CLEAN TRANSIT ENTERPRISE BOARD MEETING - JULY 13, 2022

SCHEDULE & AGENDA

I. Welcome, Roll Call, Agenda Review (5 minutes) 12:00-12:05 p.m.
   Matt Frommer, Chair

II. Action Agenda (5 minutes) 12:05-12:10 p.m.
   - Approval of Minutes 5/25 CTE Board Meeting
   - Approval of CTE Program Administrator and Secretary
     Matt Frommer, Chair

III. Program Administrator Report Out (5 minutes) 12:10-12:15 p.m.
     - Rule Published
     - CTE 10 year plan Formatted and published
       Kay Kelly, Chief, Innovative Mobility (CDOT)

IV. Presentation from RTD (20 minutes) 12:15-12:35 p.m.
    Fred Worthen, RTD’s Assistant General Manager for Bus Operation

V. MMOF match level presentation (20 minutes) 12:35-12:55 p.m.
   Michael Snow, DTD

VI. Transit Emissions Dashboard presentation (20 minutes) 12:55-1:15 p.m.
    Lisa Streisfeld, CDOT

VII. Adjournment of public meeting 1:15-1:30 p.m.

VIII. Executive Session under CRS 24-6-402(3)(a)(II) to receive legal advice and an update from counsel on a lawsuit filed against CTE and to discuss with counsel and receive advice on legislation passed by the Colorado Legislature
Clean Transit Enterprise

May 25, 2022

Regular Board Meeting – Wednesday, May 25, 2022, 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm, Virtual via Zoom Meeting

Video Recording: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lRAsZ-rnbHg

I. Roll Call (Kay Kelly) – Video Time: 00:07:31
   ● Board Members Present: Matt Frommer, Bonnie Trowbridge, Dawn Block, Cris Jones, David Averill, Theresa Takushi, Kelly Blynn, Richard Coffin, Mark Garcia
   ● Also Attending: Kay Kelly, Michael King, Brodie Ayers, Kathy Young, George Hypolite, Bethany Nicholas

II. Action Agenda (Chair Frommer) – Video Time: 00:08:41
   ● A motion by Chair Frommer to approve the meeting minutes from the April 12 CTE Board Meeting, seconded by Director Averill. Motion passed unanimously.
   ● A motion by Chair Frommer to approve the meeting minutes from the May 11 CTE 10 Year Plan Work Session, seconded by Director Takushi. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Working with Utilities on ZEV Planning (Brodie Ayers, Xcel Energy) – Video Time 00:18:15
   ● Xcel’s Transportation Electrification Plan (TEP) was approved by the Public Utilities Commission in May 2020 and follows a three-year cycle.
   ● Xcel’s Fleet Electrification Advisory Program (FEAP) provides fleets with free suitability assessment, data analysis and advisory services. The Electric Vehicle Supply Infrastructure Program (EVSI) provides no-cost advisory and turnkey services for fleet, workplace, community charging hubs and multifamily buildings. The EVSI funds can be combined with the Fleet Electrification Advisory Program, a no-cost data-driven assessment of EV fleet opportunities and charging infrastructure options to help build out the agencies’ Electric Vehicle Transition Plan that 5339 applications are requiring. Fleets and workplaces can get a rebate of $2,200 per Level 2 port and $45,000 per DCFC through the Rebates for Income Qualified & High Emissions Communities (HEC/IQ).
   ● Electric Vehicle Supply Infrastructure (EVSI) for fleet charging should have its own meter to take advantage of EVSI Program rates for off-peak charging: $0.11/kWh in the summer and $0.01/kWh in the winter.
   ● Agencies will work with Xcel through an Electrical Vehicle Advisor. The process from engagement to implementation of electric charging takes approximately 3-6 months.
   ● Rural Electric Associations (REA) have funding through USDA for loans (0-5% interest rate) to pay for vehicle charging infrastructure.

   Director Coffin: Regarding rebates for high emission communities, how are high emission communities defined?
   Brodie Ayers: Xcel worked with the Public Utilities Commission during the development of the TEP to define high emission communities. It is based on census blocks meeting certain criteria. On a quarterly basis, you can petition to have your census block become part of the high emission community.

