.

Also attending were: Commissioners Doug Aden, Heather Barry, Les Gruen, Steven Hoffmeister, and Sidny Zink. Staff present included DTR Director Mark Imhoff, DTD Director Debra Perkins-Smith, Region 1 Director Tony DeVito, Region 3 Director Dave Eller, and OPR Director / Commission Secretary Herman Stockinger.

Chairman Peterson called the meeting to order at 9:35 am.

1. **Approval of November 2013 Minutes:** The minutes of the November 2013 meeting were approved unanimously as written.
2. **FY 2015 FASTER Transit Project Recommendations / Future Years FASTER Redistribution:** Mark Imhoff gave a presentation on the FASTER Transit Project Recommendations for FY 2015, as well as a proposal to consider a redistribution of FASTER dollars for FY 2016 and beyond. He noted the Commission would be asked to approve the FY 2015 projects at the February meeting.

The redistribution proposal is to be developed through the first half of the year based on guiding principles, which principles are themselves based on Policy Directive 14 measures which have already been previously vetted through the Commission: transit utilization (ridership), transit asset condition (state of good repair for bus fleets), connectivity among transit systems, and streamlining the distribution process (government efficiency).

The T&I committee provided advisory-level support for the guiding principles, but provided strong cautions on the connectivity principle. It was re-emphasized that the T&I Committee and other commission members have noted prior concerns about FASTER allocations to operating expenditures beyond CDOT-operated services. Staff was given the direction to further define how connectivity principles could be achieved, to come back with a better definition of that, and to steer away from any situations where CDOT funds would be used to bail out under-performing, locally-unsupported services.

3. **Colorado High Speed Transit: AGS and ICS Status and Project Completion:** David Krutsinger gave a presentation outlining the completion of the Advanced Guideway System Feasibility Study (AGS Study) in the I-70 Mountain Corridor, and the Interregional Connectivity Study (ICS) in the I-25 Front Range Corridor. He highlighted the need, previously established by the State Rail Plan, to maintain Colorado's option to compete for future funds by following FRA guidance for high speed rail, and for maintaining & updating a State Rail Plan. He noted that the vision for the system, integrating the findings from both the AGS and ICS studies meets FRA criteria for capital & operating benefits exceeding the costs. David noted on the capital side, the social and economic benefits are greater than the cost of construction, but that money for construction is not available.

Questions were asked for examples and justification of the finding that operating revenues would exceed operating costs, specifically tied to densities of population found in Colorado now or expected to be found within the planning horizon of 2035/2040. David replied he would pull together such materials and other materials for a February or March workshop. Mark Imhoff noted that the Draft Reports would be released tomorrow to the Project Leadership Team members of each study.

Commissioner Aden asked whether the AGS findings meet the EIS triggers for a "not feasible" finding. Director Hunt replied that there is an "implemented or funded" clause in the EIS, on which the "or funded" portion cannot be fully determined until 2025 arrives. He noted that other decision triggers are not met yet either, since minimum program elements are not fully funded.

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Division of Transportation Development
4201 East Arkansas Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80222
(303) 757-9011



DATE: March 20, 2014

TO: Intermodal Committee of the Transportation Commission

FROM: Debra Perkins-Smith, Director, DTD
Betsy Jacobsen, Section Manager, Bike/Ped Programs

SUBJECT: #1 Bike Friendly State

Purpose

This memo provides recommended strategies for advancing the state of Colorado from the Number Two Bicycle Friendly State, to Number One.

Action Requested

Provide direction on specific strategies listed below and detailed in the attached spreadsheet.

Background

Each year the League of American Bicyclists (LAB) releases a ranking of all the states for how “Bike Friendly” each state is. This ranking is based on a lengthy survey, data on a multitude of factors and is about the whole state, not only what is being done on the state highway system. In 2013, Colorado ranked #2 and Governor Hickenlooper in his State of Health Address stated that he wanted Colorado to be the #1 Bike Friendly state by 2015. Governor Hickenlooper recognizes the economic benefits of this endeavor as biking contributes more than \$1 Billion to the economy (year 2000 data) and with the expansion of cycling events is an even larger economic generator today.

