



COLORADO

Department of
Transportation

**Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
January 29, 2016
9:00 AM – 12:00 PM
CDOT HQ Auditorium, 4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Denver, CO
Agenda**

- 9:00-9:05** Welcome and Introductions – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair
- 9:05-9:10** Approval of December Meeting Minutes – Vince Rogalski
- 9:10-9:20** Transportation Commission Report (Informational Update) – Vince Rogalski
- Summary report of the most recent Transportation Commission meeting.
- 9:20-9:40** TPR Reports (Informational Update) – STAC Representatives
- Brief update from STAC members on activities in their TPRs.
- 9:40-9:50** Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) (Informational Update) – STAC Representatives
- Update from STAC members on the most recent FAC meeting.
- 9:50-10:10** Federal and State Legislative Report (Informational Update) – Herman Stockinger & Ron Papsdorf, CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations (OPGR)
- Update on recent federal and state legislative activity.
- 10:10-10:25** Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act (Informational Update) – Ron Papsdorf, OPGR
- Update on the recently passed federal transportation reauthorization bill.
- 10:25-10:35** Break
- 10:35-10:50** SB 228 Update (Informational Update) – Maria Sobota, CDOT Chief Financial Officer, & Debra Perkins-Smith, CDOT Division of Transportation Development (DTD)
- Update on SB 228 revenue projections.
- 10:50-11:05** Development Program (Informational Update) – Jeff Sudmeier, CDOT DTD
- Update on Development Program and STAC input on criteria.
- 11:05-11:25** SWP Lessons Learned and On-going Planning Discussions (Informational Update) – Michelle Scheuerman, DTD
- STAC and planning partner discussions on the planning process and lessons learned from 2040 SWP and RTP development.
- 11:25-11:35** Approval of Non-Metro and Public Involvement Plan Guidance Documents (Informational Update/Action item) – Michelle Scheuerman, DTD
- Discussion and approval of Non-Metro and Public Involvement Plan Guidance Documents.
- 11:35-11:45** Federal Lands Access Program (Informational Update) – Scott McDaniel, CDOT Director of Project Support.
- Update on next cycle of Federal Lands Access Program
- 11:45-11:55** Rural Regional Bus Network Plan (Informational Update) – Mike Timlin, Division of Transit and Rail
- Update on Rural Regional Bus Network.
- 11:55-12:00** Other Business- Vince Rogalski
- 2016 STAC Schedule
- 12:00** Adjourn

STAC Conference Call Information: 1-877-820-7831 321805#

STAC Website: <http://www.coloradodot.info/programs/statewide-planning/stac.html>

**Draft STAC Meeting Minutes
December 4, 2015**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

Date/Time: December 4, 9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

Chairman: Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair

Attendance:

In Person: Vince Rogalski (GV TPR), Gary Beedy (EA TPR), Peter Baier (GVMPO), Todd Hollenbeck (GVMPO), Doug Rex (DRCOG), Thad Noll (IM TPR), Jan Dowker (NFRMPO), Chuck Grobe (NW TPR), Norm Steen (PPACG), Buffie McFadyen (PACOG), George Wilkinson (SLV TPR), Mack Loudon (SC TPR), Bentley Henderson (SW TPR), Barbara Kirkmeyer (UFR TPR).

On the Phone: Scott Hobson (PACOG), Stephanie Gonzales (SE TPR).

Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions & October Minutes / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of October STAC Minutes. <p>STAC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Thad Noll</u>: Would like to compliment staff on the thoroughness of the STAC minutes – they are a good resource for members and non-members alike. 	Minutes approved.
Chief Engineer Items / Josh Laipply (CDOT Chief Engineer)	<p>Josh Laipply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We discussed the Local Agency Program in a previous STAC meetings and received some good input from the group. • The most common issues cited with respect to the Local Agency Program can be categorized as relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contract Timing ○ Payments ○ Federal Requirements • Planning to do a De-Federalized Pilot Project to assess its potential for resolving some Local Agency Program issues. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ TABOR could impact this – we need to consider this factor. 	No action taken.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Currently setting up some project criteria for what types of projects would be best to pilot – e.g. highways rather than non-highway programs. ○ Will keep in mind that not all problems are necessarily caused by federal regulations; we need to look at our own requirements to see where they are causing issues. ○ We want to be thoughtful about picking a variety of projects with different characteristics in order to get a broad perspective on the benefits and costs of this approach. <p>STAC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Todd Hollenbeck</u>: I recommend looking at other states as part of this process, since they deal with this same type of money and some of them may do better than we do in terms of working with these. <p>Josh Laipply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Governor pledged \$100 million in bike/ped funding over next 4 years, although really only the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) portion is new state funding. The rest of that funding comes from pre-existing programs, but CDOT needs to better track and report our bike/ped investments. ● We will work with the CDOT Regions and TPRs to identify where bike/ped improvements are both appropriate and desired in order to ensure a context-sensitive project. ● CDOT is also increasing its focus on improvements to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), specifically as it relates to accessible sidewalks and street crossings. ADA has been in effect for over two decades and federal authorities expect compliance. <p>STAC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Norm Steen</u>: How do we currently track bike/pedestrian projects? ● <u>Josh Laipply</u>: We can track some things easily based on the type of bid item (e.g. sidewalks, ramps, etc.), but it's difficult with something like a shoulder widening to say whether that's a bike/ped investment, a safety investment, or something else. ● <u>Norm Steen</u>: You have car counters, but how do you track bike/ped volumes? 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: We have bike counters as well, and we have to work on deciding where we want to put those in the state. If you have a specific area of concern that you'd like us to look into, then we can talk about that and potentially help do an assessment. We also are starting to put in some permanent counters along important bike routes as well. • <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: Some of the counting systems can distinguish between bikes and pedestrians, but many can't. We are currently developing a Strategic Plan for our Non-Motorized Counting Program to determine where to place additional counters and how to make the program most effective. 	
<p>Transportation Commission Report / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)</p>	<p>Vince Rogalski</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Thad Noll is a new board member. ○ Kathy Gilliland is the Chair, Don Marostica is the Vice Chair, and David Spector is the HPTE Director. ○ I-70 viaduct is both a bridge and a potential toll route so HPTE is involved. ○ Final preparations for the Peak Period Shoulder Lane (PPSL) for its opening on December 12th. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PPSL Limits: 13 miles between Empire and Twin Tunnels. ○ First "major snow event" on US 36 was successfully managed. ○ C-470 looking at final RFP, and financing will include TIFIA. Currently there are ≈ 52,000 transponders out among the public and use is growing. • Comment from the Public <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerns about the timeliness of contracting by CDOT. • Bike/Pedestrian <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How to better track bike/ped investments at a statewide level, a larger effort in the works. • Transit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Looking to increase transit activities statewide using funding from SB 228 (\$20 million) and SB 1 (\$12 million). • I-70 East <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) contracts will account for 12% of construction and 11% of design. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>STAC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Thad Noll</u>: Kudos to Clear Creek County for putting up with the traffic and delays involved in the PPSL development. 	
TPR Reports / STAC Representatives	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>GVMPO</u>: RAMP program on Horizon Drive proceeding, so far so good, some business disruption but seems to be moving along. • <u>PPACG</u>: Approved Moving Forward 2040 RTP after 3 years of work; approved project priority list and two TIP amendments; 6 new projects underway in PPACG region totaling nearly \$29 million; CDOT made an \$11 million reimbursement for Baptist Road project. • <u>SW TPR</u>: Moving forward on a variety of projects, including Tribal Transportation Plan; intersection priority list completed and working through the details of those challenging locations; CDOT Region 5 has been very gracious in working on signal prioritization along US 160 with local communities; La Plata County unsuccessful in asking voters to approve tax increase for additional highway funding; projects on Red Mountain Pass wrapping up for the winter, so traffic is improving there. • <u>DRCOG</u>: Board approved 2016 budget; starting to bring components of the Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan to TAC for review and comment (including freight, bicycle, etc.); reviewing TIP selection process, Board established a work group and will submit a white paper in February with recommendations; approached by Portland State University on Urban Sustainability Accelerator concept - partnering with MPOs across the country to look at models for more effective investment decision making, could include some interesting approaches. • <u>SLV TPR</u>: Completed a few projects including Antonito, seals on US 160 east and west of Alamosa; November meeting canceled due to weather, the next one scheduled for February. • <u>NFRMPO</u>: Mulberry Bridge completed and opened, a huge success; US 287 project has been re-bid and is moving forward; CDOT Region 4 office has opened and it's very nice; Gerry Horak and Kevin Ross are the new MPO Chair and Vice Chair, respectively; program of projects and public involvement plan adopted at last meeting, as was a VanGo fare increase; working to create non-motorized plans and developing our first NFR freight plan; held a summit for 80 participants on the topic of Front Range rail, 	No action taken.

	<p>including participation from CDOT Executive Director Bhatt and BNSF railway; on 12/11 will hold regional issues summit in Loveland and will discuss transportation and finance issues being coordinated by the business community; a resolution of support for I-25 improvements adopted among all communities in the area; congratulated Myron Hora on his retirement from CDOT after many years of service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>EA TPR</u>: Shut down bridge work on I-70 for the winter; Ports to Plains (US 287) has had some severe accidents lately involving semis, the passing lanes need to be longer to prevent this, otherwise people get impatient and try to pass when they shouldn't. • <u>IM TPR</u>: Big projects are wrapped up for the winter, getting ready to send some new ones to ad (such as SH 9); Bustang has begun weekend service, don't have the numbers for it quite yet; CDOT held a kick-off on a project for connected vehicles along the mountain corridor and that's exciting. • <u>UFR TPR</u>: Debra Perkins-Smith attended meeting yesterday in UFR, which is appreciated, met in the new CDOT facility in Greeley; added some projects to the plan including Estes Park; working on US 85 PEL that affects three TPRs; would like to discuss FHWA project eligibility rule change under CMAQ that affects us; looked at RPP funds for the next 10 years; CDOT Region 4 has done a good job identifying high priority intersections for safety improvements, working closely with local governments to address these concerns. • <u>SC TPR</u>: Had 18 inches of snow that stopped everything for a while; lots of work on US 160 but it's coming to a halt due to weather; local staff have done a great job on weed control this year, it's been a concern in the past. • <u>NW TPR</u>: Everything starting to shut down for winter; SH 9 has an impressive new wildlife crossing bridge (no tolls!); SH 13 will have some intermittent stoppages as we replace a bridge near Craig. • <u>PACOG</u>: Approved 2016-2019 budget and had a good conversation with Michael Snow and Wendy Pettit regarding the results of CDOT/FHWA review on how to improve MPO operations and policies, still working on reviewing that and also received a DOLA grant to support a structural review; making improvements on US 50 as a potential alternate route to I-70; Pueblo and Las Animas County partnered with Sparq and CEO to open two stations in the area. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>GV TPR</u>: Resurfacing on US 50 west of Gunnison but the cold is coming and construction is ending; voters approved an increase in RTA tax from .6% to 1% in November election so we'll be doubling the number of bus trips between Gunnison and Crested Butte to deal with housing cost issues; looking at auxiliary route between Telluride and Grand Junction, SUCAP service has a video on YouTube related to this same topic (but from Durango), continuing to work on building a transit link from Gunnison to Montrose – a missing link for westbound travel from Gunnison to catch Grand Junction or Durango connections in Montrose. • <u>STAC Chair Comments</u>: Bustang numbers are increasing and the Transportation Commission approved the purchase of 3 new buses, Thanksgiving week saw the highest numbers to-date; the new Region 4 building is a whole new concept for a workplace, you should really see it; need to pay attention to tire and chain laws throughout the winter since they are in effect. 	
<p>Freight Advisory Council (FAC) Update / Barbara Kirkmeyer (STAC Member)</p>	<p>Barbara Kirkmeyer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At its most recent meeting, the FAC adopted bylaws and appointed members. • Identified key topics and early wins for the FAC to ensure results and integration of efforts. • STAC confirms Barbara Kirkmeyer as their chosen representative to the FAC. <p>STAC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Mike Lewis</u>: We will talk more about this during our Federal Legislative Update, but I think that one of the big topics of discussion at the next FAC meeting will be the new federal authorization bill (the FAST Act) and its inclusion of a new freight-specific funding program – a very important and interesting development. 	<p>Confirmation of Barbara Kirkmeyer as STAC Representative to the Freight Advisory Council (FAC).</p>
<p>Federal and State Legislative Report / Herman Stockinger, Ron Papsdorf, & Andy Karsian (CDOT Office of</p>	<p>Herman Stockinger, Ron Papsdorf, and Andy Karsian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Three bills coming forward <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bridge Clearance Maps: Statute says that CDOT must print maps showing bridges that comply with the 14' 6" standard, but because 	<p>No action taken.</p>