   Chair Frommer: How are things going with RTDs 17 electric buses that are on order? Are the charger’s part of the TEP funding?
   Brodie Ayers: RTD has the buses and chargers on order. Xcel is working to get an agreement signed with RTD to build out chargers on RTD’s facility on I-225 and Colfax. RTD procured the chargers on their own through an RFP, and the infrastructure going into that facility will be funded through the TEP funding.

   Chair Frommer: There was a 2019 article from the Denver Post titled “RTDs Electric 16th Street Mall Buses Cost Nearly 60% More Than Diesel Coaches.”
   Brodie Ayers: That goes back to before the TEP, before Xcel had funding for infrastructure. Without that independent meter that charges what hits their overall commercial electricity rate. Now you have a much lower demand cost and cost per kWh.

   Chair Frommer: Do you have a sense of electric buses’ fuel cost per mile compared to diesel?
   Brodie Ayers: You are seeing a 40% reduction in maintenance cost and a reduction in fuel cost. The Fleet Electric Advisory Program looks at the total cost over the life of the vehicle and total carbon reduction, to compare electric vehicles against diesel vehicles. That program is a great way to gather total cost and carbon reduction for federal funding applications.

   Chair Frommer: When Xcel has some of the fleet analysis from the TEP, or has summarized that for the PUC, could you share that with this board?
   Brodie Ayers: Yes, and the more transit vehicles we have the better the analysis will be.
IV. Update on Americans for Prosperity Lawsuit (George Hypolite, COAG) – Video Time 00:12:25

- The plaintiffs are asking SB 21-260 to be thrown out for violating Proposition 117 since the projected revenue of the Clean Transit Enterprise, Community Access Enterprise, Clean Fleet Enterprise, Bridge and Tunnel Enterprise, and the Non-attainment Area Air Pollution Mitigation Enterprise all combined reach over $100 million threshold. They argue that if the enterprises do not violate Proposition 117 because they serve different purposes, SB260 would violate the single-subject constitutional prohibition. In addition, they claim that SB260 violates the single-subject rule because the legislature adjusted the TABOR Cap, which has nothing to do with the purpose of SB260. By creating these new enterprises, the legislature should have adapted the Referendum C TABOR cap down, or since the legislature adjusted the Tabor Cap up it is a violation of the single-subject rule.

- The state has not responded to the litigation. A team from the Attorney General’s Office, Tax Protection Unit is assigned to this case. The team anticipated filing a responsive pleading (either an answer or motion to dismiss) by June 16th.

Kay Kelly: Will the board be having a closed session at our next meeting to discuss the lawsuit?
George Hypolite: After the state defendants file an affirmative pleading, we will understand more about our litigation strategy and can brief the board in more detail.

V. FY23 CTE Budget Proposal (Kay Kelly, CDOT) – Video Time 00:36:44

- CDOT’s Division of Accounting and Finance (DAF) will provide budget support and fiscal oversight. We anticipate $8,280,329 in total revenue for FY 2022-23 from the Clean Transit Retail Delivery Fee. Projected expenses include staff salaries to facilitate 50 awards per year and 6 meetings per year. Attorney General’s Fee included costs related to the lawsuit and legal assistance to the board on day-to-day items. Professional service could include contracting with a vendor to develop the public accountability dashboard.

Richard Coffin: Is it possible to add funding for additional staff support?
Kay Kelly: Any budget we put forth is an estimate and there is room to adjust the budget throughout the year.
Bethany Nicholas: The board has the ability to amend the budget as they see fit.

- A motion by Chair Frommer to approve the proposed budget, seconded by Director Trowbridge. Motion passed unanimously.

VI. 10 Year Plan Discussion (Kay Kelly and Michael King, CDOT) – Video Time 00:51:30

- Since the first CTE Board Meeting on January 31, staff have held in-depth discussions on the CTE 10YP with 140 Transit Stakeholders, presented to 6 community meetings, and have received 37 survey responses and 2 written/emailed comments. Information from the Colorado Transit Zero Emission Vehicle Roadmap including background information on transit electrification barriers and opportunities was used to inform the 10 Year Plan.