In November, the Transit and Intermodal Committee received a presentation from staff on six potential strategies to move Colorado towards being Number One. Staff was then asked to further define the strategies going forward.

The six strategies presented to the Committee were based on analysis of the results of the LAB surveys and rankings as well as looking at what will be best for the biking program in Colorado.

These are:

1. Establish a Governor’s statewide bicycle advisory committee
2. Adopt a mode share goal for biking in Colorado
3. Dedicate funding for the Safe Routes to School program
4. Implement AASHTO’s US Bike Route System in Colorado
5. Add bicycle safety to the State Highway Safety Plan
6. Implement Performance Measures for Biking

Some of the above strategies are already underway as part of the bike/ped program at CDOT. Others require partnerships with stakeholders or local governments. Some require additional resources and some are more expensive than others but also have a high return value.

Attachment A lists each strategy with a description, staff and financial resources needed to implement the strategy, and the timeline associated with each. If the Committee directs staff to proceed with these strategies, funding would be provided from the DTD federal planning funds and staff resources would be accommodated either within DTD or in partnership with other parts of the CDOT organization.

The League of American Bicyclists’ ranking is done in five categories. Below is a table showing Colorado and the other top states.

	WA #1	CO #2	OR #3	MN #4	DE #5
Legislation & Enforcement	5	5	4	4	4
Policies & Programs	4	4	4	4	3
Infrastructure & Funding	3	2	2	3	2
Education & Encouragement	5	4	4	4	4
Evaluation & Planning	3	2	3	2	2

Because Colorado has both a CDOT policy on including provision for Bike/Ped in every project and a state law requiring accommodations for Bike/Ped in all projects, a share the road law, and training and support from law enforcement, Colorado scores high in legislation and enforcement. Other areas have room for improvement. We have already done many things to improve the biking experience in Colorado and our ranking has gone up from 24th to 2nd since 2008. Strategies to address Infrastructure and Funding and Evaluation and Planning will be important to moving to Number One.

Next Steps

With Committee direction staff will move forward with implementation steps on these strategies and report progress periodically.

Colorado Strategies to Becoming the Number One Bicycle Friendly State
March 20, 2014

	Strategy	Description	Staff Resources	Timeline	Financial Commitment	Notes
1	Establish a Governor-appointed Statewide Bicycle Advisory Committee consisting of diverse representation from across the state to provide input on programs and policies. Members may include representation from CCI, CML, DOLA, Tourism, Office of Economic Development, CDOT, MPOs, education, bicycle advocates, citizens, etc.	Governor's Advisory Committee - the Governor's office takes lead in establishing an Executive Order creating the committee, providing details regarding purpose and authority of committee, selection of representatives, membership term, etc. CDOT staff serve as member on committee.	Ongoing. Staff time would be required to attend meetings and participate in decisions and activities of the committee. It's anticipated that more time would be required as the committee is formed, but then reduced as a regular schedule is determined. Anticipate 8-16 hours per month.	Recommend presenting the concept to the Governor by May. Gov office leads development of E.O. and appointments. Committee could be formed by early fall.	Staff time for meeting attendance and any related activities such as research, presentations, etc.(DTD) Committee members would be responsible for any costs associated with travel and meetings.	The League of American Bicyclists includes this as part of their scoring and identified it for improvement.
2	Adopt a statewide bicycling mode share goal	Some Colorado communities and MPOs have a goal for bicycle mode share; but CDOT, and the State, do not. The Governor's Advisory Committee could recommend a statewide goal. CDOT could support it by making a recommendation to the TC and including it in PD14. Additionally, continued expansion of the Bike/Ped Counting Program is needed to provide accurate data regarding actual usage to measure progress toward goal.	Staff would be used to research mode share goals throughout the state and identify a target for Colorado. Bike/Ped staff and Traffic Analysis staff is required to expand the counting program. The current 50% FTE will need to expand to 100% to manage the program and analysis or consultant services will be required.	Research on this project could begin this spring, with a recommendation to the TC by fall. Expansion of both permanent and short-duration counters will be needed to provide adequate data. Installation over a two-year period.	A capital investment of \$250,000 - \$300,000 for equipment and installations is required to bring the bike/ped counting program to a level for statewide analysis. Could focus on certain regions first. An operational budget and staff support would also be needed on-going. Anticipate funding from SPR funds.	The League of American Bicyclists provides points for having a mode share goal and working towards it. Just as motorized traffic counts help drive decisions, non-motorized counts are also needed in transportation decisions. To make effective investments, accurate data needs to be collected.

