



COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Division of Transportation Development
Multimodal Planning Branch
4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Shumate Bldg.
Denver, CO 80222

DATE: November 16, 2016
TO: Transportation Commission
FROM: Debra Perkins-Smith, Director, Division of Transportation Development
SUBJECT: Development Program and Project Selection

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an update on the Development Program and related project selection activities, and continue the discussion on next steps with the Transportation Commission.

Action

Staff requests Transportation Commission input on next steps in project selection for Senate Bill (SB) 09-228 and the National Highway Freight Program (new formula freight program), including specific input on project selection criteria.

Background

At the October Transportation Commission meeting, staff provided an update on the Development Program and the subset 10-Year Development Program (See <https://www.codot.gov/programs/planning/documents/plans-projects-reports/projects/draft-2016-development-program-oct-2016.pdf>) and discussed possible next steps, including the selection of projects for additional SB 09-228 transfers, and for the National Highway Freight Program (see Attachment A). The approach discussed included the use of proposed eligibility and evaluation criteria to select projects for future SB 09-228 transfers, and for the first two years (FY 15-16 and FY 16-17) of the National Highway Freight Program. The Transportation Commission requested a second workshop in November to discuss the proposed criteria further, as well as if and when to proceed with the selection of additional SB 09-228 projects. A key variable in the selection of SB 09-228 projects has been uncertainty surrounding the FY 16-17 and FY 17-18 transfers, given a projected shortfall in the FY 17-18 budget. With the November 1 release of the Governor's proposal to balance the budget, we now have a clearer picture.

Details

Staff developed draft eligibility and evaluation criteria that could be used now or in the future to further prioritize projects for funding, using the 10-Year Development Program as the foundation. Criteria has been developed for SB 09-228, and the National Highway Freight Program (See Attachment B). The criteria for each is similar, but adapted to the unique requirements and characteristics of each program. Although not expressed as criteria, geographic equity is assumed to be a key principle in project selection. The importance of geographic equity in project selection has been expressed on numerous occasions in recent months by the Transportation Commission, Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC), and other planning partners.

Senate Bill 09-228

Background

Last month, staff discussed the availability of SB 09-228 funds and sought Transportation Commission input on if and how to proceed with project selection, including input on draft eligibility and evaluation criteria. The first SB 09-228 transfer, totaling \$199.2 million (previously committed to the Central 70 project, less 10% for transit) was received by CDOT on June 30, 2016. This year the legislature allocated \$158 million through legislation, circumventing the statutory SB 09-228 transfer process. These first two years of SB 09-228 funds are direct allocations and, barring any future legislative changes, future year transfers will rely on the statutory formula involving economic forecasts and TABOR triggers. The September 2016 revenue forecast called for an additional \$225 to \$333 million in years three and four. A fifth and final year of transfers (FY 19-20) is not included in the forecast, but a full transfer in year five would result in approximately an additional \$200 million. On November 1, the Governor released a proposed budget for FY 17-18 which would help to close a budget shortfall by reducing the FY 16-17 SB 09-228 transfer from \$158 million to \$79 million, and the FY 17-18 transfer to \$79 million.

SB 09-228 Transfers (in millions)					
	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	FY 18-19	FY 19-20
Direct Allocation (Received June 30, 2016)	\$ 199.2				
Direct Allocation (Planned for June 30, 2017)		\$ 158.0			
Revenue Forecast- OSPB (September 2016)			\$ 109.3	\$ 115.2	
Revenue Forecast- Legislative Council (September 2016)			\$ 217.7	\$ 114.9	
Governor's Proposed FY 17-18 Budget (Nov. 1, 2016)		\$ 79.0	\$ 79.0		
Estimated maximum possible - 5th year					\$ 200.0

Project Selection

The Transportation Commission previously committed \$130 million in state or federal funding to the construction phase of I-25 North as part of the I-25 North TIGER application (see March and April Transportation Commission packets). Since the original funding package assumed a \$25 million TIGER grant and the actual award was for \$15 million, an additional \$10 million is needed on top of the \$130 million commitment. Although the commitment did not specify a source, there are limited options beyond SB 09-228 for fulfilling such a large commitment. While discussion in October focused on the possibility of selecting projects for multiple years of SB 09-228 funding, the reduction in anticipated transfers, and the outstanding commitment to I-25 North may make further project selection at this point premature. Instead, the Transportation Commission may want to commit FY 16-17 and FY 18-19 transfers to fulfilling the \$140 million funding need on I-25 North, and provide input on the proposed SB 09-228 criteria so this may be used in the future should additional SB 09-228 funds become available.