<p>Policy & Government Relations)</p>	<p>the vast majority of bridges in the state <i>do</i> comply, CDOT would prefer to print maps showing only those that <i>don't</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parking Enforcement: CDOT is seeking the authority to enforce parking rules in park and rides, which will provide clarity in future public-public and public-private projects. ▪ Bus-On-Shoulder: US 36 has been signed and striped for bus-on-shoulder use, but FHWA says that CDOT needs a clarification in statute that buses are exempt from rules against passing in shoulders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This doesn't impact the PPSL project because it's federally designated as a lane when in use, rather than a shoulder. ▪ Representative Carver's Proposed Bills: Proposed bill for STAC to advise the Transportation Commission <i>and</i> CDOT (rather than just CDOT) is moving forward, while the proposed bill to change Transportation Commission boundaries has been changed into a study. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A Conference Committee worked to reconcile the Senate's DRIVE Act with the House's STAR Act. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The result is the FAST Act, which has been approved by the House and the Senate and subsequently signed by the President. ○ The FAST Act is a fully-funded 5-year, \$300 billion bill. ○ Increases Colorado's highway formula funding from \$516 million in 2015 to \$542 million in 2016 and \$592 million by 2020. ○ Increases Colorado's transit formula funding from \$111.5 million in 2015 to \$114.6 million in 2016 and \$124.8 million by 2020. ○ Converts STP to a block grant program and rolls TAP into it. ○ Funds TIFIA at \$275 million in 2016 and to \$300 million in 2020. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unused TIFIA authority rolls over between years, rather than being redistributed. ○ Establishes a new national formula program for freight improvements that will distribute \$85 million to Colorado over the course of 5 years. 	
---	---	--

- Also includes a discretionary program of \$800 million (increasing to \$1 billion by 2020) that Colorado can compete for against other state applicants.
- Designates I-70 between Denver and Salt Lake City as a high priority corridor.
 - No specific funding impact, but could potentially strengthen a future grant application.
- Provides grants for states to investigate RUCs and other funding mechanisms.
- Makes BRT projects *without* designated lanes eligible for Small Starts funding.
- Removes safety awareness and education campaigns from eligibility for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding.
- CDOT's Office of Policy and Government Relations is still reviewing the 1,300 page bill and will share more information over the course of the coming weeks and months.

STAC Comments

- Barbara Kirkmeyer: What was the formula for distributing the \$85 million in freight funding?
- Ron Papsdorf: Formulas are generally based on a mix of population, lane miles, freight traffic, etc. I can't say exactly which formula was used for this program.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: When do you expect that they'll have the criteria for the discretionary freight program that you mentioned?
- Ron Papsdorf: It will likely take a while for those to be developed.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: It would be good to have the broad outlines of that for the TPRs, MPOs, and FAC to use in developing their plans moving forward and ensure that their projects are eligible for that funding in the future.
- Peter Baier: Is there any possibility that this type of grant funding could contribute to the I-70 viaduct? It seems to fit the criteria as a nationally significant, higher cost project.
- Debra Perkins-Smith: That's a good point, we will look into that.

- Buffie McFadyen: Is the Amtrak allocation the same in this new bill with respect to the Pueblo area? Can you help me find that information?
- Ron Papsdorf: I can work with you to get that information.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: What does it mean for non-MPOs that TAP is being rolled into STP?
- Ron Papsdorf: We're not quite there yet, but I don't think that it will affect those areas that don't receive direct TAP transfers. We will probably continue our statewide application system.
- Thad Noll: Will the TC have to designate a chunk of STP for TAP projects?
- Ron Papsdorf: I think that they will have to make that decision. That's one area that we need to do a deeper dive on to know more.
- Doug Rex: Off System Bridge program language is in the bill but at a reduced funding level, is that right?
- Ron Papsdorf: I can't give you the exact amount, but that's correct.
- Vince Rogalski: Will CDOT be applying for a grant for a Road User Charge (RUC) study?
- Debra Perkins-Smith: We are currently moving forward with a pilot program that would test the RUC concept with about 100 users. We are also part of a Western States RUC consortium that is looking at this same issue. One topic discussed there is the inter-operability between states, and Colorado would be interested in looking at that as well.
- Vince Rogalski: The fact that it says "fee" rather than "tax" – does that mean it gets around TABOR?
- Herman Stockinger: The language that the federal government uses doesn't impact the state designation of "fee" versus "tax".
- Herman Stockinger: I was going to ask how much involvement the STAC would like to have in going over specifics in the bill, and it sounds like a lot. We can set up a standing agenda item each month to discuss some aspect of the bill.
- Vince Rogalski: I see head nods indicating that people would like to discuss this further in future months.

<p>Input on the Planning Process / Jeff Sudmeier (CDOT Multimodal Planning Branch Manager)</p>	<p>Jeff Sudmeier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over the next few months we will be soliciting input from internal and external stakeholders on the planning process – what’s working well, what’s not working well, how we can improve it? • This will include the SWP/RTP development process, since it’s still fresh in our minds. • In the past, the model has been to wait for a formal kick-off of to the plan development cycle, have an intensive flurry of activity that lasts about 18 months, then finish and step away for a while. We want to move that towards more of a continuous planning process. • While these specific plans are an important part of this discussion, we want to talk more broadly about all planning activities, including the STAC, and how we can improve and integrate them. • We’d like to know from you what the most important issues in your mind are related to planning. Please give it some thought, discuss with your TPR members, and come back in January ready to discuss with the rest of the STAC. <p>STAC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Norm Steen</u>: Which plan are you talking about? • <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: We want to discuss the SWP, RTPs, etc. but also make it a broader, holistic discussion about all planning processes – not just specific plans. • <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: In the past, the plan is done every 4 years and we take a break of about 1 ½ years in between. Every plan has been an improvement over the previous one, and we want to start thinking now about how we can make the next one better. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Development Program / Jeff Sudmeier (CDOT Multimodal Planning Branch Manager)</p>	<p>Jeff Sudmeier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking to get some STAC input today on criteria that we want to capture to help to identify and prioritize projects from the Development Program for specific purposes in the future. • The purpose is to create a “database of major investment needs” within a 10-year timeframe. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We did not establish a firm definition of “major investment” leaving that to each Region to determine. In general, a “major investment” is something which cannot typically be funded through a single funding source, and which may require additional revenue or other funding sources to fully complete. • Reflects the priorities previously identified through the planning process and in the SWP and RTPs. • The Development Program is not the STIP and not a project list, but rather a resource to reflect project needs and aid us in compiling project lists when the need arises in the future. • We provided an early draft of this to the Transportation Commission last month and we will share it with STAC in January. It is not final – we are still validating the information and we would like your review and feedback. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At present we have identified 75 projects totaling over \$7 billion. ○ We have also inventoried studies with remaining, unfunded work, including EAs, EIS, PELs, etc. ○ Also trying to include transit and operations projects, and other investments but at a higher level than the “major” projects. • Thus far we’ve recorded a number of attributes for each project in the Development Program, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SWP Goals and Strategies ○ Type of Need <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Congestion ▪ Crash Rates ▪ Drivability Life ▪ Poor Structures ▪ Low Vertical Clearance Bridge ▪ Less Than 2 Foot Shoulders ○ Corridor Designation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NHS ▪ Freight ▪ Energy ▪ Regional Priority ○ Traffic Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AADT ▪ Truck AADT 	
--	---	--

- % Truck
- VMT
- V/C
- Other Factors
 - Redundancy
 - Continuity
 - Intermodal Connections

STAC Comments

- Barbara Kirkmeyer: How do you define major? Is there a specific dollar amount?
- Jeff Sudmeier: We intentionally didn't set a dollar amount because "major" varies by the part of the state that you're in. Something that's not particularly major in Denver could be in Region 3 or Region 5. So the guidance that we provided was more or less "a project that you can't fund with existing sources".
- Bentley Henderson: When you say "major" are you really talking about "regionally significant"?
- Jeff Sudmeier: That term has a very specific federal meaning in relation to air quality and the STIP, so we avoided using it. We have been using "major investments" but if you have a better suggestion please let us know.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: Are you including corridor-level priorities in here? Because if so, my worry is that any project falling along that corridor will automatically get in whereas those projects that have been identified specifically won't.
- Debra Perkins-Smith: At this point we're building this as a database and gathering the information that we want to include in it, but further down the road we'll have to get more specific in order to build some sort of 10-year constraint. In those cases where we have a broader corridor priority, we have worked with the regions to get more detailed, specific project characteristics.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: Based on that, we need to add RTP priority as one of the criteria for inclusion (as its own bullet) – otherwise it discredits the whole planning process. Everything on this list should be endorsed by and coming from the regions in some avenue or another.