Colorado Strategies to Becoming the Number One Bicycle Friendly State
March 20, 2014

	Strategy	Description	Staff Resources	Timeline	Financial Commitment	Notes
3	Dedicate funding for Safe Routes to School Program.	<p>Currently, there is no dedicated funding for this popular, grass-roots program. Project and administration costs need to be provided. Past funding levels have been approximately \$2M per year. No project funding is available after FY 14.</p> <p>A bill is being introduced to the Colorado Legislature that requests general funds to support SRTS. CDOT plans to support the bill.</p>	Currently CDOT has one FTE dedicated to this program through FY16 and paid for with remaining SAFETEA-LU funds; but no dedicated project funds beyond FY14.	Dedicated funds would need to be identified for future years in order to call for projects and administer a program in FY15.	Funding for infrastructure, education, and administration has been approximately \$2M per year.	This is a key element of the state ranking. Without funding for this program, it's unlikely we will even retain our Number Two ranking.
4	<p>Implement AASHTO US Bike Route System</p> <p>US Bike Route system is intended to identify best intra and inter-state bike routes. Routes across Colorado both E/W and N/S would be identified. These may be on state highways or on local roads or a combination.</p>	<p>This will take coordination with local agencies as well as neighboring states. Criteria for determining routes will need to be created.</p> <p>Prospective routes identified.</p> <p>Meetings with local agencies and public outreach will be required.</p> <p>IGAs with local agencies will need development.</p> <p>Coordination with surrounding states will be needed.</p> <p>Approval from AASHTO is required (applications are accepted once a year).</p> <p>Once approved, publishing of routes on maps and signage on roadways.</p>	Significant amount of time from staff to oversee and implement the program. It is anticipated that 30-50% cumulative FTE time within CDOT, as well as consultant support would be required.	Once staff and consultant are identified, preparing the first submission to AASHTO would be approximately 18-24 months.	Consultant expenses are expected to be approximately \$400,000 total but phase 1 could be \$75,000- \$100,000. Funds from SPR or potential TIGER grant.	<p>Adopting specific routes could have a economic impact by bringing more travelers to our state. It may also improve safety as we improve specific roads where more bicyclists ride.</p> <p>This is also a specific question on the League's annual survey and would affect our rating.</p>
5	Add Bicycle Safety to the Strategic Highway Safety Plan	Bicycle safety is one of the seven emphasis groups in the Plan.	DTD staff is attending meetings and providing input to the plan. Expect less than 10% of FTE time during the next six months.	Anticipated completion of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan is late summer, 2014.	None until plan is implemented.	The League of American Bicyclists suggested this as one of the areas to improve Colorado's scoring.

Colorado Strategies to Becoming the Number One Bicycle Friendly State
March 20, 2014

	Strategy	Description	Staff Resources	Timeline	Financial Commitment	Notes
6	Implement Performance Measures to track statewide progress	<p>Performance measures are being finalized as part of the Statewide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Phase II. Data needed to support performance measures includes:</p> <p>1) Developing an inventory of bicycle/pedestrian facilities to measure extent of system.</p> <p>2) Determining method to identify funds spent on bike/ped projects when they're part of a larger project. Identify and implement changes in reporting. Additionally, coordination and training appropriate staff would be required.</p>	<p>Consultant support would be required for developing data.</p> <p>Additionally, staff time equating to 50% FTE for two years would be needed to do data entry, extraction, mapping, training, coordination with MPOs/locals.</p>	Two years to collect existing data from locals, inventory SH system, consolidate all data, implement financial reporting.	<p>Inventory collection will require both staff and outside expenses such as specific data base purchase and consultant support. Costs are estimated to be \$300,000.</p> <p>Need to determine cost and timeline for financial reporting.</p>	The League of American Bicyclists recommends each state establish performance measures to determine progress. In addition to performance, these measurements can help guide decisions on funding.