Transit priorities for SB 09-228 were identified through a separate process led by the Division of Transit & Rail (DTR) over the summer months (see July and August Transportation Commission packets). Transit projects have been identified in priority order and projects will be funded in order of priority, as funds become available.

National Highway Freight Program

Background

The National Highway Freight Program is a new formula freight program created under the FAST Act. The National Highway Freight Program provides approximately \$15 million annually to Colorado, beginning in FY 15-16.

Project Selection

Beginning in December 2017, projects must be identified in a State Freight Plan in order to be eligible for funding. The Multimodal Freight Plan and State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan, both currently in development, will identify a long-term freight investment strategy and project priorities. However, given that these plans will not be complete until the end of 2017, staff is recommending that over the next few months a project selection process be conducted for the first two years of funding (FY 15-16 and FY 16-17) based on the proposed criteria. With input on criteria and the concurrence of the Transportation Commission to proceed, staff will conduct a project selection process and return to the Commission in early 2017 with recommendations for funding.

Questions

Staff requests Transportation Commission input on how to proceed with next steps on the above programs. Questions to consider include:

SB 09-228

1. Does the Transportation Commission want to formally or informally commit to funding the \$140 million in need for I-25 North with FY 16-17 and FY 17-18 SB 09-228 transfers?
2. Given the commitment to I-25 North and the proposed reduction of transfers to \$79 million in FY 16-17 and \$79 million in FY 17-18, does the Transportation Commission want to wait to conduct any further SB 09-228 project prioritization or selection? Or should projects be identified for the potential remaining funding, with consideration of geographic equity?
3. Does the proposed criteria for SB 09-228 provide a good framework for project selection, if/when conducted? Are there criteria that should be added or modified?

National Highway Freight Program

1. Should staff proceed with project selection processes as described for the first two years of the National Highway Freight Program, based on the proposed criteria and any additional Transportation Commission input?
2. Does the proposed criteria for the National Highway Freight Program provide a good framework for project selection? Are there criteria that should be added or modified?

Advisory Committee Input

State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)

STAC discussed the Development Program and project selection at September and October meetings. STAC provided general agreement that the 10-Year Development Program provides a good foundation for moving forward with different project selection processes, including SB 09-228, the National Highway Freight Program, and discretionary grant programs. There was also some discussion and differing viewpoints on whether there should be consistency in SB 09-228 and National Highway Freight Program project selection processes across the state, or whether each Region should have more latitude to determine how to apply and weight criteria. Other comments included:

- For the safety criteria, focus on fatalities and serious injuries rather than Property Damage Only (PDO) crashes
- Rely on local input in assessing a project for the economic vitality criteria.
- Readiness should be an important factor - focus on projects that are closer to ready to go and where we have already invested in Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), Environmental Assessments (EAs), or Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) studies.
- Need to further define what constitutes statewide or regional significance.

Freight Advisory Committee (FAC)

The Freight Advisory Council (FAC) discussed the National Highway Freight Program at its October meeting. No concerns were expressed regarding the proposed criteria. The FAC Steering Committee is providing additional input on criteria and project priorities. Some of the projects identified to date as priorities for consideration of National Highway Freight program funding include:

- Truck parking/Truck Parking Information Management System (TPIMS)
- Truck facilities such as chain-up stations and weigh stations
- Low vertical clearance bridges
- Size and weight restricted bridges
- Runaway truck ramps, arrestor systems, or escape ramps
- Freight signal priority systems at intermodal facilities
- First and last mile connections and access to intermodal facilities
- Rail projects including track upgrades, grade separations, and a rail loan program

Next Steps

Subject to Transportation Commission input, next steps include:

- Finalization of National Highway Freight Program criteria, incorporating Transportation Commission, STAC, and FAC input.
- Identification of freight project priorities based on 10-Year Development Program and FAC input, evaluation of projects based on criteria, and development of recommendations for funding.
- Finalization of SB 09-228 criteria, incorporating Transportation Commission and STAC input, in order to be ready to select projects in the future.