- 2 CCR 607-1, Rules Governing Clean Transit Enterprise Processes and Fees was adopted by the board on April 12, 2022. The estimated revenue for this enterprise over the first 10 years is $134,89,225. Although there are no project category funding caps in the 10 Year Plan, more funding for Planning and Facility Modification is expected to be provided in FY23-FY25 and more Vehicle and Infrastructure projects in future years (FY26-FY32).

Mark Garcia: Are the Contingency Reserve annual amounts? Could we have a total reserve listed in the revenue projection?
Kay Kelly: If we don’t use the contingency reserve, it would be rolled into project funding for the next year.
Chair Frommer: From the Transit Zero Emission Vehicle Roadmap, the largest incremental cost was infrastructure, especially as we achieve price parity on the vehicle procurement side around 2027. In the later years, we will be spending more on the infrastructure side.
Kay Kelly: Estimates of program funding by category are based on the Transit ZEV Roadmap, but we do have the opportunity to refine this as we gain more experience.

- CTE’s Funding Strategy (Video Time 01:16:00) will consist of grants, loans and rebates, focusing on grants in the early years. A weighted, multi-factor formula for scoring the projects will be developed by the CTE Board, CDOT staff and transit agency stakeholders prior to the first funding awards being made. Board will work with staff to develop specific minimum planning requirements that applicants must meet in order to be awarded funding for Facility Modifications, Vehicle Purchases and/or Charging or Fueling Infrastructure funding. Board will develop tiered match percentage requirements that account for the differing ability of transit agencies to contribute financially to projects.

- CTE will encourage the scrapping of the oldest and dirtiest in-service transit vehicles as a feature of all Vehicle acquisition programs. There is no required vehicle replacement ratio, vehicle-to-charger or vehicle-to-fueling station ratio.
CTE Board will work with stakeholders to develop awardee data reporting requirements.
CTE Funding Programs include planning, facilities modifications, vehicle acquisition, and charging/fueling infrastructure programs.
Staff, board, and public comments: Charging/Fueling Programs updated to reflect that hydrogen is considered currently eligible, but there will be future offerings specifically for hydrogen vehicles and fueling infrastructure. Clearly stated that conversions and repowers are eligible under SB260. Revised the definition of Recovered Methane/RNG and guardrails to ensure 90% target is met. Potential for future vehicles/battery leasing and other innovative financing options were added.

VII. 10 Year Plan Finalization (Kay Kelly, Michael King) – Video Time 01:35:09
A motion by Director Garcia to approve the proposed 10 Year Plan, seconded by Chair Frommer. Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Future Meeting Cadence and Topics (Kay Kelly) – Video Time 01:50:18
Monthly meeting cadence will need to continue through the summer, board meetings will shift to bi-monthly or quarterly cadence in the fall.
Chair Frommer: Are there any plans to put out a press release regarding the 10 Year Plan?
Kay Kelly: No current plans, but we will talk with the CDOT Office of Communications and report back.

IX. Adjournment (Matt Frommer) – Video 01:54:10
Meeting Adjourned: 2:55 pm
For terms expiring 9/28/2024

Matt Frommer CHAIR (Denver): Member with an expertise in zero-emissions transportation, motor vehicle fleets or utilities

Bonnie Trowbridge (Berthoud): Member representing a public advocacy group that has transit or comprehensive transit expertise

Dawn Block (La Junta): Member representing a transportation-focused organization that services an environmental justice community

For terms expiring 9/28/2025

Mark Garcia (Pagosa Springs): Member of the Transportation Commission and have statewide transportation expertise

Cris Jones (Boulder): Member representing an urban area, having transit expertise

David Averill CO-CHAIR (Telluride): Member representing a rural area having transit expertise