STATE OF COLORADO

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



DATE: March 20, 2014
TO: Transit and Intermodal Committee of the Transportation Commission
FROM: Debra Perkins-Smith, Director, DTD
SUBJECT: Safe Routes to School (SRTS) FY14

Purpose

This memo summarizes information about the list of Safe Routes to School projects recommended for funding for FY 2014.

Action Requested

Recommend to full Commission the approval of the SRTS projects for FY 2014 as selected by the nine-member SRTS Advisory Committee established in state statute.

Background

SRTS is a Federal program designed to enable and encourage more children K-8 to walk and bike to school. Since its inception in 2005, CDOT's SRTS program has distributed \$15.4 million FHWA funds through 175 grants to schools, school districts, cities, towns, and counties for both infrastructure (capital) and non-infrastructure (education and encouragement) projects. Between 60 and 100 schools per year benefit from this program, this equates to more than 300,000 total Colorado students to date. Additionally, parents, teachers, drivers, and other community members also benefit from SRTS programs.

Under MAP-21, SRTS was combined with other programs and included within the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Because the amount of Federal funding for TAP was reduced from the level formerly allocated to Transportation Enhancement (TE), Commission decision was not to designate a specific portion of TAP funds for SRTS past FY13. Therefore, the only funds available for projects in FY14 are the remaining SAFETEA-LU funds resulting from project savings or project withdrawals (i.e., Colorado Springs school closure).

These are 100% federal funds dedicated to SRTS and cannot be used for any other program. FHWA requires 10-30% of the funds to be used for educational projects. We were able to maintain this requirement this year at 15% of funding awarded to non-infrastructure (education) projects while using savings from previous non-infrastructure projects.

In addition to federal requirements, Colorado statute requires funds to be distributed based in proportion to the geographic distribution of K-8 student population. In Colorado, approximately 75% of the projects are awarded to urbanized areas (MPOs) and 25% in rural areas (TPRs). This is not a formula that provides funding for every TPR. The statute also requires that the projects be selected through a competitive process by a nine-member advisory committee which is appointed by the CDOT Executive Director.

“Taking Care To Get You There”

Details

For FY14, CDOT has \$2,458,873 to distribute. A total of 40 applications were received with representation from all five CDOT regions. Twenty-two (55 percent) were infrastructure; 18 (45% percent) were non-infrastructure; 71 percent of projects are from MPO areas and 29 percent from TPRs. Total requests equaled \$6,376,372 – exceeding the amount available by a ratio of more than 2 to 1.

The applications were reviewed and scored by the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee, which, by rule, consists of representatives of MPOs, TPRs, educators, pedestrians, bicyclists, law enforcement, and parents. CDOT Region engineers also screened the infrastructure applications for review on construction, budget, ROW and other issues that might prohibit execution of the project.

The Committee spends hours reading and scoring every project, and then coming together for a full day to discuss, evaluate and determine the very best projects for funding. The Committee also ensures all budget items are eligible and appropriate to the project. In a few cases where items are ineligible, they are removed from the application and the award amount is reduced.

The projects recommended for funding for FY 2014 total \$2,361,169. A complete list of recommended projects is attached. That will still leave a balance of approximately \$97,704 (\$79,752 for infrastructure projects and \$17,952 for non-infrastructure projects) which is not enough to fund the next highest-scored projects in each category. By the end of calendar year 2014, staff will determine how to allocate these and any additional funds from other SRTS project close-outs.