Attachment

- Attachment A: Summary of National Highway Freight Program
- Attachment B: Draft Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria

National Highway Freight Program

Program Description

- Provide Federal financial assistance to improve the efficient movement of freight on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN)

Program Goals

- Investing in infrastructure and operational improvements that strengthen economic competitiveness, reduce congestion, reduce the cost of freight transportation, improve reliability, and increase productivity;
- Improving the safety, security, efficiency, and resiliency of freight transportation in rural and urban areas;
- Improving the state of good repair of the NHFN;
- Using innovation and advanced technology to improve NHFN safety, efficiency, and reliability;
- Improving the efficiency and productivity of the NHFN;
- Improving State flexibility to support multi-State corridor planning and address highway freight connectivity; and
- Reducing the environmental impacts of freight movement on the NHFN. [23 U.S.C. 167 (a), (b)]

Eligible Projects

- A project is eligible for funding if it:
 - Contributes to the efficient movement of freight on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN), and
 - Is identified in a freight investment plan included in a freight plan
 - Is an intermodal or freight rail project (except that a State can only obligate up to 10% of its total freight apportionment to these projects).
- A project must be on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN)
- Eligible projects include:
 - Development phase activities, including planning, feasibility analysis, revenue forecasting, environmental review, preliminary engineering and design work, and other preconstruction activities.
 - Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, acquisition of real property (including land relating to the project and improvements to land), construction contingencies, acquisition of equipment, and operational improvements directly relating to improving system performance.
 - Intelligent transportation systems and other technology to improve the flow of freight, including intelligent freight transportation systems.
 - Efforts to reduce the environmental impacts of freight movement.
 - Environmental and community mitigation for freight movement.
 - Railway-highway grade separation.
 - Geometric improvements to interchanges and ramps.
 - Truck-only lanes.
 - Climbing and runaway truck lanes.
 - Adding or widening of shoulders.
 - Truck parking facilities eligible for funding under section 1401 (Jason's Law) of MAP-21.
 - Real-time traffic, truck parking, roadway condition, and multimodal transportation information systems.
 - Electronic screening and credentialing systems for vehicles, including weigh-in-motion truck inspection technologies.
 - Traffic signal optimization, including synchronized and adaptive signals.
 - Work zone management and information systems.
 - Highway ramp metering.
 - Electronic cargo and border security technologies that improve truck freight movement.
 - Intelligent transportation systems that would increase truck freight efficiencies inside the boundaries of intermodal facilities.
 - Additional road capacity to address highway freight bottlenecks.

- Physical separation of passenger vehicles from commercial motor freight.
- Enhancement of the resiliency of critical highway infrastructure, including highway infrastructure that supports national energy security, to improve the flow of freight.
- A highway or bridge project, other than a project described above, to improve the flow of freight on the NHFN.
- Any other surface transportation project to improve the flow of freight into and out of an eligible intermodal freight facility. [23 U.S.C. 167(i)(5)(C)]
- Diesel retrofit or alternative fuel projects under the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program (CMAQ) for class 8 vehicles.
- Conducting analyses and data collection related to the NHFP, developing and updating freight performance targets to carry out section 167 of title 23, and reporting to the Administrator to comply with the freight performance target under section 150 of title 23. [23 U.S.C. 167(i)(6)]

Funding Requirements

- Federal Funding by Year (\$85.2 M total):
 - FY 16: \$15.5 M
 - FY 17: \$14.9 M
 - FY 18: \$16.2 M
 - FY 19: \$18.3 M
 - FY 20: \$20.3 M
- Standard federal match requirements apply.