Agency Appointments

Theresa Takushi: Colorado Department of Transportation designee

Kelly Blynn: Colorado Energy Office designee

Richard Coffin: Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment designee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome, Roll Call, Agenda Review (5 min)</td>
<td>Matt Frommer, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Agenda (5 min)</td>
<td>Matt Frommer, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Approval of Minutes - 5/25/22 CTE Board Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Approval of Kay Kelly as CTE Program Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Approval of Deseri Scott as CTE Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Administrator Report Out (5 min)</td>
<td>Kay Kelly, CDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Presentation (20 min)</td>
<td>Fred Worthen, RTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMOF Match Level Presentation (20 min)</td>
<td>Michael Snow, CDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Emissions Dashboard Presentation (20 min)</td>
<td>Lisa Streisfeld, CDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment of Public Meeting</td>
<td>Matt Frommer, Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Session under CRS 24-6-402(3)(a)(II) to receive legal advice and an update from counsel on a lawsuit filed against CTE and to discuss with counsel and receive advice on legislation passed by the Colorado Legislature.
• 2 CCR 607-1 Clean Transit Enterprise Processes and Fees
  • On April 12, 2022, the CTE adopted new permanent rules
  • The rules were filed with the Secretary of State and went into effect on June 14, 2022
  • A copy of the final rule can be found in the “Resources” section of the CTE website

• Formatted CTE 10 Year Plan Published
  • On May 25, 2022, the CTE adopted an unformatted version of the CTE 10 Year Plan
  • THANK YOU to Annelies Van Vonno in CDOT’s Division of Transportation Development for lending us her graphic design skills!
  • The final formatted version of the CTE 10 year plan is now available in the “Resources” section of the CTE website
Placeholder for RTD Slides
Fred Worthen, RTD Assistant General Manager for Bus Operation
Match Reduction Formula Overview

Multimodal Transportation & Mitigation Options Fund (MMOF)

Michael Snow, Multimodal Planning Branch
• 50% match requirement – meaning, at least 50% of project funding must come from sources other than MMOF.

• TC is permitted to reduce or eliminate match by formula or on individual projects

• Current TC Match Reduction Formula adopted in December 2021
  • Formula developed and recommended by a select committee of bike, ped, transit, disabled, aging, and active transportation advocates.
  • Automatically grants 25% or 0% match requirement to certain towns and counties
  • Match rate for non-government entities (e.g., transit, schools, etc.) determined by the rate required of the towns/counties within their service area
  • Reduces or Eliminates match for a 20% proportion of the population, rather than a proportion of the towns/counties
MMOF Match Formula

• Towns/Counties are rank-ordered based on a combination of four criteria that indicate:
  • Ability to generate revenue: Median Household Income, Median Home Value
  • Degree of burden on resources: Poverty, Population Aged 65+

• Criteria recommended by our State Demographer (DOLA)

• Key benefits:
  • Indicates agencies’ potential to generate and sustain revenue, NOT their actual revenues or financial state
  • Data is readily available, reliably maintained, and regularly updated
## Resulting Match Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REDUCED MATCH 25%</th>
<th>ELIMINATED MATCH 0%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTIES (64)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(46) 20.7% of Pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWNS (272)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(137)</td>
<td>(169) 15.2% of Pop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20.7% of Pop.
## Getting into the MATH