- Barbara Kirkmeyer: I also want to thank you for doing this so we don't all have to get together to put together a new list every time we need one. This will be much easier for everyone involved and save a lot of time moving forward. Having a database allows us to have a good resource for the future.
- Jeff Sudmeier: Thank you- this will help staff as well. The key here is to all be working from the same list and maintaining that data moving forward.
- Thad Noll: This database should be fluid enough that we can add projects to this list in the future as needs and funding change.
- Buffie McFadyen: One problem we have in some parts of the state in terms of designating a freight corridor is a lack of communication between CDOT and State Patrol on what corridors should or shouldn't be unilaterally designated as "no freight" by the State Patrol. This prevents us from getting this designated as such by CDOT and also hurts local economies.
- Jason Wallis: We are aware of this issue and working on it. One key is to ensure that communications between all these parties is working as it should.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: How does State Patrol do that? How are they allowed to?
- Buffie McFadyen: It's based on HazMat status, but that includes everything from fuel to hairspray. It's becoming cheaper to ship things from out of state than from local communities. And in contrast, we have no restrictions on transporting inmates across state lines.
- Norm Steen: How do we look at the "out year" difference between the 25-year Statewide Transportation Plan / Regional Transportation Plans and 10 year Development Program?
- Jeff Sudmeier: The 10 year piece isn't really fixed in stone, it's more of a window for gauging what's realistic to consider within the near future versus longer future needs that we can't realistically address in the next decade.
- Norm Steen: Does this imply that what's in the Development Plan will move into the STIP?
- Jeff Sudmeier: No, the amount contained here is far above what we can realistically fund. But we want to be thinking about these because 10 years passes quickly and we want to be prepared if and when these projects can be done and if additional funding becomes available.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bentley Henderson</u>: Is there a plan to take this on the road to the TPRs at some point? • <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: Yes, in the coming months we're going to package this information in a way that we can share with a broader audience. And of course we'll keep updating it for accuracy and completion here. 	
Budget Update / Maria Sobota (CDOT Chief Financial Officer)	<p>Maria Sobota</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft budget updated in November, presented to TC in that same month and they adopted it. It will be submitted to the Governor for his review, and we expect to receive his feedback in March prior to final TC adoption in April. • Earlier this week CDOT was able to review and discuss the budget with the Joint Budget Committee and put a big emphasis on our funding short-falls. It was a very long and thoughtful discussion and I think that they have a good perspective on our situation. • Only significant change is that, based on assessment of TC contingency combined with future revenue forecasts, \$12 million was put towards RoadX and another \$6 million will go to TSMO and Maintenance. • The final budget will be released in winter but we don't expect any significant changes between now and then. 	No action taken.
STIP Annual Update / Jamie Collins (CDOT Office of Financial Management and Budget)	<p>Jamie Collins</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last spring we adopted the FY2016 – FY2019 STIP and we are now going to have a 4-year rolling STIP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This will allow us to move money/projects between years as dictated by cash management needs. • In order to maintain this we have to do an annual STIP update to make sure that we always have a 4th year available to draw from. • This is our first time doing this so we're learning as we go. • We will be adding in the new fiscal year without all the Asset Management projects included, but will amend those in later. • We will come back to you in March to review the draft that we have at that point and will be asking TC to release for public release at the same time. 	No action taken.
Other Business	Aaron Bustow, FHWA	No action taken.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ In keeping with standard practice, CDOT worked with FHWA to establish criteria for distributing CMAQ funds, reviewed and scored applications, and then awarded grants.○ One project that was approved locally required a Buy America waiver, which was subsequently rejected by FHWA Headquarters due to their use of a stricter standard for approval. This may be an isolated case, but there are also indications of a “final CMAQ guidance” coming out of Washington soon that might affect all future projects. <p>STAC Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Doug Rex</u>: Is this specific to Buy America, or all CMAQ projects?• <u>Aaron Bustow</u>: At this point we are not sure, but we will come back to you with more information once we have it. <p>Vince Rogalski</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2016 STAC Meeting Calendar reviewed.• No objections by STAC members to the proposed calendar.	
--	--	--

STAC ADJOURNS

Transportation Commission January 20 -21, 2016**Wednesday January 20, 2016**

Note: Materials for specific agenda items are available at: <https://www.codot.gov/about/transportation-commission/meeting-agenda.html> by clicking on the agenda item on the schedule provided at this site.

HTPE Update and Relationship with Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) (David Spector)

- Over next 6-8 months the HTPE Board will evaluate the enterprise's structure and finances and will report back to the TC periodically.
- Working with CDOT Chief Financial Officer and Executive Management Team for ideas on scaling the HTPE program.
- HTPE first big project is US 36.
- Have other projects to follow or continue (I-25 N segments 2 and 3, I-25 N, I-70 East & PPSL, Mountain Express).
- Intentions are to expand this enterprise.
- CDOT and HTPE are working together to fund projects and will continue to do so.

Discussion and Comments

- Transportation Commission (TC) member question was raised regarding where the collected tolls go.
- Tolls go to the HTPE to pay off project loans; eventually the intent is to collect enough tolls to increase revenues that would be used to fund projects.

10-year Development Program Criteria and Attributes (Debra Perkins-Smith)**Purpose**

To review and discuss criteria and approach to identify and prioritize projects from the 10-year Development Program.

The projects were re-sorted in this new order to give a better statewide view: by Interstates, U.S. highways, state highways, transit, and operations. A placeholder is included for biking/walking projects. The TC was asked to give guidance on three issues:

- Project Identification - Use of 10- year Development Program project data to identify different types of projects for different purposes in the future.
- Prioritization for Additional Revenue (i.e. SB 228) – Review and verification of criteria to identify projects for funding with additional SB 228 revenue.
- Identification of Higher Priority Projects – Identification of criteria to select higher priority projects from the Development Program for potential spending of new funding sources over the next 10 years.

Discussion and Comments

- Geographic equity should be a consideration in actual project selection from the Development Program database.
- The Regions have reviewed the 10 Year Development Program, which will be a tool for selecting projects for unanticipated funds.
- The TC generally agreed that the perceived impact of projects on mobility and economic vitality were the correct criteria for SB 228 project selection. These were the same criteria used in the initial November 2014 selection of projects for SB 228 funding. Staff will bring an updated recommendation for SB 228 funding at a later meeting.
- How projects should be ranked for selection for SB 228 program funding, for example, has not been decided.

JANUARY 2016 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS

- Given the large maintenance backlog, it might be wise for CDOT to use SB 228 funds to maintain existing facilities rather than adding lanes.
- Local jurisdictions that intend to add their own resources beyond what may be required for state highway projects should receive some consideration in the ranking of projects.

Program Management Workshop (Josh Laipply, Maria Sobota, and Mike Keleman)

Purpose

The Program Management Workshop provides the TC with an update on the delivery of programs and significant projects. The focus for this month is new indicators developed for cash management monitoring.

Discussion and Comments

- The presentation showed that the Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships (RAMP) and Operations Program is having steadily increasing monthly expenditure totals. Budgeted funds increased substantially when the construction funding for the C-470 Express Lanes was budgeted.
- The Flood Recovery Program is beginning to close out Emergency Repair projects and beginning design and construction of the Permanent Repair projects.
- The graphs used to show how well capital construction expenditures are being spent in a timely manner, as well the actual and projected expenditure rate for the two programs, received TC support. Three new indicators – Forecast Total Expenditure (FTE), FTE with risk, and Schedule Performance Index (SPI) with risk (See packet).
- Staff will make a recommendation in March 2016 to assist CDOT in meeting its obligations.
- CDOT intends to change to reporting construction program expenditures to a calendar year rather than fiscal year.

Update for the CDOT Rolling Owner Controlled Insurance Program (ROCIP) (Josh Laipply)

Purpose

Update the TC on the Rolling Owner Controlled Insurance Program (ROCIP) Pilot Program for Design Bid, Design Build, and Construction Manager/General Contractors (CMGC) projects.

- CDOT started this practice as part of T-REX and learned management of our own insurance program had benefits.
- This would apply to projects that cost over \$20 million – CDOT would be the owner of insurance vs. the contractor.
- There are pros and cons; pros include:
 - Increased safety
 - Quicker turnaround for claims
 - Better for smaller contractors
 - Customer service for claims is better
 - CDOT can be more proactively engaged in addressing issues
- Cons include:
 - Larger contractors feel competitive advantage is lost for projects
 - It is difficult to identify the cost savings related to the costs of insurance and the cost of bids
 - Contractor loses ability to direct claim strategies
 - Safety resources and requirements fall to all levels of contractors (as no lead contractor is responsible)
- Recommend a new Request for Proposal be developed for a new provider for CDOT
- CDOT wants to capitalize on advantages and take steps to decrease disadvantages

Discussion/Comments

- One TC member expressed support, and another was against.
- Per TC Chair – there is a need to weigh liability against savings; understanding that customer satisfaction has increased in the past.
- CDOT staff will research further methods to identify cost savings of this practice.

RoadX: First Two Projects & Update (Peter Kozinski)**Purpose**

This workshop is in response to the November 2015 TC request to be kept apprised of RoadX efforts that exceed \$1 million.

Action

The RoadX Program is asking the TC to review the scope of the first two RoadX projects and be aware that expenditures in excess of \$1 million are pending. The two RoadX projects are:

- I-25 South Metro/Managed Motorway Demonstration Project (Ridge Gate Parkway to University Blvd.) - Managed Motorways is a concept that has been successfully implemented on the M1 in Melbourne, Australia. Cost is \$7.6 million.
- I-70 Mountain Corridor Connected Vehicle (CV) Project (I-70 Mtn. Corridor C-470 to Vail) – with an estimated Cost of \$ 11.2 million, the primary goal of the CV Pilot Program is to maximize safety and mobility on the I-70 mountain corridor through probe data collection, vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I) communication, and related decision support analysis to enable real-time traffic management and traveler information and safety applications. This project will:
 - Equip more than 700 CDOT, first responder, ski shuttle, and commercial vehicles on I-70 with Dedicated Short-Range Communication (DSRC) devices to facilitate data collection.
 - Install more than 24 DSRC devices on the roadside to enable data collection and timely V2I safety alerts.

Discussion and Comments

- General Support for this program was expressed by the TC.
- Asked if Colorado Motor Carriers Association (CMCA) have been involved; a Freight Advisory Council (FAC) has been formed and is being kept up to date on RoadX, and CMCA is participating in the FAC.

Update on the Department's development of Policies and Procedures regarding the FASTER Performance Audit (Joshua Laipply, Herman Stockinger)**Purpose & Action**

To provide a status report on the steps the Department has taken to respond to the Colorado Office of the State Auditor regarding the FASTER audit.

Development of Directives

To address FASTER audit recommendations, the following new policy directives and procedural directives have been drafted.

- Policy Directive BE16.0 "Bridge Enterprise Management of FASTER Revenue and Selection of FASTER Bridge Projects"
- Procedural Directive BE16.1 Bridge Enterprise Management of FASTER Revenue and Selection of FASTER Bridge Projects"
- Policy Directive 704.0 "Policy Governing the Efficient Use of FASTER Revenue"
- Procedural Directive 704.1 "Financial Management of FASTER Revenues"
- Procedural Directive 1504.1 "FASTER Safety Mitigation Program"

JANUARY 2016 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS

- Procedural Directive 1608.1 “FASTER Transit Program”
- Procedural Directive 1608.2 “Asset Management Program use of FASTER Funds”

In addition, the Department has developed processes to more accurately track surcharge revenue internally for oversized overweight permitting of vehicles. It has finalized an Interagency Agreement (“IAA”) together with the Department of Public Safety and the Department of Revenue to more accurately track surcharge revenue between agencies.

Discussion and Comments

- Refine text of draft Policy Directive 704.0 with minor edits suggested, recognizing the TC’s authority to modify it after initial approval.
- The TC will review and approve associated draft Procedural Directives for adoption in February or March 2016.