Key Benefits

Colorado is seeing an impact from SRTS. According to a national survey from participating SRTS recipients, the percentage of parents supporting walking and biking to school significantly increased from 24.9% to 33% from 2007 through 2012. In some Colorado schools, biking and walking to school has increased by more than 31% with schools in Boulder and Loveland seeing an average of 27% and 32% of students at participating schools biking and walking to school, replacing vehicle trips and reducing emissions in school zones.

A requirement of Colorado's SRTS grantees is to collect and report classroom travel tallies and parent surveys. We, and they, receive valuable information about the progress of their projects and for planning for sustainability. According to a sample of 8,000 surveys, 62% of Colorado parents believe schools are "strongly encouraging" or "encouraging" students to walk and bike to/from school, up from 45% in 2008. Parent's opinion that walking and biking to/from school is "very healthy" for their child has increased by 17% after the introduction of a SRTS program at their child's school. Parents also report a 25% increase of students living one to two miles from school asking for permission to walk or ride to school. Overall, SRTS has increased rates of children walking and biking to school in 95% of schools receiving funds.

Next Steps

- Commission approval of the FY 2014 SRTS project list selected by the SRTS Advisory Committee.
- Implementation of projects.

Attachments

- Resolution
- Projects list
- SRTS Advisory Committee members

INFRASTRUCTURE

Application #	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Region	MPO/TPR	* Infra or Non-Infra	Final Score	Awarded Y/N	Amount Awarded	Amount Available \$2,078,861	NOTES
4	City of Littleton	Berry Ave/Fed Blvd Ped Safety Improvements	\$119,606.00	1	MPO	I	70.000	Y	\$119,606.00	\$ 1,959,255.00	
30	City of Commerce City	East 72nd Ave Corridor Infrastructure Improvements	\$291,560.00	1	MPO	I	66.250	Y	\$284,618.00	\$ 1,674,637.00	Adjusted for unallowed ROW purchase.
25	City of Montrose	Northside Elementary SRTS Project	\$288,707.00	3	TPR	I	64.111	Y	\$288,707.00	\$ 1,385,930.00	
26	City of Durango	Needham Elementary Connect	\$299,985.00	5	TPR	I	63.587	Y	\$291,885.00	\$ 1,094,045.00	Adjusted for excess education allowance.
20	City of Loveland	Garfield ES Sidewalk Improvements	\$112,533.00	4	MPO	I	63.556	Y	\$112,533.00	\$ 981,512.00	
38	City of Sheridan	City of Sheridan's SRTS Infrastructure Improvements Project	\$174,809.00	1	MPO	I	60.875	Y	\$174,809.00	\$ 806,703.00	
29	City of Thornton	Brantner ES Trail	\$249,475.00	1	MPO	I	60.444	Y	\$237,475.00	\$ 569,228.00	
10	Town of Milliken	Town of Milliken State Highway 60 SRTS	\$219,200.00	4	MPO	I	60.000	Y	\$219,200.00	\$ 350,028.00	
31	City of Boulder	Hanover Multi-Use Path project	\$270,276.00	4	MPO	I	58.778	Y	\$270,276.00	\$ 79,752.00	
1	Town of Crestone	Ped Pathway Network Proj	\$300,000.00	5	TPR	I	63.444*	Y			Overall a good project but large cost to small impact.
27	Summit County Open Space & Trails	CR 450 SRTS	\$300,000.00	3	TPR	I	62.444*	N			Score just fell below level of available funds for TPR projects. May have utility conflict.
2	Town of Kremmling	Kremmling MS Sidewalk	\$294,287.00	3	TPR	I	62.000*	N			Project need evident. Weak eval and little education; no ed \$ included. Score just fell below available funds.
22	City of Florence	AWARE Program	\$298,487.00	2	TPR	I	61.444*	N			Pedestrian only project. Some concern about maintenance of existing sidewalks. Score fell just below the funds available.
13	City of Northglenn	"Mor" Safe to School	\$191,664.00	1	MPO	I	60.889	N			Demographics support need but issues identified are related more to traffic patterns / enforcement.