| County               | Percent ABOVE Poverty | Percent UNDER Poverty 65 years | Median Household Income | Median Home Value | Overall Percentile Rank | Match reduced from 50% for 46 counties (representing 20% of pop.) | RATE | 2019 Population | Percent ABOVE Poverty | Percent UNDER 65 years | Median Household Income | Median Home Value | Percentile Ranks |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| La Plata County      | 90.9%                 | 83.5%                          | $68,865                 | $395,600          | 70.1%                  | 50%                                                                | 50%  | 56,272           | 71.4%                 | 63.5%                 | 71.4%                 | 62.3%                 | 2,6866               |
| Denver County        | 87.1%                 | 88.6%                          | $68,952                 | $390,600          | 74.6%                  | 50%                                                                | 50%  | 729,239          | 41.3%                 | 93.7%                 | 69.8%                 | 81.0%                 | 2,8570               |
| El Paso County       | 89.9%                 | 87.5%                          | $68,779                 | $275,000          | 73.0%                  | 50%                                                                | 50%  | 722,493          | 61.9%                 | 90.5%                 | 73.9%                 | 52.4%                 | 2,7776               |
| Larimer County       | 88.4%                 | 84.9%                          | $71,881                 | $303,800          | 71.4%                  | 25%                                                                | 356,938 | 50.8%         | 71.4%                 | 77.8%                 | 70.2%                 | 2,7617               |
| Clear Creek County   | 92.2%                 | 80.6%                          | $67,060                 | $378,300          | 69.8%                  | 25%                                                                | 9,740 | 82.5%           | 38.1%                 | 68.3%                 | 79.4%                 | 66.7%                 | 2,6023               |
| Park County          | 92.7%                 | 80.6%                          | $73,622                 | $327,200          | 68.2%                  | 25%                                                                | 18,644 | 84.1%          | 36.5%                 | 79.4%                 | 66.7%                 | 2,6064               |
| Gunnison County      | 90.5%                 | 83.3%                          | $71,198                 | $308,200          | 68.6%                  | 25%                                                                | 15,718 | 69.8%          | 60.3%                 | 74.6%                 | 60.3%                 | 2,6506               |
| Grand County         | 88.6%                 | 87.7%                          | $56,577                 | $367,300          | 65.0%                  | 25%                                                                | 17,495 | 80.1%          | 84.1%                 | 58.7%                 | 77.8%                 | 2,5871               |
| Ouray County         | 92.8%                 | 72.3%                          | $69,417                 | $449,000          | 63.4%                  | 25%                                                                | 4,934  | 85.7%          | 4.8%                  | 63.5%                 | 67.3%                 | 2,4126               |
| San Juan County      | 94.7%                 | 75.2%                          | $54,625                 | $322,400          | 61.9%                  | 25%                                                                | 726    | 95.2%          | 17.5%                 | 52.4%                 | 65.1%                 | 2,3014               |
| Teller County        | 91.8%                 | 78.8%                          | $66,592                 | $292,700          | 69.3%                  | 25%                                                                | 25,355 | 76.2%          | 31.7%                 | 65.1%                 | 55.6%                 | 2,2852               |
| Rio Blanco County    | 89.4%                 | 84.6%                          | $54,357                 | $197,100          | 59.7%                  | 25%                                                                | 6,307  | 82.7%          | 60.0%                 | 50.0%                 | 41.3%                 | 2,2682               |
| Phillips County      | 93.9%                 | 82.7%                          | $51,155                 | $168,500          | 57.1%                  | 25%                                                                | 4,279  | 86.5%          | 52.1%                 | 38.1%                 | 26.8%                 | 2,1497               |
| Lake County          | 85.4%                 | 89.4%                          | $50,565                 | $202,100          | 58.3%                  | 25%                                                                | 8,681  | 90.2%          | 98.4%                 | 30.0%                 | 49.2%                 | 2,1426               |
| Morgan County        | 89.0%                 | 88.4%                          | $53,927                 | $192,000          | 60.3%                  | 25%                                                                | 20,984 | 83.0%          | 64.0%                 | 57.7%                 | 49.2%                 | 2,1216               |
| Hinsdale County      | 90.2%                 | 75.5%                          | $38,339                 | $350,000          | 52.3%                  | 25%                                                                | 8,197  | 85.1%          | 20.8%                 | 67.1%                 | 66.3%                 | 2,1199               |
| Chaffee County       | 90.2%                 | 75.5%                          | $55,771                 | $357,600          | 50.7%                  | 25%                                                                | 20,361 | 65.1%          | 15.9%                 | 55.6%                 | 71.4%                 | 2,0791               |
| Archuleta County     | 91.2%                 | 74.5%                          | $52,221                 | $314,400          | 49.2%                  | 25%                                                                | 13,252 | 18.0%          | 72.0%                 | 43.1%                 | 36.6%                 | 1,9045               |
| Moffat County        | 83.0%                 | 86.2%                          | $57,771                 | $182,300          | 47.6%                  | 25%                                                                | 14,002 | 73.0%          | 12.7%                 | 41.3%                 | 63.5%                 | 1,9045               |
| Chaffee County       | 89.8%                 | 83.5%                          | $34,937                 | $222,000          | 47.6%                  | 25%                                                                | 1,825  | 60.3%          | 61.9%                 | 49.2%                 | 11.1%                 | 1,8252               |
| Kit Carson County    | 93.9%                 | 81.7%                          | $49,349                 | $122,400          | 44.4%                  | 25%                                                                | 7,128  | 90.5%          | 4.4%                  | 28.6%                 | 17.8%                 | 1,8094               |
| Mesa County          | 85.6%                 | 81.4%                          | $55,379                 | $227,000          | 42.8%                  | 0%                                                                 | 154,933 | 33.3%         | 42.9%                 | 54.0%                 | 47.6%                 | 1,7775               |
| Logan County         | 87.4%                 | 82.9%                          | $53,318                 | $157,900          | 41.2%                  | 0%                                                                 | 21,914 | 44.4%          | 58.7%                 | 46.0%                 | 27.0%                 | 1,7618               |
| Mineral County       | 86.3%                 | 73.2%                          | $62,188                 | $308,600          | 39.6%                  | 0%                                                                 | 764    | 36.5%          | 5.9%                  | 61.9%                 | 61.0%                 | 1,6982               |
| Yuma County          | 80.0%                 | 81.8%                          | $52,022                 | $191,800          | 38.0%                  | 0%                                                                 | 10,063 | 34.9%          | 39.7%                 | 38.7%                 | 31.8%                 | 1,5872               |
| Jackson County       | 90.4%                 | 71.7%                          | $61,300                 | $196,600          | 36.5%                  | 0%                                                                 | 1,383  | 68.6%          | 3.9%                  | 44.4%                 | 40.7%                 | 1,5554               |
Questions & Discussion

