



COLORADO Department of Transportation

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

DATE: October 21, 2016
TO: Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
FROM: Jeff Sudmeier, Manager, Multimodal Planning Branch
SUBJECT: Development Program and Project Selection

Purpose

To discuss next steps in project selection for Senate Bill (SB) 09-228 and other funding opportunities.

Background

The Development Program is an inventory of major investment needs identified through the transportation planning process to support the prioritization of major investment needs for future planning. Staff developed the initial inventory of major investment needs during the winter of 2016 based on the Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs), and other plans and existing project lists. The most current Development Program inventory includes roughly 130 highway projects representing more than \$9 billion in funding need, and roughly 100 transit projects representing more than \$2 billion in funding need. Additional bicycle and pedestrian investment needs will be incorporated in the future. Over the summer, CDOT staff worked with planning partners to further discuss and vet priorities. The result of this outreach is the 10-Year Development Program, a smaller subset of the Development Program, identifying those major investment needs that are a higher priority over the next 10 years. The Development Program is available at: <https://www.codot.gov/programs/planning/documents/plans-projects-reports/projects/draft-2016-development-program-oct-2016.pdf>.

Staff is now looking at next steps, including how to build on the Development Program in identifying priorities for funding with SB 09-228, the National Highway Freight Program (new formula freight program), and discretionary grant programs such as FASTLANE. The 10-Year Development Program provides a solid foundation by focusing in on higher priority projects that have been vetted by planning partners and are consistent with RTPs.

Details

It should be emphasized that the focus of current project selection discussion is on highway projects. Transit priorities for SB 09-228 were already identified through a separate process led by the Division of Transit & Rail (DTR) over the summer months (see July and August Transportation Commission packets). Standalone bicycle and pedestrian projects are not eligible under these programs, although bicycle and pedestrian elements of a larger project may be eligible.

Staff has developed some initial draft eligibility and evaluation criteria for SB 09-228 and for the National Highway Freight Program (see Attachments A and B). A variation of these criteria could also be used in identifying priorities for 2017 FASTLANE grants. 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, STAC, and other planning partners. The two sets of criteria have different eligibility criteria. Evaluation criteria are similar, but with one set of criteria targeting freight more specifically. Evaluation criteria are based on the Statewide Transportation Plan / Policy Directive 14 goal areas of Safety, Mobility, Maintaining the System, and Economic Vitality. Additional criteria have been added based on previous input from the Transportation Commission and STAC and include resiliency and redundancy, and leveraging funds/building on prior funding/phases.

Using the 10-Year Development Program and the draft criteria provided as a starting point, staff proposes to conduct a project selection process over the next several months to identify priorities the National Highway Freight Program, discretionary grants, and possibly SB 09-228. This process would likely include:

- Refinement of project selection criteria and identification of appropriate weighting of criteria with Transportation Commission, STAC, and Freight Advisory Council (FAC) input
- Region-level evaluation and prioritization of 10-Year Development Program projects based on criteria; consideration of need to evaluate any other projects not included in 10-Year Development Program



- Statewide evaluation of projects prioritized at Region level
- Examination of opportunities to combine/leverage funding across sources

Availability of Funds

The first SB 09-228 transfer, totaling \$199.2 million, was received by CDOT on June 30, 2016. The second SB 09-228 transfer, totaling \$158 million, will be received by CDOT on June 30, 2017, absent new legislation to eliminate or reduce the transfer. An additional \$225 to \$333 million is anticipated in years three and four, depending on the forecast, with an additional \$200 million possible in the fifth and final year. The first year of funding is committed to the Central 70 project. As a reminder, the Transportation Commission previously committed \$130 million in state or federal funding to I-25 North as part of the I-25 North TIGER application (see March and April Transportation Commission packets). Although the commitment did not specify a source, there are limited options beyond SB 09-228 for fulfilling such a large commitment.

The National Highway Freight Program provides approximately \$15 million annually to Colorado, beginning in FY 16. 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 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 projects be identified for the first two years of funding as part of the process described here.

Staff further recommends that priorities be identified for FY 17 FASTLANE grants. States are allowed to submit up to three applications. Since a large match commitment is required in order to be competitive, it is likely that priorities for FASTLANE grants will follow from SB 09-228 and/or National Highway Freight Program priorities, and leverage those funds as match.

Input to Date

The 10-Year Development Program was reviewed with STAC at the September meeting. STAC also discussed criteria for SB 228 and the National Highway Freight Program at the August and September meetings.

The 10-Year Development Program and next steps in project selection were the subject of an October 19 Transportation Commission Workshop. The Transportation Commission provided general concurrence with approach and requested a follow up workshop in November to further discuss criteria as well as how to approach SB 09-228 (i.e. should projects be selected as funds are received or should projects be identified up to the full possible amount of transfers, etc.).

Input Requested

Staff is requesting STAC input on next steps in project selection, including feedback on draft criteria (see Attachments A and B). Questions to consider include:

- Does the 10-Year Development Program provide a good foundation for moving forward with these project selection processes?
- Do the proposed criteria provide a good framework for project selection? Are there criteria that should be added or modified?

Next Steps

Staff will refine approach and criteria based on input from the Transportation Commission and STAC. The Freight Advisory Council (FAC) is also providing input on priorities for the National Highway Freight Program. A second Transportation Commission workshop is planned for November. In the meantime, staff will continue to prepare in anticipation of moving forward with project selection later this fall.

Attachment

- Attachment A: SB 09-228 Draft Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria
- Attachment B: National Highway Freight Program Draft Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria



Senate Bill 228
Draft Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria
October 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 to advertisement by December 2018.				
Evaluation Criteria				
Criteria and Measures	Low Score	Medium Score	High Score	Weighting
1. Safety				
1.1 Fatalities reduced	Number of fatalities reduced per year			TBD
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			TBD
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 to no reliability or travel time benefit	Project provides some reliability or travel time benefit	Project provides significant reliability or travel time benefit	TBD
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)			TBD
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.	TBD
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, <i>or</i> leverages other funds	Project builds on recent prior phases or corridor investments <i>and</i> leverages other funding.	
6. Estimated Project Cost				

**National Highway Freight Program
Draft Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria
October 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 as a freight need and project area in the State Highway Freight Plan (federal requirement, begin Dec 2017)				
E3. Is an eligible activity under the National Highway Freight Program (federal requirement - see Eligible Activities)				
E4. Is on a Colorado Freight Corridor or other facility with evidence of significance to freight				
E5. Is able to receive federal funding authorization by September 1, 2017 (see Project Readiness)				
Evaluation Criteria				
Criteria and Measures	Low Score	Medium Score	High Score	Weighting
1. Safety				
1.1 Fatalities reduced	Number of fatalities reduced per year for commercial motor vehicle crashes			TBD
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.	TBD
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	TBD
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	TBD
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.	TBD
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				