Recommended FY 2014 SRTS Projects

Page 2 of 3

March 4, 2014

18	City of Colo Springs	Midland Elementary School Sidewalk/Traffic Calming Improvements	\$299,795.58	2	MPO	I	60.778	N			Need not as critical as other projects. MPO not contacted. CDOT not contacted for grant review.
16	City of Colo Springs	Cheyenne Mountain Jr High Sidewalk/Crossing Improvement	\$297,030.81	2	MPO	I	58.444	N			MPO not contacted. CDOT did not review. 5' sidewalks probably won't accommodate bikers & walkers both.
24	City of Bayfield	Bayfield Elementary Sidewalk Improvements	\$225,181.00	5	TPR	I	57.625	N			Problem not well defined. No wellness policy. Ped but not bike focus.
21	Eagle County	Pavilion Park Pedestrian Path	\$235,669.50	3	TPR	I	56.778	N			Not seen as high need project. Seems like GOCO project.
39	Rocky Mtn Deaf School	Rocky Mountain Deaf School "Getting to School Safe" Project	\$134,076.97	1	MPO	I	54.556	N			Project does not support SRTS to get kids to walk/bike to school or reducing vehicle usage.
23	Town of Mancos	Highway 160 At-Grade Pedestrian Crossing	\$136,791.00	5	TPR	I	DQ	N			Proof of all ROWs not included in application as required.

*Although some TPR projects ranked higher, statute requires funds be distributed on K-8 population; i.e., ~75% urban (MPO) and 25% rural (TPR)

NON-INFRASTRUCTURE

Application #	Applicant	Project Title	Funding Request	Region	MPO/TPR	*Infra or Non-Infra	Final Score	Awarded Y/N	Amount Awarded	Amount Available \$380,012	Ntoes
9	City of Gunnison	Gunnison RE1J SD SRTS	\$22,325.00	3	TPR	N	62.556	Y	\$ 22,325	\$ 357,687	
40	Montrose County School District RE-1J	SRTS After School Program	\$69,460.00	3	TPR	N	61.111	y	\$ 69,460	\$ 288,227	
14	City of Fort Collins	Fort Collins SRTS	\$25,822.00	4	MPO	N	60.889	Y	\$ 25,325	\$ 262,902	
37	City/County of Denver	Denver SRTS	\$67,800.00	1	MPO	N	60.556	Y	\$ 67,800	\$ 195,102	
19	City of Loveland	T-n-T Tuesdays Ed/Encouragement Prog	\$13,900.00	4	MPO	N	60.111	Y	\$ 13,900	\$ 181,202	
35	Jeffco Public Schools	Jeffco SRTS	\$45,500.00	1	MPO	N	60.000	Y	\$ 45,500	\$ 135,702	
36	City of Sheridan	City of Sheridan's SRTS Ed & Policy Project	\$69,545.00	1	MPO	N	59.625	Y	\$ 69,545	\$ 66,157	

Recommended FY 2014 SRTS Projects

Page 3 of 3

34	Englewood Schools	Advancing SRTS in Englewood	\$48,205.00	1	MPO	N	58.889	Y	\$ 48,205	\$ 17,952	
32	Boulder Valley School District	Project Crosswalk & Bike	\$92,000.00	4	MPO	N	58.222	N			Traffic counts, crash data don't support need. Lots of good components. Expensive for 5 schools.
7	Adams CO SD 50	District 50 Bike Program	\$22,350.00	1	MPO	N	58.000	N			Enforcement component needed to address identified problems. Lacks clarity for engaging parents/ caregivers.
33	Adams-Arapahoe 28J (Aurora Public SD)	SRTS - Aurora Public SD	\$28,080.00	1	MPO	N	58.000	N			Existing SRTS program w/ high # of walkers. High immigrant pop. that could benefit from ed re rules/norms re walk/bike.
3	West Metro Fire	Getting to School Safely	\$30,720.00	1	MPO	N	58.000	N			Works w/ lots of schools-high reach but low impact. No student tally or parent surveys to measure impact but does look at emergency calls.
6	Adams 12 Five Star	Adams 12 Five Star SRTS	\$53,000.00	1	MPO	N	57.778	N			Poor job defining need. Lacks coordination w/ partners.
28	Grand Valley Bikes	Grand Junction SRTS Program	\$84,850.00	3	MPO	N	57.500	N			Good project. High avg walking rate (28%). Other proj with higher need.
17	City of Colo Springs	Signs of Life Mobile Classroom Additions	\$49,840.00	2	MPO	N	56.222	N			Project not clearly defined. Most costs are for trailer; not for student programming (3 hrs/school).
15	Thompson School District	District Safe Routes Coordination	\$36,118.00	4	MPO	N	55.889	N			Have current strong program with high impact. Other programs have higher need.
5	Colo Spgs SD 11	CSSD 11 SRTS	\$33,000.00	2	MPO	N	55.444	N			Multiple student optys thru-out year. Only one partner. No school ltrs of support. Problem ID & budget not very detailed.
11	City of Longmont	Longmont SRTS Program	\$244,834.00	4	MPO	N	55.333	N			Well articulated issues/goals. 1 FTE request-not sustainable. Excessive request for SRTS.