• For questions or comments, please contact:
  Michael Snow
  Transportation Planning Specialist
  michael.snow@state.co.us | 303.512.4123
Transit Emissions Dashboard: A Potential Tool for the Clean Transit Enterprise

Lisa Streisfeld, Office of Innovative Mobility
July 13, 2022
Colorado Emission Reduction Goals:

Decrease greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 levels by:

- 26% by 2025
- 50% by 2030
- 90% by 2050

CO₂, CH₄, NOₓ, HFCs, PFCs, NF₃, SF₆
Traveling by bus transit produces the fewest greenhouse gas emissions per passenger vehicle mile traveled!

We compared bus transit to: electric trains, diesel trains, electric vehicles, or internal combustion engine passenger vehicles.

Analysis conducted by CDOT for Front Range Passenger Rail pre-NEPA activities.
Electric buses produce the least amount of carbon dioxide emissions, no matter how many passengers are riding.

*Analysis conducted by CDOT for Front Range Passenger Rail pre-NEPA activities.
1. Provide monthly transit ridership and transit emissions information to state agencies and the public.

2. Demonstrate the impact the Volkswagen Settlement and other grant funds are having on electrifying the fleet of buses and document the emission reductions.

3. Track CDOT’s performance in meeting the goals of House Bill 19-1261 to reduce GHG emissions by 26% by the year 2025.

4. Serve as baseline data on GHG emissions.

5. Motivate transit agencies to replace their operational fleet with electric and other low or zero emission vehicles.

6. Motivate the traveling public to reduce their trips in single occupancy vehicles, increase transit use, and reduce emissions.
Transit Dashboard Data*

- Fleet sizes
- Fleet composition
- Fleet conversion to zero emission vehicles (ZEVs)
- Transit ridership
- Transit vehicle miles traveled
- Emissions for different classifications of transit vehicles
- Statewide emissions for Bustang family of services
- Emissions per passenger vehicle mile traveled
- Trend data for transit emission reduction over time

“If you can’t measure it, you can’t improve it.” (Lord Kelvin, William Thompson, Peter Drucker)
Data Sources and Analysis Tools

- Environmental Protection Agency MOVES Model
- Bustang and Outrider Data
- Regional Transportation District Data
- FTA Transit Greenhouse Gas Emissions Estimator
- Local Transit Agency Data
  - Federal Transit Administration (FTA) National Transit Database
  - GTFS Data (General Transit Feed Specification Data)
  - GTFS-Flex Data
- Microsoft Power BI
Website* for Transit Emissions Dashboard
*https://www.codot.gov/programs/transitandrail/transitemissionsdashboard

About the Dashboard
The Colorado Department of Transportation’s interactive Transit Emissions Dashboard tracks and quantifies greenhouse gases (GHG) emitted by transit vehicles in the State of Colorado. This user-friendly dashboard displays emission reductions associated with replacing single occupancy vehicle trips with transit trips, along with the projected transportation contribution to zero-emissions vehicle.