Transit and Intermodal Quarterly Meeting (Mark Imhoff and David Krutsinger)

Transit Grant Status

- Status of Transit grants was provided; made major strides in the expedition of grant review and getting funds distributed to applicants.
- A 50% increase was reported for the number of grants processed in 2015 compared to 2014.
- The Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) is coming to the TC to report and to comply with requests for information and the FASTER Transit funding requirements.
- A new grants program manager tool will come on line in 2016 – COTRANS – invoices can be submitted online. Currently submittals, reviews, and funding distribution are done manually.
- With new system applicants will be able to track progress made with invoices submitted.
- DTR is making invoice payments within an average of 28 days – 2 days earlier than the 30-day target.

Bustang Quarterly Report

- Safety – there have been 4 minor incidents – due to weather conditions
- Having major farebox scanning issues – working to address issues – fares are being collected even with faulty fareboxes.
- DTR evaluating need and ridership to support weekend service – although funds are limited to cover this.
- Other stops are also desired and DTR requested permission to start conversations with local communities that are requesting stops to discuss in more detail. No transit service to link to and no adequate stop infrastructure exists in these communities. Estimate extra stops could cost \$10 million annually – that is not available now. Stops are requested for:
 - Castle Rock
 - Southwest Weld County
 - Clear Creek
 - Idaho Springs

Discussion and Comments

- TC members generally feel the need to hold off on weekend service and additional stops for now.
- Okay to start conversations with communities desiring stops now – but be clear there is no commitment from CDOT at this point.
- Maintaining travel times (as express) is also an important consideration.

Thursday, January 21, 2016

Roll Call

JANUARY 2016 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS

- Attendance – all TC members were present and accounted for.

Comments of Individual Commissioners

- TC members expressed Happy New Year and optimism for 2016.
- Recognized CDOT staff for breaking down silos and working together.
- TC members attended various County Commission meetings.
- Many commented on the grand opening of the US 36 project – that is a successful project to date.
- Recognized appreciation for return of Karen Rowe, Region 2 Regional Transportation Director (RTD).
- Recognized Kerrie Neet's, Region 5 RTD, retirement.

Executive Director's Report (Shailen Bhatt)

- Agreed with TC comments and recognitions, and that it is great to get good comments from the TC.
- Recognized TC members for their hard work, time commitment and caring.
- Recognized CDOT snow removal teams for their hard work.

Chief Engineer's Report (Joshua Laipply)

- Visited the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in Washington D.C. pertaining to C-470 and I-70 Central projects related to Transportation Infrastructure and Innovation Act loans. CDOT getting well known in Washington for these projects.
- I-70 Peak Period Shoulder Lane (PPSL) project is a great success thanks to much transportation and operations planning that prepared CDOT for incidents and crashes in the toll lane and how to quickly respond.
- Working with the community on the I-70 Exit 241 bridge – held off project until January 2016 at community's request – community is pleased with CDOT.
- CDOT becoming a national leader of DOTs for technology with RoadX projects.
- Working closely and effectively with the Colorado Contractors Association (CCA) to improve project and program delivery.

High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) (David Spector)

- New HPTE board member, Jan Martin – now have full membership.
- HPTE legislative audit went well – HPTE has implemented 26 of 29 recommendations.
- HPTE Annual report is online now for review and comment, and will be submitted to the Colorado Legislature on February 15th; recognized Kari Grant for her work on the HPTE Annual Report.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Division Report (Alicia Nolan)

- Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) passed.
- States will get approximately 10% more money.
- New freight programs – one is formula-based and other is discretionary and competitive.
- New operations allows states to know what dollars to be distributed – Colorado received its full apportionment – this bill will allow for better federal funding predictions for states.
- Added TIGER 2016, relief for earmarked projects, and for Emergency Relief (ER) – still waiting to see what the benefits for earmarks and ER will be.
- Federal Freight Roundtable occurring on February 22nd; Administrator is coming to Denver, Colorado as part of nationwide outreach visiting urban areas of the country to discuss freight.
- USDOT is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year – established by Congress on October 15th 1966 and began operation on April 1, 1967 – celebrations have been planned.

STAC Legislation Update (Vince Rogalski)

JANUARY 2016 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS

HB 16-1018 passed unanimously with the Transportation Legislative Review Committee – this bill is sponsored by D. Mitsch Bush, T. Carver, and N. Todd. This new bill more precisely specifies the matters on which advice is to be provided, and requires the STAC to provide its advice and comments to both CDOT and the TC.

Act on Consent Agenda – Approved unanimously on January 21, 2016

- a) Resolution to Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of Nov. 19, 2015 (Herman Stockinger)
- b) Resolution to Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of Dec. 18, 2015 (Herman Stockinger)
- c) R1 disposal of Multiple I-76 Parcels (Paul Jesaitis)
- d) Region 1 US 36 and Federal Property Disposal (Paul Jesaitis)

State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) Greeley County Airport Loan Request (Maria Sobota) – Approved unanimously on January 21, 2016

State Infrastructure Bank Park County Airport Load Request (Maria Sobota) Approved unanimously on January 21, 2016

Discuss and Act on the 7th Budget Supplement of FY 2016 – Approved unanimously January 21, 2016

- **Region 2 \$2,200,000 -SH21-ACCEL/DECEL LANES MP 141.7-148.7- FASTER Safety-** Add acceleration and deceleration lanes to project via change order.
- **\$1,191,527 -US 24E I-17-A BRIDGE REHABILITATION-Bridge Construction Program-** Bid adjustment for project award. Rainbow Falls Bridge rehab deck and replace bridge rail.
- **RoadX \$500,000 – I-70 West Corridor Connected Vehicles–Ethernet/network and ITS device upgrades** at multiple locations between mile points 200-260 in Clear Creek, Jefferson and Summit Counties.
- **Region 4 - \$10,500,000 - I-76: Minor Resurfacing-Surface Treatment-**Resurface I-76 east of Brush to Merino between mile points 92.310 and 101.742.

Discuss and Act on the Resolution Approving the I-25 North Interagency Agreement (IAA) between CDOT and HPTE (David Spector) – Approved Unanimously January 21, 2016

Approval of Policy Directive 704.0 "Policy Governing the Efficient Use of FASTER Revenue" (Herman Stockinger, Josh Laipply) – with redlines distributed to the TC this morning and including "CDOT Staff" where appropriate – unanimously approved on January 21, 2016

Recognitions

- Karen Rowe, Region 2 RTD, presented the I-25/US 24 RAMP Project-Colorado Springs Partnership award – CDOT recognized work of Colorado Springs staff with a certificate for their work on this project and the partnerships formed to make this project successful.
- Commissioner Zink presented the awards of recognition to Mike McVaugh and Kerrie Neet – who both participated in resolving a dangerous roadway incident with a unconscious woman, in a locked car at the driver seat, with the motor running, on US 160 at Wolf Creek Pass. Commissioner Zink was also present. Mike and Kerrie worked with the troubled woman in the car to react appropriately and safely remove herself and her vehicle from the road.
- Executive Director recognized Ty Ortiz for his work in Oklahoma, helping OKDOT to respond to a rockfall event. Oklahoma Governor's letter formally thanked Ty, and recognized Ty's help to opening a closed highway earlier.
- Executive Director's Cup was awarded to Kerrie Neet of Region 5.



MEMORANDUM

TO: STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: RON PAPSDORF, FEDERAL AFFAIRS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT LIAISON
DATE: JANUARY 22, 2016
SUBJECT: FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION (FAST) ACT - DETAILED OVERVIEW

BACKGROUND

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

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

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

For Colorado, the bill increases highway formula funding from \$516 million in 2015 to \$542 million in 2016 and grows to \$592 million in 2020. Overall, this represents an increase of about \$250 million over MAP-21 funding levels over the five years of the bill. On the transit side, funding increases from \$111.5 million in 2015 to \$114.6 million in 2016 and grows to \$124.8 million in 2020. Overall, this represents an increase of about \$40 million over MAP-21 funding levels over the five years of the bill.

This memorandum details some of the key components of the FAST Act by broad subject area. At future STAC meetings, based on input from the Committee, we will delve deeper into each subject area. As you review this information, please consider the subject areas about which you are most interested in receiving more details.



Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act

Funding Summary for Colorado

Highway Programs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
National Highway Performance Program	\$297,705,132	\$304,312,514	\$310,098,755	\$316,507,189	\$323,099,910	\$1,551,723,500
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program	\$137,015,364	\$140,516,942	\$143,558,486	\$146,342,615	\$149,830,157	\$717,263,564
Surface Transportation Block Grant Set-aside	\$10,486,329	\$10,486,329	\$10,703,299	\$10,703,299	\$10,703,299	\$53,082,555
STBGP Set-aside: Recreational Trails Program	\$1,591,652	\$1,591,652	\$1,591,652	\$1,591,652	\$1,591,652	\$7,958,260
Highway Safety Improvement Program	\$29,431,653	\$30,085,816	\$30,649,742	\$31,201,622	\$31,834,485	\$153,203,318
Railway-Highway Crossings Program	\$3,236,539	\$3,308,462	\$3,380,386	\$3,452,309	\$3,524,232	\$16,901,928
CMAQ Program	\$42,132,383	\$43,067,485	\$43,886,376	\$44,689,751	\$45,597,422	\$219,373,417
Metropolitan Planning	\$5,266,924	\$5,373,578	\$5,486,478	\$5,604,275	\$5,734,725	\$27,465,980
National Freight Program	\$15,546,723	\$14,870,779	\$16,222,667	\$18,250,501	\$20,278,334	\$85,169,004
Total	\$542,414,715	\$553,615,574	\$565,579,859	\$578,345,232	\$592,196,236	\$2,832,151,616

Transit Programs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total
5303: Metropolitan Planning	\$1,807,282	\$1,844,151	\$1,882,878	\$1,922,795	\$1,963,558	\$9,420,664
5304: Statewide Planning	\$372,263	\$379,857	\$387,834	\$396,056	\$404,452	\$1,940,462
5307+5340: Urbanized Area Formula	\$74,345,208	\$75,863,206	\$77,506,323	\$79,505,365	\$81,219,297	\$388,439,399
5329(3): State Safety Oversight Program	\$536,630	\$547,362	\$558,857	\$570,704	\$582,803	\$2,796,356
5310: Enhanced Mobility for Adults and People with Disabilities	\$3,781,419	\$3,857,047	\$3,938,045	\$4,021,532	\$4,106,788	\$19,704,831
5311+5340: Non-urbanized Area Formula	\$11,158,622	\$11,408,398	\$11,674,316	\$11,948,201	\$12,228,030	\$58,417,567
5311(b)(3): RTAP	\$158,456	\$161,625	\$165,019	\$168,518	\$172,090	\$825,708
5311(c)(1): Indian Reservation Formula	\$182,995	\$182,995	\$182,995	\$182,995	\$182,995	\$914,975
High Intensity Fixed Guideway	\$13,880,464	\$14,116,715	\$14,360,514	\$14,607,801	\$14,859,341	\$71,824,835
High Intensity Motor Bus	\$420,108	\$427,258	\$434,634	\$442,121	\$449,735	\$2,173,856
5339: Bus and Bus Facilities Formula	\$6,225,267	\$6,382,263	\$6,550,237	\$6,723,078	\$6,899,443	\$32,780,288
5339: Statewide Allocation	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$8,750,000
Total	\$114,620,730	\$116,922,894	\$119,393,670	\$122,241,185	\$124,820,552	\$597,988,941