	Infra	Non-Infra	TOTAL	% of Total
MPO	\$ 1,418,517	\$ 270,275	\$ 1,688,792	72%
TPR	\$ 580,592	\$ 91,785	\$ 672,377	28%
	\$ 1,999,109.00	\$ 362,060.00	\$ 2,361,169	
	85%	15%		

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

2014 SRTS Advisory Committee Members:

- **Ken Simms**, Mesa County, Grand Valley MPO
- **Aaron Fodge**, Colorado State University, North Front Range MPO
- **Janet Hurby**, Routt County, Northwest TPR
- **Miriam Gillow-Wiles**, Southwest Colorado Council of Governments, Southwest TPR
- **Tom Poe**, Commerce City Police Department, Law Enforcement Representative
- **Jennifer Eisler Cooney**, Adams 12 School District Parent, Parent Representative
- **Mary Monroe**, Trails 2000, Bicyclist Representative
- **Jessica Osborne**, GP RED, Pedestrian Representative
- **Sarah Mathew**, Colorado Dept. of Education, Educator Representative

By Colorado statute, allocation of funds is required in proportion to the geographic distribution of K-8 student population. This equates to allocating approximately 75% of the funds in urban areas and 25% to rural areas based upon 2005-07 American Community Survey data. CDOT averages this across funding years to assure that all selected projects are fully funded rather than awarding partial funding to a project to meet the percentages exactly each year.

FISCAL YEARS 2005 - 2014 SRTS ALLOCATIONS											
	2006*	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	TOTAL	%
MPOs	\$ 1,371,930	\$ 1,207,303	\$ 932,808	\$ 1,238,025	\$ 1,563,262	\$ 2,060,844	\$ 1,745,978	\$ 1,324,719	\$ 1,688,792.00	\$ 13,133,661	75%
TRPs	\$ 504,174	\$ 81,967	\$ 541,003	\$ 499,403	\$ 496,128	\$ 422,101	\$ 754,022	\$ 392,281	\$ 672,377.00	\$ 4,363,456	25%
	\$ 1,876,104	\$ 1,289,270	\$ 1,473,811	\$ 1,737,428	\$ 2,059,390	\$ 2,482,945	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 1,717,000	\$ 2,361,169	\$ 17,497,117	
INFRA	\$ 1,456,434	\$ 996,326	\$ 1,198,208	\$ 1,347,176	\$ 1,457,403	\$ 1,713,232	\$ 1,989,462	\$ 1,186,181	\$ 1,999,109.00	\$ 13,343,531	76%
NON-INFRA	\$ 419,670	\$ 292,944	\$ 275,603	\$ 390,252	\$ 601,987	\$ 769,713	\$ 510,238	\$ 530,819	\$ 362,060.00	\$ 4,153,286	24%
	\$ 1,876,104	\$ 1,289,270	\$ 1,473,811	\$ 1,737,428	\$ 2,059,390	\$ 2,482,945	\$ 2,499,700	\$ 1,717,000	\$ 2,361,169	\$ 17,496,817	
*Years 2005 and 2006 were combined for one distribution											