The dashboard serves as visual accountability for emission reduction goals set forth by Colorado ( HB19-1241), Climate Action Plan to Reduce Emissions. The dashboard tracks the state’s path toward a fully zero-emission transit fleet.

Emission Goals
The dashboard seeks to track progress in the transformation of Colorado’s transit fleet to zero-emission vehicles as well as the replacement of SOV trips with transit trips. CDOT is committed to reducing emissions that are created in the state’s transit system. HB19-1241 has set forth statewide GHG emission reduction goals as:

- 30% by 2030
- 50% by 2030
- 80% by 2050 (compared to a 2005 baseline)

CDOT has received funding from the Volkswagen Clean Air Act Settlement to aid in the electrification of vehicles in the United States and also applies state and federal grant resources to this effort. The goal set forth by HB19-1241, and funding from the Volkswagen Clean Air Act Settlement, are catalysts in the conversion of statewide transit fleets to zero-emissions vehicles (ZEVs).

Signed by Governor Jared Polis in 2021, the Colorado ( HB19-1241) “Sustainability of the Transportation System” imposes the statewide transition to zero-emission transit vehicles with the creation of a Public Transit Enterprise. This bill is estimated to generate $184.9 million over 15 years for public transit funding, and funds are anticipated to become available starting in July 2023.

Project Background
- Who manages the dashboard?
- What is the dashboard tracking?
- What are greenhouse gases and criteria pollutants?
- How are emissions calculated?
- What is the time frame of the data?
- How is the data presented?
- How do I use the dashboard?
- What are the next steps?
- How often is the data updated?

Resources
- CDOT Air Quality
- CDOT Performance Management Strategy
- Clean Air Act
- Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment
- Colorado Greenhouse Gas Emissions Roadmap
- Colorado Electric Vehicle Plan 2020
- Colorado Energy Office: Home
- Colorado Transit Zero-Emission Vehicle Roadmap
- Executive Order B-8 2014 002
- Governor’s Dashboard: Environment & Sustainability
- State Agency Transit
- HB19-1241
- NREL/NOAA
- National Transit Database
- FTA
- 40 CFR 230
- South Central Council of Governments: Transit

Questions?

Lisa Stockdale
Assistant Director of Agency Services
Lisa.Stockdale@colorado.gov
303-757-6757

Michael King
Assistant Director of Electric/EV & Energy
Michael.King@colorado.gov
303-757-6887

Contact Us
For more information on CDOT and other statewide efforts to improve air quality, mitigate and track greenhouse gas emissions, please visit the following resources.
Potential Next Steps for Transit Dashboard

- Publish Transit Emissions Dashboard to CDOT website
- Incorporate remaining transit agencies data into the dashboard
- GIS mapping view for transit routes or service areas to be linked to the data
Discussion

• What type of metrics would assist the Clean Transit Enterprise in tracking its progress?
• Could the Transit Emissions Dashboard serve as a tool?
• What other types of data would be helpful?
• How often should reports be provided?
For More Information

Lisa Streisfeld
Office of Innovative Mobility
Colorado Department of Transportation
2829 West Howard Place
Denver, Colorado 80204
Lisa.Streisfeld@state.co.us
303.757.9876
Reminders

Upcoming Meetings
• August 24th - Clean Transit Enterprise Board Meeting

Topics:
• Budget update
• Continued discussion on project scoring criteria - emission calculations, equity, match structure, planning requirements, etc.
• Data reporting requirements
• Public accountability dashboard
• Transit agency presentations
• Other topics at the board’s pleasure
Clean Transit Enterprise Information

https://www.codot.gov/programs/innovativemobility/cte
Executive Session under CRS 24-6-402(3)(a)(II) to receive legal advice and an update from counsel on a lawsuit filed against CTE and to discuss with counsel and receive advice on legislation passed by the Colorado Legislature.