**Senate Bill 228
Draft Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria
November 2016**

Eligibility Criteria			
E1. Is a "strategic" project (a project of regional or statewide significance serving regional or statewide travel needs, recognized as a high priority at the regional or statewide level, and representing a significant cost or long-term investment.)			
E2. Is identified in the 10-Year Development Program (i.e. is Tier I)			
E3. Is identified as a high priority at the project or corridor level in a Regional Transportation Plan or other Plan (i.e. State Highway Freight Plan, Transit Plan)			
E4. Is "ready to go" by XX (Ready to go is defined as: Ad Date (Design/Bid/Build), 30% Plans and NTP to Team (Design Build), or 90% design complete (CMGC))			
Evaluation Criteria			
Criteria and Measures	Low Score	Medium Score	High Score
1. Safety			
1.1 Fatalities reduced	Number of fatalities reduced per year		
1.2 Serious injuries reduced	Number of serious injuries reduced per year		
1.3 Property damage only reduced	Number of property damage only reduced per year		
2. Maintaining the System			
2.1 Pavement Drivability Life Index improvement	Drivability Life Index x Lane Miles Improved		
2.2 Bridge improvement	Improvement in bridge condition and function, as measured by improvements in structural deficiency scale, sufficiency rating, elimination of load restrictions, or low vertical clearances, or other improvements to bridge metrics identified in the Risk-Based Asset Management Plan.		
2.3 Other asset improvement	Project provides little to no upgrades to culverts, signs, pavement markings, tunnel improvements, or other roadway and roadside features that comprise the whole highway infrastructure network, from right-of-way line to right-of-way line	Project provides moderate upgrades and enhancements to culverts, signs, pavement markings, and other roadway and roadside features that comprise the whole highway infrastructure network, from right-of-way line to right-of-way line	Project provides significant upgrades and enhancements to culverts, signs, pavement markings, and other roadway and roadside features that comprise the whole highway infrastructure network, from right-of-way line to right-of-way line
3. Mobility			
3.1 Reliability or Travel Time	Project provides little or no reliability or travel time benefit	Project provides some reliability or travel time benefit	Project provides significant reliability or travel time benefit
3.2 Modal choice	No modal choices provided by project	Project provides some modal choice for two of pedestrian, cycling, or transit modes	Project provides excellent modal choice for pedestrian, cycling, AND transit
3.3 Connectivity and Accessibility	No improved accessibility or connectivity provided by project	Project provides some improved accessibility or connectivity to regionally-important centers	Project provides substantially improved accessibility or connectivity to regionally-important centers
4. Economic Vitality			
4.1 Economic Impact	Estimation of project economic impacts (using economic analysis tool such as TREDIS or AASHTO EconWorks, or qualitative assessment if data is unavailable for analysis)		
5. Other Considerations			
5.1 Resiliency	Project does not improve the resilience of transportation infrastructure.	Project will somewhat improve the resilience of transportation infrastructure by incorporating betterments that mitigate the risks of economic, social, or environmental impacts.	Project will significantly improve the resilience of transportation infrastructure by incorporating betterments that mitigate the risks of economic, social, or environmental impacts.
5.2 Redundancy	Project improves a corridor segment with a high level of redundancy	Project improves a corridor segment with a medium level of redundancy	Project improves a corridor segment with a low level of redundancy or adds redundancy
5.3 Builds on Other Funding or Phases	Project does not build on recent prior phases or corridor investments, or leverage other funds.	Project builds on recent prior phases or corridor investments, or leverages other funds	Project builds on recent prior phases or corridor investments and leverages other funding.
6. Estimated Project Cost			

**National Highway Freight Program
Draft Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria
November 2016**

Eligibility Criteria			
E1. Is on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) or is a freight intermodal or freight rail project (federal requirement)			
E2. Is identified in a State Highway Freight Plan (federal requirement, begin Dec 2017)			
E3. Is an eligible activity under the National Highway Freight Program (federal requirement)			
E4. Is on a Colorado Freight Corridor or other facility with evidence of significance to freight			
E5. Is identified in the 10-Year Development Program (i.e. is Tier I), if a scale of project typically included.			
E4. Is "ready to go" by XX (Ready to go is defined as: Ad Date (Design/Bid/Build), 30% Plans and NTP to Team (Design Build), or 90% design complete (CMGC))			
Evaluation Criteria			
Criteria and Measures	Low Score	Medium Score	High Score
1. Safety			
1.1 Fatalities reduced	Number of fatalities reduced per year for commercial motor vehicle crashes		
1.2 Serious injuries reduced	Number of serious injuries reduced per year for commercial motor vehicle crashes		
1.3 Property damage only reduced	Number of property damage only reduced per year for commercial motor vehicle crashes		
2. Maintaining the System			
2.1 Freight Focus	General asset life improvements with no freight specific design features or freight specific benefits.	General asset life improvements with some freight specific design features or freight specific benefits.	Freight focused asset life improvements designed to address a specific freight need.
2.2 Pavement Drivability Life Index improvement	Drivability Life Index x Lane Miles Improved		
2.2 Bridge improvement	Improvement in bridge condition and function, as measured by improvements in structural deficiency scale, sufficiency rating, elimination of load restrictions, or low vertical clearances, or other improvements to bridge metrics identified in the Risk-Based Asset Management Plan.		
2.4 Other asset improvement	Project provides little to no upgrades to culverts, signs, pavement markings, tunnel improvements, or other roadway and roadside features that comprise the whole highway infrastructure network, from right-of-way line to right-of-way line	Project provides moderate upgrades and enhancements to culverts, signs, pavement markings, tunnel improvements, and other roadway and roadside features that comprise the whole highway infrastructure network, from right-of-way line to right-of-way line	Project provides significant upgrades and enhancements to culverts, signs, pavement markings, tunnel improvements, and other roadway and roadside features that comprise the whole highway infrastructure network, from right-of-way line to right-of-way line
3. Mobility			
3.1 Reliability or Travel Time	Project provides little to no reliability or travel time benefit	Project provides some reliability or travel time benefit	Project provides significant reliability or travel time benefit
3.2 Truck AADT	Truck AADT		
3.3 % Truck	% Truck Off-Peak		
4. Economic Vitality			
4.1 Economic Impact	Estimation of project economic impacts (using economic analysis tool such as TREDIS or AASHTO EconWorks, or qualitative assessment if data is unavailable for analysis)		
4.2. Intermodal connections	Project does not support connections between freight modes, nor the promotion of multiple transportation choices, and does not directly impact access to an intermodal facility	Project generally supports connections between freight modes, and promotes some transportation choices and, indirectly impacts access to an intermodal facility	Project enhances and creates workable connections between freight modes, promotes multiple transportation choices, and directly impacts access to an intermodal facility
5. Other Considerations			
5.1 Resiliency	Project does not improve the resilience of transportation infrastructure.	Project will somewhat improve the resilience of transportation infrastructure by incorporating betterments that mitigate the risks of economic, social, or environmental impacts.	Project will significantly improve the resilience of transportation infrastructure by incorporating betterments that mitigate the risks of economic, social, or environmental impacts.
5.2 Redundancy	Project improves a corridor segment with a high level of redundancy	Project improves a corridor segment with a medium level of redundancy	Project improves a corridor segment with a low level of redundancy or adds redundancy
5.3 Builds on Other Funding or Phases	Project does not build on recent prior phases or corridor investments, or leverage other funds.	Project builds on recent prior phases or corridor investments, or leverages other funds	Project builds on recent prior phases or corridor investments and leverages other funding.
6. Estimated Project Cost			



COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Division of Transportation Development
Multimodal Planning Branch
4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Shumate Bldg.
Denver, CO 80222

DATE: November 16, 2016
TO: Transportation Commission
FROM: Debra Perkins-Smith, Director, Division of Transportation Development
SUBJECT: FASTLANE Discretionary Grants

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to update the Transportation Commission on the recent solicitation for a second round of FASTLANE discretionary grants, due December 15, 2016.

Action

Staff requests Transportation Commission input on how to proceed with identifying and submitting projects for consideration by USDOT under the FASTLANE program.

Background

USDOT recently announced the second round of FASTLANE discretionary grants (see Attachment A). FASTLANE is a discretionary grant program intended to provide Federal financial assistance to freight and highway projects of national or regional significance. It was the original intent of staff to work through priorities for FASTLANE grants for this and future cycles over the next few months, in tandem with other project selection discussions. However, USDOT announced the second cycle early, on October 28, with an application deadline of December 15. This accelerated timeline will require a quick decision on which projects to submit (or resubmit from last year).

Details

The previous (and first) FASTLANE round was announced on February 26, 2016. Staff was hoping for a little more time before the second round in order to work through current project selection discussions first, but USDOT has significantly accelerated the timeline. We anticipate, however, that our current 10-Year Development Program and project selection efforts will put us in a very good position for future rounds of FASTLANE and other discretionary grant programs.

The FASTLANE program is essentially unchanged from the first round. Eligible projects include:

- Highway freight projects on the National Highway Freight Network
- Highway or bridge projects on the National Highway System
- Freight intermodal or freight rail projects
- Railway-highway grade crossing or grade separation projects

FASTLANE grants can cover up to 60% of total project costs, and up to half of the required 40% match can come from other federal funding sources. Approximately \$850 million is available for the current round. FASTLANE grants can be used for small and large projects. Large projects are eligible for a minimum award of \$25 million, and small grants for a minimum award of \$5 million. Each applicant may submit no more than three applications each round.

<p>Large Projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant amount of at least \$25 M. • Total project cost of at least \$100 M. • Federal share under grant program may not exceed 60% • Total federal share may not exceed 80% 	<p>Small Projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant amount of at least \$5 M. • Federal share under grant program may not exceed 60% • Total federal share may not exceed 80%
----------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	---

The following three applications were submitted by CDOT in the first round:

- US 287 Lamar Bypass (Region 2)
 - Total Project Cost: \$160 million
 - FASTLANE Request: \$96 million
 - Matching Funds: \$64 million (including Transportation Commission commitment of \$59 million)
- US 85 Centennial Highway Improvements (Region 4)
 - Total Project Cost: \$160 million
 - FASTLANE Request: \$96 million
 - Matching Funds: \$64 million (including Transportation Commission commitment of \$45 million)
- Truck Parking Information Management System (TPIMS) (DTD/RoadX)
 - Total Project Cost: \$9 million
 - FASTLANE Request: \$5 million
 - Matching Funds: \$4 million (Transportation Commission commitment of \$4 million)

An additional application was developed by CDOT Region 5 and submitted by La Plata County:

- US 550 (Region 5)
 - Total Project Cost: \$197.5 million
 - FASTLANE Request: \$113 million
 - Matching Funds: \$84.5 million (including Transportation Commission commitment of \$45 million)

Since this was the first year of the FASTLANE program, staff had limited information to identify projects beyond the basic program requirements. Staff has reached out to USDOT for feedback on the first round, but thus far we have not been successful in getting a response. However, a review of first round awards provides some insight on what it may take to be competitive. Key findings include:

- CDOT applications in the first round had the minimum required amount of match, 40%, while the average match of successful applications was 62%.
- Grant requests for large CDOT project applications ranged from \$96 million to \$113 million, significantly larger than the average FASTLANE grant award of \$42 million.
- High benefit-cost ratio is important, with cost-effectiveness being a key factor in USDOT's preliminary review process.

The attached FASTLANE criteria (see Attachment B) was developed based on draft criteria for the National Highway Freight Program and Senate Bill (SB) 09-228, and refined based on the findings above. Staff proposes using this criteria as a framework for considering which projects we submit (or resubmit) for the current cycle. Given the short turnaround, potential new projects will need to be sufficiently developed and/or sufficient information readily available that an application can be developed by December 15. Due to the limited number of potential project applications for this round of FASTLANE, staff will likely be able to identify the most competitive projects based on screening criteria. If new projects are identified for consideration, they will be discussed at the Commission Workshop. USDOT has indicated that they anticipate many of the projects submitted in the second cycle will be resubmittals from the first cycle.

Applications are likely to include some amount of previously identified match (from RPP, HSIP, or FASTER Safety, for example), although additional matching funds requiring Transportation Commission approval will be needed for any project submittals or resubmittals. For large projects, this additional match commitment can be very significant, as was the case with the previously submitted projects. Given the commitment to I-25 North and the uncertainty of later years of SB 09-228 transfers, the Transportation Commission may want to consider whether or not it is comfortable making a large match commitment. Attachment C provides information on the status of potential funding sources that the Transportation Commission may wish to consider in its discussion. One factor to consider as we look at resubmitting projects is scalability. Based on the findings above, if we are to resubmit one of the larger projects from the first round we may want to do so with a higher match amount, and a lower grant request and total project cost. The Transportation Commission may also want to consider whether we want to submit the three applications we are permitted, or demonstrate priority by focusing instead on only one or two applications.

While we will consider each of the projects submitted in the first round for possible update/revision and resubmittal, we feel the Truck Parking Information Management System (TPIMS) application, in particular, may be competitive this year. Florida was awarded funds for a TPIMS project in the first round. Since we submitted our TPIMS application in the first round, we have made progress and are currently working on a partial implementation on I-70. We are also coordinating with neighboring states as possible co-applicants. The TPIMS project is a statewide project, and can be scaled based on available match.

Questions

Staff requests Transportation Commission input on how to proceed. Questions to consider include:

1. *Matching Funds* - To what extent does the Transportation Commission want to commit to matching funds for FASTLANE projects? Is there a maximum dollar amount the Transportation Commission is comfortable committing?
2. *Number of Projects to Submit* - Should CDOT focus on one or two highest priorities or support the maximum allowable proposals?
3. *Transportation Commission Approval Process* - What type of approval action is the Transportation Commission comfortable with? Does the Transportation Commission want to approve specific projects and match commitment, or provide general input on projects and match commitment and allow staff discretion on what is ultimately submitted? Approval via resolution would need to occur at the December 14 meeting and applications would be due the next day.
4. *Additional Guidance* - What additional guidance does the Transportation Commission want to provide staff in selecting projects for submittal?

Advisory Committee Input

State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)

The second round of FASTLANE was announced the afternoon following the October Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) meeting. As such, STAC has not had the opportunity to weigh in. However, as discussed in the Development Program memo included in your packet, STAC did review and discuss SB 09-228 and National Highway Freight Program criteria, which has been adapted for potential application for FASTLANE. STAC does not meet again until December 2. Staff has notified STAC of the next round of funding, and will discuss further at the next meeting.

Freight Advisory Committee (FAC)

Similarly, the most recent Freight Advisory Council (FAC) meeting was held prior to the announcement, although the full FAC has previously provided input on criteria and priorities for the National Highway Freight Program. The FAC was very interested in the first round of FASTLANE funding, and provided letters of support for the three applications submitted by CDOT. They declined to support the US 550 application, recognizing it as an important project but a lower priority for freight as compared to other projects. At the meeting of the FAC Steering Committee on November 8, members committed to work with CDOT to provide letters of support for this round of CDOT FASTLANE applications. The Steering Committee reiterated its priorities for truck parking projects such as TPIMS and safety projects. They also stated their preference that large corridor projects submitted for FASTLANE should have a specific freight element as part of the project.