Note: Estimates are Pre-Obligation Limitations



SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

FAST Act changes the name of the Surface Transportation Program to the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP). Along with the name change come other important updates:

- Increased local funding: Currently, 50 percent of STP funding is sub-allocated to local areas by population. Under FAST Act's new STBGP, this gradually increases to 55 percent over the course of the five-year bill.
- Transportation alternatives: Under current law, the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a standalone program for funding bike, pedestrian, and other alternative projects. FAST Act deletes the existing federal authorization for TAP and moves it into the STBGP as a set-aside. TAP is currently funded at \$820 million annually; FAST increases that figure to \$835 million in FY 2016 and FY 2017 and then to \$850 million per year.
 - Must use competitive process to allocate the funds.
 - MPOs over 200,000 may flex up to 50% of STP Set Aside for use on any STBGP-eligible project.
 - Adds requirement that MPOs must distribute funds 'in consultation with State'.
- The off-system bridge set-aside is retained under the STBGP, funded at \$777 million per year. Colorado funding under this program is approximately \$10.5 million per year.
- Maintains all existing eligibilities of old STP program and adds several new eligibilities:
 - Safe Routes to Schools
 - Boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate routes or other divided highways
 - Workforce development, training, and education
 - Projects that facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of a port terminal
 - Costs associated with providing Federal Credit Assistance (TIFIA)
 - Public Private Partnerships

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY

- A State in which an automated traffic enforcement system is installed shall expend apportioned Highway Safety Program funds to conduct a biennial survey that includes: a list of automated traffic enforcement systems in the State; adequate data to measure the transparency, accountability, and safety attributes of each automated traffic enforcement system; and a comparison of each automated traffic enforcement system with Speed Enforcement Camera Systems Operational Guidelines and Red Light Camera Systems Operational Guidelines.
- Within 1 year, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies as appropriate shall conduct a study on marijuana-impaired driving. The study will examine:
 - Methods to detect marijuana-impaired driving.
 - A review of impairment standard research for driving under the influence of marijuana.
 - Methods to differentiate the cause of a driving impairment between alcohol and marijuana.
 - State-based policies on marijuana impairment.
 - The role and extent of marijuana impairment in motor vehicle accidents.



FREIGHT

In general, the FAST Act places additional emphasis on freight planning and freight movement. It creates a National Multimodal Freight Policy, to be administered by the US Department of Transportation Undersecretary for Policy, to improve the condition and performance of the National Multimodal Freight Network (NMFN).

- States are encouraged to form State Freight Advisory Committees and mandates that all States receiving National Highway Freight Program formula funds create a State Freight Plan (SFP) within two years of enactment and updated every five years.
- The Act also establishes a National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) consisting of:
 - A primary highway freight network (PHFN) of 41,518 miles already identified by FHWA
 - Critical Rural Freight Corridors
 - Must meet minimum criteria
 - No more than 150 miles in Colorado
 - Critical Urban Freight Corridors
 - Designated by MPOs over 500,000 in consultation with the State, or
 - By the State in consultation with MPOs with less than 500,000 population
 - No more than 75 miles in Colorado
 - Any portion of the interstate system not include above
- Creates a new formula distribution National Freight Program that will provide Colorado with \$85 million over five years for freight infrastructure improvements. In General, formula funds are used “to improve the movement of freight on the National Highway Freight Network.”
 - Each State’s formula distribution is based upon the number of Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) miles in that State relative to all PHFS miles. For States whose formula proportion is greater than or equal to two percent, it may obligate funds to any of the NHFN elements except for interstates that are not part of the PHFS. For States whose formula proportion is less than two percent, it may obligate funds to any segment of the NHFN, including all interstates.
 - Colorado is a “low primary highway freight system mileage” state so is eligible to use funds for projects on any component of the NHFN and not just the PHFN.
- Creates a new \$800 million per year (grows to \$1 billion in 2020) Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Program that will provide grants to highway, bridge, rail-grade crossing, intermodal and freight rail projects costing more than \$100 million. The program allows up to \$500 million to be allocated to freight rail and/or intermodal projects.
 - Grant Authority: Except as otherwise provided, each grant shall be at least \$25m.
 - Eligible Applicants: A State or group of states; MPOs with a population over 200,000; local governments or groups of local governments; political subdivisions of a State or local government; special purpose district or public authority; Federal land management agency; tribal government or group of tribal governments; multistate or multijurisdictional group of any of the above entities.
 - Eligible Projects:
 - Highway freight project on the National Highway Freight Network;



- Highway or bridge project on the NHS;
- A freight project that is:
 - A freight intermodal or freight rail project, or
 - Within the boundaries of a public or private freight rail, water (including ports), 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, or
 - A railway-highway grade separation project.
- Has eligible project costs reasonably expected to exceed:
 - \$100m, or
 - For a project located in one state, 30% of the federal-aid highway apportionment to the State in the most recent FY, or
 - For a project located in more than one state, 50% of the federal-aid highway apportionment to the State with the largest apportionment in the most recent FY.
- Limitation: No more than \$500m of the total amount in the program (2016-2020) may be used for a freight project that is an intermodal or freight rail project or within the boundaries of a public or private freight rail, water, or intermodal facility.
- Small Projects: 10% of grant funding is reserved each fiscal year for projects that do not satisfy the minimum project cost thresholds. Each small project grant shall be at least \$5m.
- 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;
 - Project reasonably expected to begin construction no more than 18 months after date of obligation of funds.
- Rural Areas: The Secretary shall reserve at least 25% of funds (including amount for small projects) each fiscal year for grants in rural areas. Rural area means an area outside an urbanized area with a population over 200,000.
- Federal Share: The Federal share of a project assisted with a grant under this program may not exceed 60%. Other Federal assistance may be used to satisfy the non-federal (40%) share of a project except that the total Federal assistance may not exceed 80% of the total project cost.



TRANSIT

- Improvements to landscaping and streetscape must be ‘functional’ to be eligible as an associated transit improvement.
- Bicycle storage shelters and parking facilities and the installation of equipment are eligible.
- Plans and TIPs for each Metro Area shall provide for intermodal facilities that support intercity transportation, including intercity buses and intercity bus facilities and commuter vanpool providers.
- Transportation plans must include the identification of intercity bus facilities.
- Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grants:
 - Removes weekend service requirement for corridor-based bus rapid transit projects.
 - Increases maximum size of small start grant from \$75 million to \$100 million and the maximum size of small start project from \$250 million to \$300 million.
 - Redefines Corridor-Based Bus Rapid Transit Project to mean a small start project that emulates rail fixed guideway systems, the majority of which does not operate in a separated right-of-way dedicated for public transportation use during peak periods.
- Creates a new pilot program for innovative coordinated access and mobility to provide grants for innovative projects that improve the coordination of transportation services and non-emergency medical transportation (including the deployment of technology).
- Grants or loans may not be used to pay incremental costs of incorporating art or non-functional landscaping into facilities, including the costs of an artist on the design team.
- Re-creates a competitive grant bus program which includes a 10% rural set-aside and a cap that not more than 10% of all grant amounts can be awarded to a single grantee.
 - Allows States to submit statewide applications for bus needs, which would allow the State to distribute competitively awarded funds.
 - The competitive bus program includes \$55 million annually for no/low emission buses and grows from \$268 million in 2016 to \$344 million by 2020.
 - Each State will receive \$1.75 million each fiscal year in formula grants.
 - Non-Federal share may be provided from revenues generated from value capture financing mechanisms.
 - Creates a new pilot program under which an eligible recipient of formula grant funds in an urbanized area with population of not less than 200,000 and not more than 999,999 may elect to participate in a State pool.
 - The purpose of a State pool is to allow transfers of formula grant funds among the designated recipients in a manner that supports their transit asset management plans.
 - A State, and eligible recipients in the State, may submit to the Secretary a request for participation in the program.
 - A participating State shall develop an allocation plan for FY 2016 through 2020 to ensure that an eligible recipient participating in the pool receives an amount that equals the amount that would have otherwise been available.



PASSENGER RAIL

For the first time, Amtrak funding is separated into the Northeast Corridor and the National Network. The bill directs the creation of at least two distinct accounts for the Northeast Corridor and the National Network to assign all revenues, appropriations, grants and other forms of financial assistance, compensation, and other sources of funds, including operating surplus, commuter payments and state payments. If Amtrak determines that a transfer between the accounts is necessary, Amtrak may transfer funds between the Northeast Corridor and National Network accounts if Amtrak notifies the Amtrak Board of Directors, including the Secretary, at least 10 days prior to the expected date of transfer.

The National Network is funded at \$5.454 billion over five years while the Northeast Corridor is funded at \$2.596 billion.

PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

The FAST Act makes no significant changes to the performance-based planning and programming policy requirements included in MAP-21. This includes no new national-level performance measures beyond what is currently being developed through the Federal rule-making process. The Act does change to a “shall” regarding the inclusion of description of performance measures and the system performance report in a State’s long-range transportation plan.

The Act also includes new provisions to enable the USDOT to better support State DOTs, MPOs, and FHWA in the collection and management of data for performance-based planning and programming. This includes data analysis activities related to vehicle probe data, household travel behavior data, travel demand model data and performance management prediction tools. These data-related activities are funded at \$10 million per year nationally over the duration of the FAST Act.

- Each metropolitan planning organization is encouraged to consult with officials responsible for other types of planning activities that are affected by transportation in the area (including State and local planned growth, economic development, **tourism**, **natural disaster risk reduction**, environmental protection, airport operations, and freight movements) or to coordinate its planning process, to the maximum extent practicable, with such planning activities.
- The metropolitan planning process for a metropolitan planning area shall provide for consideration of projects and strategies that will **“improve resiliency and reliability of the transportation system”** and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation.
- Directs planners to include considerations to enhance travel and tourism.
- Emphasize intermodal transfer facilities and accessibility effects of intercity bus services and facilities.
- ‘Private transportation’ should include consideration of intercity bus operators and employer-based commuting programs.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project delivery provisions in the FAST Act contain many important streamlining measures. The Act requires USDOT to allow States to assume Federal responsibility for project design, plans, specifications, estimates, contract awards and inspection of projects, to the maximum extent practicable. The Act also allows USDOT operating administrations to adopt the NEPA environmental documents and assessments developed by other operating



administrations. It expands the multimodal categorical exclusion established in MAP-21 to provide the authority for any DOT operating administration to use a CE of another operating administration.

- Exempts ‘common post-1945 concrete steel bridge or culvert’ from individual review.
- Establishes a 45 day response time for comments from cooperating agencies.
- Requires lead agency to prepare a ‘complete’ document including permits.
- Accelerated decision making in environmental reviews.
 - Allows errata sheets
 - Single document for FEIS and ROD to the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law.
 - Requires Secretary to make publicly available no later than 18 months after bill’s enactment the status and progress of projects requiring an EA or EIS and the names of participating agencies not participating in development of project purpose and need and range of alternatives.
- Participating agencies shall limit their comments to subject matter areas within the special expertise or jurisdiction of the agency.
- The lead agency may eliminate from detailed consideration an alternative proposed in an EIS regarding a project if the alternative was considered in a metropolitan planning process or a State environmental review process by an MPO or a State or local transportation agency under certain circumstances.
- Allows lead agency or cooperating agency to adopt or incorporate by reference an entire planning product for use in NEPA under certain conditions.