SRTS Requested versus Awarded Projects

Year	Amount Requested	# Apps Received	Funded Infrastructure	# Funded	Average	Funded Non-Infrastructure	# Funded	Average	TOTAL
					Award			Award	
2005-06			\$ 1,456,434	20	\$ 74,329	\$ 419,670	9	\$ 46,630	\$ 1,876,104
2007	\$ 2,819,242	28	\$ 996,326	8	\$ 131,322	\$ 292,944	8	\$ 37,492	\$ 1,289,270
2008	\$ 5,065,539	38	\$ 1,198,208	9	\$ 131,023	\$ 275,603	9	\$ 30,623	\$ 1,473,811
2009	\$ 5,320,795	42	\$ 1,347,176	7	\$ 192,454	\$ 390,252	12	\$ 32,521	\$ 1,737,428
2010†	\$ 5,440,029	52	\$ 1,457,403	9	\$ 161,934	\$ 601,467	16	\$ 37,592	\$ 2,058,870
2011	\$ 6,400,000	52	\$ 1,713,232	10	\$ 176,859	\$ 769,713	17	\$ 45,209	\$ 2,482,945
2012	\$ 6,000,000	44	\$ 1,989,462	10	\$ 187,058	\$ 510,238	15	\$ 34,016	\$ 2,499,700
2013*	\$ 3,509,701	29	\$ 1,186,181	6	\$ 197,697	\$ 330,819	8	\$ 41,377	\$ 1,517,000
2013**			\$ -			\$ 200,000	1		\$ 200,000
2014±	\$ 6,376,372	40	\$ 1,999,109	9	\$ 222,123	\$ 362,060	8	\$ 45,257	\$ 2,361,169
TOTAL	\$40,931,678	285	\$ 11,344,422	88		\$ 4,152,766	103		\$ 15,497,188
Average	\$ 5,116,460	35.6		9.8	\$ 139,186		11.4	\$ 33,940	\$ 1,699,688
% of Total			73.2%			26.8%			100%

† - Includes curriculum project of \$70,000

* - MAP-21 TAP funds used for 2013 projects

** - SAFETEA-LU funds funded the 2013 statewide project

± SAFETEA-LU Funds used for FY 2014 projects

Resolution # TC-XXXX

Resolution to approve Safe Routes to Schools projects for Fiscal Year 2014 Funds

March 20, 2014

WHEREAS, in 2004, C.R.S. 43-1-1604 required the Transportation Commission of Colorado to establish and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) to administer a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program to distribute federal funds to eligible projects that enable and encourage children K-8 to bicycle and walk to school; and

WHEREAS, CDOT supports walking and biking as modes of transportation in Colorado; and

WHEREAS, Colorado is a national leader in SRTS, funding programs that have reached more than 790 schools statewide since 2005. This is more than 90 schools per year on average and more than 300,000 total Colorado students to date (in addition to parents, teachers, drivers, and community members who are also impacted by SRTS programs); and

WHEREAS, the SRTS program has replaced vehicle trips and increased the number of children walking and biking to school by as much as 31% in some schools; and

WHEREAS, approximately 95% of schools receiving SRTS funding had significantly increased rates of children walking and biking to school; and

WHEREAS, CDOT has awarded more than \$15.4 million in FHWA funds from 2005 through 2013 for SRTS program grants; and

WHEREAS, \$2.458 million in SAFETEA-LU designated SRTS funds remain; and

WHEREAS, Colorado SRTS Advisory Committee was appointed by the CDOT Executive Director as per state statute to represent educators, parents, law enforcement, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transportation advisors to review all applications and to recommend projects for funding; and

WHEREAS, the SRTS Advisory Committee selected projects in February 2014 to recommend to the Commission for approval:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Commission approves the Fiscal Year 2014 project list, dated March 20, 2014

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Commission directs staff to take appropriate steps to amend the STIP, if required, and supplement the budget to be able to proceed with contract development.

Transportation Secretary

Date