Next Steps

- Identification of projects for second round of FASTLANE, development/update of applications and submittal to USDOT by December 15.
- Transportation Commission action on December 14 resolution committing support for project applications.

Attachment

- Attachment A: Summary of FASTLANE Program
- Attachment B: Draft Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria
- Attachment C: Potential FASTLANE Grant Match

Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects (FASTLANE)

Program Description

- Provide Federal financial assistance to freight and highway projects of national or regional significance

Program Goals

- The goals of the program are to:
 - (A) improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of the movement of freight and people
 - (B) generate national or regional economic benefits and an increase in the global economic competitiveness of the United States
 - (C) reduce highway congestion and bottlenecks
 - (D) improve connectivity between modes of freight transportation
 - (E) enhance the resiliency of critical highway infrastructure and help protect the environment
 - (F) improve roadways vital to national energy security;
 - (G) address the impact of population growth on the movement of people and freight.

Eligible Projects

- A highway freight project on the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN)
- A highway or bridge project on the National Highway System (NHS), including:
 - A project to add capacity to the Interstate system to improve mobility; or
 - A project in a national scenic area;
- A freight project that is:
 - A freight intermodal or freight rail project; or
 - A project within the boundaries of a public or private freight rail, or intermodal facility and that is a surface transportation infrastructure project necessary to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, or access into or out of the facility,
 - provided that the project will make a significant improvement to freight movements on the NHFN and that the Federal share of the project funds only elements of the project that provide public benefits, and that the total assistance for these projects does not exceed \$500 million over the period 2016-2020; or
- A railway-highway grade crossing or grade separation project.

Project Requirements

- Generate national or regional economic, mobility, or safety benefits;
- Be cost-effective;
- Contribute to accomplishment of one or more of the national goals described in section 150
- Based on results of preliminary engineering;
- With respect to non-federal financial commitments:
 - One or more stable and dependable sources are available to construct, maintain, and operate the project; and
 - Contingency amounts are available to cover unanticipated cost increases.
- Cannot be easily and efficiently completed without Federal funding or financial assistance available to the project sponsor;
- For a large project, the Department cannot award a project that is not reasonably expected to begin construction within 18 months of obligation of funds.
- Preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition activities, such as environmental review, design work, and other preconstruction activities, do not fulfill the requirement to begin construction within 18 months of obligation for large projects.

Eligible Project Costs

- Financial assistance received for a project may be used for:
 - development phase activities, including planning, feasibility analysis, revenue forecasting, environmental review, preliminary engineering and design work, and other preconstruction activities; and

- construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, acquisition of real property (including land related to the project and improvements to the land), environmental mitigation, construction contingencies, acquisition of equipment, and operational improvements directly related to improving system performance.

Funding Requirements

- Large Projects - Grant amount of at least \$25 million and a total project cost of at least \$100 million. Federal share under grant program may not exceed 60% and total federal share may not exceed 80%.
- Small Projects - Grant amount of at least \$5 million. Federal share under grant program may not exceed 60% and total federal share may not exceed 80%

FASTLANE
Draft Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria
November 2016