DESIGN AND PROJECT DELIVERY

- Creates an option to bundle small bridge projects to increase efficiency. Projects bundled under this subsection shall have the same financial characteristics, including the same funding category or subcategory and the same Federal share.
- HSIP funds may be used for the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment, pedestrian hybrid beacons, roadway improvements that provide separation between pedestrians and motor vehicles, including medians and pedestrian crossing islands, a physical infrastructure safety project not described elsewhere.
- The Secretary shall also consider the ‘Highway Safety Manual’ of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and the ‘Urban Street Design Guide’ of the National Association of City Transportation Officials to develop criteria for project design on the NHS.
- A State may allow a local jurisdiction to use a roadway design publication that is different from the roadway design publication used by the State in which the local jurisdiction is located for the design of a project on a roadway under the ownership of the local jurisdiction (other than a highway on the Interstate System) if:
 - the local jurisdiction is a direct recipient of Federal funds for the project;
 - the roadway design publication—
 - is recognized by the Federal Highway Administration; and
 - is adopted by the local jurisdiction;
 - The design complies with all other applicable Federal laws.



- The Secretary shall encourage each State and MPO to adopt standards for the design of Federal surface transportation projects that provide for the safe and adequate accommodation of all users of the surface transportation network, including motorized and non-motorized users, in all phases of project planning, development and operation.

INNOVATION

- Directs the Secretary to establish an advanced transportation and congestion management technologies deployment initiative to provide grants to eligible entities to develop model deployment sites for large scale installation and operation of advanced transportation technologies funded at \$60 million per year.
 - Grants shall be awarded to not less than 5 and not more than 10 eligible entities. Eligible entities are State or local governments, MPOs with population over 200,000, or other political subdivisions of a State or local government or multijurisdictional groups or consortia of research institutions or academic institutions.
 - Grants may not exceed \$12 million to a single recipient in a fiscal year. The Federal share is limited to 50%.
 - Grant awards shall consider geographic and technology diversity.
 - Grants may be used to deploy advanced transportation and congestion management technologies, including advanced traveler information systems; advanced transportation management technologies; infrastructure maintenance, monitoring, and condition assessment; advanced public transportation systems; transportation system performance data collection, analysis, and dissemination systems; advanced safety systems, including vehicle-to-vehicle and vehicle-to-infrastructure communications, technologies associated with autonomous vehicles, and other collision avoidance technologies; integration of intelligent transportation systems with the Smart Grid; electronic pricing and payment systems; or advanced mobility and access technologies, such as dynamic ridesharing and information systems to support human services for elderly and disabled individuals.
- The goals of the Intelligent Transportation System Program are amended by adding: “enhancement of the national freight system and support to national freight policy goals.”
- The Secretary shall establish a program to provide grants to States or groups of States to demonstrate user-based alternative revenue mechanisms that utilize a user fee structure to maintain the long-term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund.
 - Geographic diversity shall be considered in awarding grants.
 - The grant program is funded at \$15 million in 2016 and \$20 million per year for fiscal years 2017 through 2020.
 - The Federal share is limited to 50%.

FINANCING

- TIFIA is funded at \$275 million in 2016 and increases to \$300 million in 2020. A roll-over provision is included so that unused TIFIA allocations accumulate year to year rather than being redistributed.



- The bill also updates the TIFIA program to enable it to be better utilized by rural areas and more accessible for small projects and makes transit-oriented development projects eligible to apply for TIFIA loans.
- Modifies the cost parameters for eligible projects. All eligible projects are now expected to cost at least \$50 million. Adds project cost exceptions for transit-oriented development (costs must equal or exceed \$10 million), rural projects (\$10 million to \$100 million), and local infrastructure projects (equal to or greater than \$10 million).
- Redefines a rural infrastructure project as a project located in an area that is outside an urbanized area of 150,000 people or more.
- Sets a limit for TIFIA funding used towards small projects with project costs of less than \$75 million.
- Adds a requirement that MPOs must be consulted on the placement and amount of tolls on an HOV facility located on the Interstate System if the facility is located in an MPO.
- Authorizes the Secretary to establish a National Surface Transportation and Innovative Finance Bureau to provide assistance and communicate best practices and financing and funding opportunities to eligible entities; administer the application processes for TIFIA, RRIF, the qualified highway or surface freight transfer facilities bonding program, and the new Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects program; promote innovative financing best practices; reduce uncertainty and delays in environmental reviews and permitting; and reduce costs in project delivery and procurement.
- Requires the Secretary of Transportation to establish a Council on Credit and Finance. The Council shall review applications for assistance submitted under TIFIA, RRIF, the qualified highway or surface freight transfer facilities bonding program, and the new Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects program.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Funds apportioned to a State under HSIP may not be used to purchase, operate, or maintain an automated traffic enforcement system, except a system located in a school zone.
- Vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment is specified as an eligible expenditure under the Highway Performance Program and the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program.
- Secretary shall designate national electric vehicle charging and hydrogen, propane, and natural gas fueling corridors within 1 year.
 - Corridors will identify near- and long-term need for, and location of, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, hydrogen fueling infrastructure, propane fueling infrastructure, and natural gas fueling infrastructure at strategic locations along major national highways.
 - Secretary shall solicit nominations from State and local officials.
- Designates I-70 between Denver and Salt Lake City as a High Priority Corridor on National Highway System.





**STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION (FAST) ACT BRIEFINGS**

PRIORITIES BALLOT

Please rank 1 through 10 in priority order (1=highest priority, 10=lowest priority)

- _____ Surface Transportation Block Grant Program
- _____ Financing
- _____ Highway Traffic Safety
- _____ Freight
- _____ Transit
- _____ Passenger Rail
- _____ Planning and Performance Management
- _____ Environmental Review
- _____ Design and Project Delivery
- _____ Innovation



**MEMORANDUM**

TO: STATE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: MARIA SOBOTA, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER (CFO)
DATE: JANUARY 29, 2016
SUBJECT: SENATE BILL 09-228 TRANSFER SCENARIOS FOR FY 2015-16 AND FY 2016-17

Purpose

This memorandum summarizes the December 21, 2015 economic forecasts from the Governor's Office of State Planning and Budget (OSPB) and Legislative Council Staff (LCS) regarding potential Senate Bill (SB) 09-228 transfers for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16 and FY 2016-17. The protocol for measuring the benefits of potential SB 09-228 projects is also enclosed.

Action

The Division of Administration and Finance (DAF) is informing the State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) of information that was presented to the Transportation Commission (TC) for information only in January 2016.

Background & Details

Both OSPB and LCS released their December quarterly economic forecasts on Monday, December 21st:

- OSPB and LCS have updated their forecasts and are now both projecting similar SB 09-228 General Fund transfers in FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17 (see Table 1 below). Both OSPB (\$200.2 million) and LCS (\$199.5 million) are projecting a full transfer in FY 2015-16 and a 50% transfer in FY 2016-17 (\$106.8 million for OSPB and \$106.1 million for LCS). Both OSPB and LCS forecast that SB 09-228 General Fund transfers will be eliminated in FY 2017-18.
- In the previous forecast (September 2015), OSPB projected a 50% SB 09-228 General Fund transfer in FY 2015-16 and no transfer in FY2016-17, while LCS projected a full SB 09-228 General Fund transfer in FY2015-16 and a 50% transfer in FY 2016-17. In light of the revised OSPB and LCS forecasts, CDOT will be re-evaluating the impact of the SB 09-228 General Fund transfer in FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17.
- According to current projections, a General Fund transfer will be reduced to zero for FY 2017-18 because the TABOR refund is expected to be larger than 3.0% of total General Fund revenue. This forecast projects the refund to be 3.03% of total General Fund revenue. Therefore, a small reduction in revenue subject to TABOR would result in a half-transfer in FY 2017-18.



Table 1: December 2015 Economic Forecasts

December 2015 Forecasts (in millions)			
	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18
OSPB	\$200.2	\$106.8	\$0.0
LCS	\$199.5	\$106.1	\$0.0

Office of State Planning and Budget Forecast

After exceeding the Referendum C cap in FY 2014-15, TABOR revenue is projected to come in below the cap in FY 2015-16, meaning there will be no TABOR refund. Because no TABOR refund is projected for FY 2015-16, SB 09-228 transfers for transportation and capital construction are projected to be made at full levels, resulting in transfers of \$200.2 million and \$50.0 million, respectively. TABOR revenue is expected to come in over the cap by \$112.0 million in FY 2016-17 and \$340.9 million in FY 2017-18. TABOR revenue for FY 2016-17 assumes lower Hospital Provider Fee collections by \$100.0 million projected in the Governor's budget request.

Under the December 21 forecast, the State's General Fund reserve is projected to be \$156.5 million below the required amount of 6.5% of appropriations in FY 2015-16. The projected shortfall is larger than in OSPB's September forecast, due to lower revenue projections and the new expectation that transfers to transportation and capital construction under Senate Bill 09-228 will occur at their full amounts rather than being reduced by half. Full transportation and capital construction transfers are now expected as no TABOR refunds are forecast for FY 2015-16. Refunds above 1.0% of General Fund revenue trigger a reduction in the transfers.

The projected TABOR refund in FY 2016-17 under the Governor's budget request is only slightly above the level that would trigger full SB 09-228 transfers to transportation and capital construction. Therefore, a small downward revision in the revenue forecast would result in additional General Fund obligations to cover full transfers. The projected FY 2016-17 TABOR refund of \$112.0 million (assuming the lower Hospital Provider Fee collections) is equal to 1.05 percent of General Fund revenue, meaning that the SB 09-228 transfers will only be made at half levels. However, a very small decrease in revenue from projections would result in full transfers for FY 2016-17. As a result of the expected size of the TABOR refunds in FY 2017-18, SB 09-228 transfers are projected to be eliminated.

Legislative Council Staff Forecast

The state and national economies continue to see moderate, broad-based job growth across most industries. Rising household incomes have supported growth in consumer spending, propping up economic activity. Low commodity prices, a stronger U.S. dollar, and slower global economic activity softened business conditions in 2015 and will continue to do so into 2016. The aging population, tighter monetary policy, and rising Colorado housing costs will also moderate growth.

The five-year block of transfers to the Capital Construction Fund and Highway Users Tax Fund required by SB 09-228 will begin in FY 2015-16. Full SB 09-228 transfers of \$199.5 million to the HUTF and \$49.9 million to the Capital Construction Fund will occur in FY 2015-16. The transfers



are expected to be cut in half in FY 2016-17 (\$106.1 million to the HUTF and \$27.3 million to the Capital Construction Fund). Transfers are expected to be eliminated in FY 2017-18.

Economic Analyses of Potential SB 09-228 Projects

In response to the expected transfer of SB 09-228 funds, CDOT has compiled a list of critical projects. In early 2015, the Executive Management Team (EMT) initiated a study to assess the economic benefits and impacts of selected SB 09-228 projects. Economic analyses can provide useful information on one important aspect of transportation projects: the degree to which projects directly support or generate business and other economic activity. This kind of analysis is particularly helpful in assessing the “invisible” economic effects of an investment, such as how much it could streamline business logistics or the ability of a project to generate “ripple effects” of savings throughout the economy.

The following projects are included in the study: 1) I-70 East Express Lanes, 2) I-25 Alameda Interchange, 3) I-70 Floyd Hill to Empire, 4) I-70 Westbound PPSL, 5) I-25 North (Fort Collins), 6) US 550/160 Connection (Durango), 7) SH 119 Bus Rapid Transit, 8) North Metro Rail Extension, 9) I-70 Silverthorne Interchange, 10) US 50 West (Pueblo), 11) SH 13 North (Rifle), 12) SH 71 Ports to Plains Connection, 13) I-76 to I-70.

The projects were selected based on variety, relevance, and geographic diversity, and are a representative sample of the full SB 09-228 project list. The 12 case studies provide an estimate of the potential value selected improvements in Colorado’s transportation infrastructure could add to the State and local economies. Moreover, they demonstrate the tie between transportation and the economy in a concise and relatable way. The analysis is based on a detailed assessment of the scenarios “before” and “after” a project is implemented. The analysis utilizes detailed project specific data, baseline performance condition, interviews with project stakeholders and businesses, and other economic and demographic data. The analysis is done using CDOT’s Transportation Investment Analysis Toolkit and the Transportation Economic Development Impact System (TREDIS). The results are summarized in terms of:

- 1) *Direct Benefits* - The dollar value of transportation savings or increased productivity that result from improved transportation performance, such as time saving, vehicle operating cost saving, safety saving, reliability (logistics) saving, and emission saving.
- 2) *Business Output (Sales)* - Total new revenue accruing to Colorado businesses as a result of both dollars spent on transportation outlays and the dollars of societal benefit being spent in the State’s economy, measured in:
 - *Gross State Product (Value Added)* - The portion of Business Output retained in Colorado’s economy; and
 - *Wage Income* - The portion of Gross State Product in the form of dollars of income earned by Colorado households.
- 3) *Employment* - Jobs supported and sustained in Colorado’s economy from the business activity above. It also includes construction jobs created.

Specific project results are not included in this memorandum, as they are currently under review by the EMT.



Options and Recommendations

N/A

Next Steps

As an Executive Department, CDOT utilizes OSPB forecasts for SB 09-228 transfers during its annual budget process. CDOT, previously expecting no SB 09-228 transfer in FY 2016-17, is now expected to increase its final FY 2016-17 budget request in-line with OSPB's current forecast of a 50% transfer. The March 2016 state economic forecast and TABOR revenue projection from OSPB may further alter the expected SB 09-228 transfer for FY 2016-17. Finally, expected legislation during the 2016 General Assembly session which cordons off the Hospital Provider Fee from TABOR revenue, if passed, will increase the likelihood of a full SB 09-228 transfer to the HUTF for FY 2016-17 and beyond.

The Economic Analyses outlined in the memorandum will be presented to the TC by March 2016, before any SB 09-228 transfer occurs for FY 2015-16.

Attachments

N/A





DATE: January 29, 2016
TO: Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
FROM: Jeff Sudmeier, Manager, Multimodal Planning Branch
SUBJECT: Development Program Update and Next Steps

Background

The purpose of the Development Program is to bridge the gap between the 4-year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the 20+ year Statewide Transportation Plan (SWP), and to identify the needs for major investments and the priorities over a 10 year timeframe (through 2025). Major investment needs were identified based on a statewide inventory of documented needs from planning and development studies. These major investment or corridor needs are also identified in the RTPs for the TPRs and MPOs. The Development Program is not intended to capture every potential project identified to date. It is intended to, at a minimum, capture major projects as defined by each Region, as well as priorities for transit, bike/ped, and operations. Less detailed information is also being collected on other regionally important projects identified in Regional Transportation Plans, but not included in the inventory of major investment needs.

A draft of the Development Program inventory of major investment needs was presented to the Transportation Commission at a November workshop and sent out to STAC in December. Additional staff review and validation of the Development Program was conducted in December, resulting in a number of additions. The current draft includes nearly 100 major highway projects totaling \$7.8 billion, plus priorities for transit, bike/ped, and operations (see **Attachment A and B**). The most current information on the Development Program is available at: <https://www.codot.gov/programs/planning/projects/development-program>.

The January Transportation Commission workshop included a discussion of the need to be ready to quickly identify and prioritize projects from the Development Program for possible new funding sources, additional revenue, or competitive programs. Recent developments, including new Senate Bill (SB 228) revenue forecasts and discussions of different legislative proposals, reiterate the need to be prepared to identify and prioritize projects from the Development Program.

Use of the Development Program to Identify Potential Projects

One of the uses of the Development Program is as a tool to identify potential projects for different types of purposes, for example, to identify candidate projects for different competitive programs. To aid in this process, the Development Program includes a variety of data that can be queried or filtered for particular types of projects.

Attachment C displays the data currently being captured for the major highway projects included in the Development Program. This includes:

- Location Information (Region, TC District, TPR, County, Corridor, and Route)
- Project Overview (Name and Description, Related Study, and Limits)
- Project Funding (Funding Need and Total Project Funding, alignment with STIP and planned or programmed RPP)
- Regional Transportation Plan (Relationship to RTP, including alignment with Statewide Plan goals and strategies)
- Types of Need (Needs present at project location based on CDOT data sources, including congestion, safety issues, poor pavement, etc.)
- Other Attributes (corridor designations, access to federal lands, access to other key activity centers)
- Traffic Data (AADT, Truck AADT, % Truck, VMT, V/C Ratio)



Identification of Higher Priority Projects

As noted previously, the Development Program currently includes major highway projects totaling nearly \$8 billion. As indicated by the substantial funding gap identified in the 2040 Statewide Transportation Plan, project needs far exceed available revenue. Some of these projects are likely to move forward in small increments with funding from existing sources, many others are not likely to see any significant progress without additional revenue. At \$8 billion, these projects exceed what might reasonably be accomplished within the next 10 years even if new funding sources were to come to fruition. Given the potential for new funding sources, consideration should be given to criteria that can be used to further prioritize and identify a smaller subset of projects (a “10-Year Development Program”) with a target of closer to \$2 - \$2.5 billion. The following are criteria that could be used in further prioritization. Many of these criteria have been used in past efforts, including the earlier identification of candidate SB 228 projects and the identification of RAMP projects. Potential criteria include:

- **Mobility** - Extent to which project addresses a mobility need, including congestion reduction, improved reliability, new or improved connections, eliminations of “gaps” or continuity issues, new or improved multimodal facilities, or improved access to multimodal facilities
- **Economic Vitality** - Extent to which a project supports the economic vitality of the state or region, including supporting freight, agricultural, or energy needs, or providing or improving access to recreation, tourism, military, job, or other significant activity centers
- **Safety** - Extent to which project addresses safety deficiencies at locations with known safety issues (as indicated by Level of Safety Service (LOSS) 3 or 4), or other known or projected safety issues
- **Asset Life** - Extent to which project addresses asset life, including improving Low Drivability Life pavement or poor rated structures
- **Regional Priority** - Priority within the Region, based on planning partner input including priorities expressed in Regional Transportation Plans
- **Strategic Nature** - Strategic nature of project, and regional or statewide significance

Next Steps

- January - STAC review and discussion of Development Program major investments and criteria for further prioritization

Attachments

- Attachment A - Development Program Draft Major Investments
- Attachment B - Map of Development Program Major Investments
- Attachment C - Development Program Project Data



Development Program - DRAFT Major Investments
1/20/2016

Projects added since prior version highlighted in orange.												
Project ID		Project Location			Project Overview					Project Funding		
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Project ID	SB 228 Project ID	Region	TPR	Corridor	Study	Project Name	Project Description	Limits From	Limits To	\$ Funding Need	\$ Total	Project/ Related Phase in STIP
Highway Projects												
1	7*	2	Pueblo Area	I-25 through Pueblo	I-25: New Pueblo Freeway EIS and ROD	I-25: 1st St. to 13th St. (New Pueblo Freeway)	Complete reconstruction and widening, construction of a split-diamond interchange between 1st St. and 13th St. with additional exit ramps near 6th St., and construction of one-way frontage roads between the ramps.	1st St.	13th St.	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	v
2	7*	2	Pueblo Area	I-25 through Pueblo	I-25: New Pueblo Freeway EIS and ROD	I-25: 29th St. Section	Part of the Phase 1 of the New Pueblo Freeway. Widening of the interstate from two to three lanes in each direction and relocation of interchange ramps and construction of frontage roads.	US 50B (Exit 100)	US 50 / SH 47 Interchange	\$ 52.00	\$ 52.00	v
3		2	Pikes Peak Area	I-25 through Colorado Springs	N/A	I-25: Widening S. Academy to Circle/Lake	Widening of roadway to six lanes.	S. Academy Blvd.	Circle/Lake	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.00	
4	5*	1	Greater Denver Area, Pikes Peak Area	I-25: El Paso County Line to C-470	I-25 South PEL	I-25: Monument to C-470	PEL to be completed for corridor with movement into NEPA and design/construction. Potential for adding one tolled Express Lane in each direction on I-25 to connect to tolled Express Lane on C-470.	Monument	C-470	\$ 270.00	\$ 270.00	v
5	13	1	Greater Denver Area	I-25: Broadway to I-70	I-25/US 6: Valley Highway EIS and Phased ROD	I-25: Santa Fe to Alameda	Completion of the Alameda Interchange on I-25 including reconstruction of Lipan, reconstruction of the Alameda Bridge over the South Platte and finalization of ramp configurations.	Santa Fe	Alameda	\$ 3.00	\$ 30.00	v
6		1	Greater Denver Area	I-25: Broadway to I-70	I-25/US 6: Valley Highway EIS and Phased ROD	I-25: Valley Highway Phase 3.0: Santa Fe to Bronco Arch (including bridges)	Replacement of bridges and interchanges and roadway widening.	Santa Fe	Bronco Arch	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	
7		1	Greater Denver Area	I-25 North	I-25 North EIS and Phased ROD; I-25 North: US 36 to SH 7 PEL	I-25 North: US 36 to 120th	Implementation of I-25 North PEL recommendations including additional capacity from 84th Ave. to Thornton Pkwy., and auxiliary lanes between interchanges.	US 36	120th	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	v
8		1	Greater Denver Area	I-25 North	ROD; I-25 North: US 36 to SH 7	I-25 North: 120th to SH 7	where segment three ends (136th/144th) to SH 7. Addition of auxiliary lanes between interchanges as identified in the I-25	120th	SH 7	\$ 80.00	\$ 150.00	v
9	11	4	North Front Range, Greater Denver Area	I-25 North	I-25 North EIS and Phased ROD	I-25 North: SH 7 to SH 14	Addition of one tolled Express Lane in each direction, interchange reconstruction, mainline reconstruction, safety, and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) improvements from SH 7 to SH 14.	SH7 (MP 229)	SH14 (MP 270)	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 1,500.00	v
10	9	3	Grand Valley	I-70B through Grand Junction	I-70B EA and FONSI	I-70: Business Loop	Reconstruction of First and Grand intersection to improve operations and safety, meet current geometric design standards, and improve pedestrian safety.	I-70B (MP 4)	15th St. (MP 6)	\$ 16.00	\$ 20.00	v
11		3	Grand Valley	I-70: Palisade to Parachute	N/A	I-70: Palisade to Debeque	Reconstruction with realignment of curves and other safety improvements.	Palisade	Debeque	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	v
12		3	Intermountain	I-70: Parachute to Glenwood Springs	N/A	I-70: Garfield County Interchange Improvements	Upgrade of current 4-way stop with a roundabout concluded to be necessary from a recently completed corridor study for I-70. Improvements to southern half of the Edwards Spur Rd. starting north of the roadway bridge and ending with connection to US 6 to the south. Improvements anticipated to include road and bridge widening, intersection improvements, and pedestrian mobility improvements.	MP 75	MP 114	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.00	v
13	21	3	Intermountain	I-70: Glenwood Springs to Vail	I-70 Mountain Programmatic EIS and ROD (individual projects cleared subsequently)	I-70: Edwards Spur Rd.	Reconstruction and upgrade of I-70 Dowd Canyon Interchange for safety and operations.	I-70G Spur Rd. (MP 0)	I-70G Spur Rd. (MP 0.527)	\$ 25.00	\$ 35.00	v
14	18	3	Intermountain	I-70: Glenwood Springs to Vail	I-70 Mountain Programmatic EIS and ROD (individual projects cleared subsequently)	I-70 West: Dowd Canyon Interchange	Reconstruction and upgrade of I-70 Dowd Canyon Interchange for safety and operations.	MP 170	MP 174	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.00	v
15	26	3	Intermountain	I-70: Vail to EJMT	I-70 Mountain Programmatic EIS and ROD (individual projects cleared	I-70 West: Vail Pass Auxiliary Lanes and Wildlife Overpass	Completion of NEPA and preliminary engineering for permanent water quality features and recommended third lane (both directions) to increase safety and mobility. Installation of	MP 180	MP 195	\$ 72.50	\$ 75.00	