Eligibility Criteria			
E1. Is an eligible activity under the FASTLANE Program (federal requirement)			
E2. Meets project size, grant size, and match requirements (federal requirement)			
E3. Can be reasonably expected to begin construction within 18 months of obligation, with obligation occurring no later than September 30, 2020. (federal requirement)			
E4. Is on a Colorado Freight Corridor or other facility with evidence of significance to freight			
E5. Is identified in the 10-Year Development Program (i.e. is Tier I), if a scale of project typically included.			
E6. Is identified as a high priority at the project or corridor level in a Regional Transportation Plan or other Plan (i.e. State Highway Freight Plan, Transit Plan)			
Screening Criteria			
S1. Project has a competitive level of match (target of 60%).			
S2. Grant request amount is competitive (average grant award of \$42 million).			
S3. Project has a strong benefit-cost ratio.			
Evaluation Criteria			
Criteria and Measures	Low Score	Medium Score	High Score
1. Safety			
1.1 Fatalities reduced	Number of fatalities reduced per year for commercial motor vehicle crashes		
1.2 Serious injuries reduced	Number of serious injuries reduced per year for commercial motor vehicle crashes		
1.3 Property damage only reduced	Number of property damage only reduced per year for commercial motor vehicle crashes		
2. Maintaining the System			
2.1 Freight Focus	General asset life improvements with no freight specific design features or freight specific benefits.	General asset life improvements with some freight specific design features or freight specific benefits.	Freight focused asset life improvements designed to address a specific freight need.
2.2 Pavement Drivability Life Index improvement	Drivability Life Index x Lane Miles Improved		
2.3 Bridge improvement	Improvement in bridge condition and function, as measured by improvements in structural deficiency scale, sufficiency rating, elimination of load restrictions, or low vertical clearances, or other improvements to bridge metrics identified in the Risk-Based Asset Management Plan.		
2.4 Other asset improvement	Project provides little to no upgrades to culverts, signs, pavement markings, tunnel improvements, or other roadway and roadside features that comprise the whole highway infrastructure network, from right-of-way line to right-of-way line	Project provides moderate upgrades and enhancements to culverts, signs, pavement markings, tunnel improvements, and other roadway and roadside features that comprise the whole highway infrastructure network, from right-of-way line to right-of-way line	Project provides significant upgrades and enhancements to culverts, signs, pavement markings, tunnel improvements, and other roadway and roadside features that comprise the whole highway infrastructure network, from right-of-way line to right-of-way line
3. Mobility			
3.1 Reliability or Travel Time	Project provides little or no reliability or travel time benefit	Project provides some reliability or travel time benefit	Project provides significant reliability or travel time benefit
3.2 Truck AADT	Truck AADT		
3.3 % Truck	% Truck Off-Peak		
4. Economic Vitality			
4.1 Economic Impact	Estimation of project economic impacts (using economic analysis tool such as TREDIS or AASHTO EconWorks, or qualitative assessment if data is unavailable for analysis)		
4.2. Intermodal connections	Project does not support connections between freight modes, nor the promotion of multiple transportation choices, and does not directly impact access to an intermodal facility	Project generally supports connections between freight modes, and promotes some transportation choices and, indirectly impacts access to an intermodal facility	Project enhances and creates workable connections between freight modes, promotes multiple transportation choices, and directly impacts access to an intermodal facility
5. Other Considerations			
5.1 Resiliency	Project does not improve the resiliency of transportation infrastructure.	Project will somewhat improve the resiliency of transportation infrastructure by incorporating betterments that mitigate the risks of economic, social, or environmental impacts.	Project will significantly improve the resiliency of transportation infrastructure by incorporating betterments that mitigate the risks of economic, social, or environmental impacts.
5.2 Redundancy	Project improves a corridor segment with a high level of redundancy	Project improves a corridor segment with a medium level of redundancy	Project improves a corridor segment with a low level of redundancy or adds redundancy
5.3 Builds on Other Funding or Phases	Project does not build on recent prior phases or corridor investments, or leverage other funds.	Project builds on recent prior phases or corridor investments, or leverages other funds	Project builds on recent prior phases or corridor investments and leverages other funding.
6. Estimated Project Cost			

POTENTIAL FASTLANE GRANT MATCH

FUNDING SOURCE	POTENTIAL AVAILABLE FUNDS	RISKS
Revenue Surplus for FY 17-18	\$10 Million	Amount is known and funds are available for TC direction.
TC Contingency Redistribution For FY15-FY16	Up to \$80 Million	Amount is known, however, may be needed as a backstop for SB 228 funds on I-25 North or for other important projects as discussed at September TC.
Federal Redistribution for FY16-FY17	\$24 Million (5 Year Average)	CDOT has consistently received yearly redistribution funds. For the federal fiscal years 2011 to 2015, the yearly amount ranged from \$15.0 million to \$31.8 million, with a five-year average of \$23.7 million. (Note federal fiscal year 2016 was not included because it was a high of \$48.0 million, and therefore not typical.)
SB 228	\$0-\$400 Million (Years 4-5)	Year 1 funding is allocated to Central I-70, Year 2 and 3 funding remains uncertain and is dependent on Governor's Budget with \$79 Million each year needed for previously identified I-25 North and Transit projects. Therefore, only SB 228 funds for Year 4 and 5 may be available. However, Year 4-5 funds are uncertain as they dependent on revenue forecasts and Legislature as well.
RAMP	\$0 -20 Million	\$20 Million of RAMP HPTE Development Fund was used for credit support on the C-470 loan and will be available in February 2017. Use of these funds are subject to the RAMP HPTE Development fund eligibility criteria and RAMP Sponsor Coalition approval, which takes into consideration other project needs. (Potentially, these funds could be applied to I-25 North freeing up other state match funds.)
Reprioritization of FY17-FY18 Budget	TBD	TC could redirect program funds to provide match.