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Project ID	SB 228 Project ID	Region	TPR	Corridor	Study	Project Name	Project Description	Limits From	Limits To	\$ Funding Need	\$ Total	Project/ Related Phase in STIP
16	20	3	Intermountain	I-70: Vail to EJMT	I-70 Mountain Programmatic EIS and ROD (individual projects cleared subsequently)	I-70 West: Exit 203 Interchange Improvements	Conversion of single lane roundabout at the Exit 203 ramp termini to a double lane, consideration of addition of through lane over existing structure and bridge expansion. This will correct traffic back ups on westbound I-70 in peak periods and weave from an auxiliary lane east of the ramp.	MP 202	MP 203	\$ 6.20	\$ 6.20	
17	27	3	Intermountain	I-70: Vail to EJMT	I-70 Mountain Programmatic EIS and ROD (individual projects cleared subsequently)	I-70 West: Frisco to Silverthorne Auxiliary Lane	Construction of eastbound auxiliary lane from MP 203 to 205. Identified in the Silverthorne Interchange PEL as a safety improvement for eastbound I-70. Minimal widening required.	Frisco (MP 203)	Silverthorne (MP 205)	\$ 10.00	\$ 11.20	
18	19	3	Intermountain	I-70: Vail to EJMT	I-70 Mountain Programmatic EIS and ROD (individual projects cleared subsequently); I-70: Silverthorne/Dillon Interchange PEL	I-70 West: Silverthorne Interchange	Reconstruction of Exit 205 (Silverthorne) interchange including construction of a Diverging Diamond Interchange, extensive paving, curb, drainage. All four ramps affected, including new capacity on westbound on ramps.	MP 205	MP 206	\$ 19.00	\$ 20.00	
19	12	1	Greater Denver Area	I-70 Mountain	I-70 Mountain Programmatic EIS and ROD (individual projects cleared subsequently)	I-70 West: Westbound Peak Period Shoulder Lanes (PPSL)	Construction of Peak Period Shoulder Lanes (PPSL) on westbound side from Empire Junction to top of Floyd Hill.	Empire Junction (MP 231)	Beaver Brook (MP 246.5)	\$ 170.00	\$ 170.00	
20	2	1	Greater Denver Area	I-70 Mountain	I-70 Mountain Programmatic EIS and ROD (individual projects cleared subsequently)	I-70 West: Floyd Hill	Reconstruction of westbound Bridge at US 6 (MP 244) and construction of third lane westbound down Floyd Hill to bridge. Construction of third lane to Twin Tunnels-either Peak Period Shoulder Lanes (PPSL) or permanent.	E. Idaho Springs (MP 241)	Beaver Brook (MP 246.5)	\$ 200.00	\$ 250.00	
21		1	Greater Denver Area	I-70 West: C-470 to I-25	I-70 Kipling Interchange PEL	I-70: Kipling Interchange	Reconstruction of interchange to reduce congestion and improve operational performance and safety.	I-70 and Kipling		\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	
22	1	1	Greater Denver Area	I-70 East: I-25 to E-470	I-70 East EIS and ROD	I-70 East: I-25 to I-225	reconstruction of I-70, including the I-70 viaduct. First phase project would include the addition of one tolled Express Lane in each direction from Brighton Blvd. to I-225. Preferred ultimate alternative is expansion and reconstruction of I-70 from Brighton Blvd. to Tower Rd. with two tolled Express Lanes in each direction.	I-25	I-225	\$ 180.00	\$ 1,117.00	v
23		4	Eastern	I-70 Plains	N/A	I-70: ASR Pavement Replacement and Safety Improvements	Replacement of Akali-Silica Reactivity (ASR) pavement and associated safety improvements.	Stratton		\$ 55.52	\$ 59.00	
24		4	Upper Front Range	I-76 Plains	N/A	I-76: Reconstruction Phase 4 and 5	Reconstruction of roadway and interchanges between Ft. Morgan and Brush.	Ft. Morgan	Brush	\$ 400.00	\$ 400.00	v
25		1	Greater Denver Area	I-225	I-225 PEL	I-225: I-25 to Yosemite	Complete NEPA and final design for \$3 million. Construction involves removing bottleneck at Yosemite by splitting traffic going to northbound and southbound I-25 with two lanes for each direction. Current DTR on-ramp would serve northbound I-25 only with a braided ramp under I-225 to I-25 northbound that will connect to the right side of the I-225 to I-25 southbound lanes. Includes replacement of Ulster bridge.	I-25	Yosemite	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	
26		1	Greater Denver Area	I-270	I-270 PEL	I-270: Widening from I-76 to I-70	Reconstruction to improve capacity, safety, and economic competitiveness. Addition of one tolled Express Lane in each direction, replacement of bridges, and reconstruction of concrete pavement.	I-76	I-70	\$ 250.00	\$ 250.00	v
27	4	1	Greater Denver Area	C-470	C-470 Express Lanes Feasibility Study/EA/Revised EA and FONSI	C-470: Platte Canyon to Kipling	Second phase of C-470 Corridor project. Currently funded first phase adds one tolled Express Lane westbound from I-25 to Wadsworth, and a second tolled Express Lane from I-25 to Colorado. Eastbound, the project adds one tolled Express Lane from Platte Canyon to I-25. The funded first phase also includes auxiliary lanes between select interchanges. The second phase includes the extension of one westbound tolled Express Lane from Platte Canyon to Kipling, and a second westbound tolled Express Lane to Lucent. Eastbound, one tolled Express Lane would be extended to Kipling, and a second tolled Express Lane would be added from Broadway to I-25.	Platte Canyon	Kipling	\$ 334.00	\$ 334.00	
28		3	Grand Valley	US 6: Fruita to Palisade	US 6: Clifton PEL	US 6: Improvements Mesa County	Completion of intersection studies and preliminary engineering for safety and mobility throughout the corridor. Intersection, shoulders, and other safety and mobility improvements at problem locations throughout the corridor.	Fruita (MP 21.2)	Palisade (MP 43.3)	\$ 57.00	\$ 60.00	v

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Project ID	SB 228 Project ID	Region	TPR	Corridor	Study	Project Name	Project Description	Limits From	Limits To	\$ Funding Need	\$ Total	Project/ Related Phase in STIP
29	14	1	Greater Denver Area	US 6: I-70 to I-25	US 6: Wadsworth Blvd. EA and FONSI	US 6: Wadsworth Interchange	Reconstruction of the interchange at US 6 and Wadsworth.	US 6 and Wadsworth		\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	
30	15	1	Greater Denver Area	US 85: I-270 to E-470	US 85: Vasquez PEL	US 85: I-270 to 62nd Ave. Interchange	Reconstruction of the interchange at I-270 and intersection at 60th Ave. to improve the safety and capacity by making the geometric configuration more intuitive for drivers, adding grade separation, and improving access points based on a PEL study recommendation.	I-270	62nd Ave.	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.00	
31		3	Intermountain	US 24: Dowd Junction to Leadville	N/A	US 24: Minturn	Safety, capacity, and pedestrian crossing improvements, including traffic calming, curb and gutter, and road platform adjustment.	MP 143	MP 148	\$13.00	\$13.00	v
32		5	San Luis Valley, Central Front Range	US 24: Hartsel to Johnson Village	Region 5 Passing Lanes & Pullouts Study	US 24: Safety and Mobility Improvements on Trout Creek Pass-Phase II	Shoulder widening/bike facilities and addition of passing lanes and bike facilities on Trout Creek Pass.	MP 213	MP 227	\$ 7.80	\$ 8.00	v
33		2	Pikes Peak Area, Central Front Range	US 24: Divide to I-25	US 24 West: I-25 West to Manitou Springs EA and FONSI	US 24 West: Ute Pass	Drainage and intersection improvements and resurfacing.	Green Mountain Falls	Manitou Springs	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00	v
34		2	Pikes Peak Area	US 24: Divide to I-25	US 24 West: I-25 West to Manitou Springs EA and FONSI	US 24 West: 8th Street to 31st Street	Widening of roadway from four to six lanes.	8th St.	31st St.	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00	
35		2	Pikes Peak Area	US 24 East: I-25 to I-70	US 24 PEL	US 24 East: Widening Garrett/Dodge to Stapleton Rd.	Widening of roadway to four lanes from Garrett/Dodge Rd. to Stapleton Rd.	Garret/Dodge Rd. (MP 318.3)	Stapleton Rd. (MP 323.6)	\$ 28.00	\$ 28.00	
36		4	Upper Front Range	US 34: RMNP east entrance to the west side of Loveland	N/A	US 34/US 36 Intersection in Estes Park	Intersection improvements.	US 34 / US 36		\$2.00	\$2.00	
37		4	North Front Range	US 34: Loveland to Kersey	US 34: US 287 to LCR 3 EA and FONSI	US 34: Widening Denver Ave. to LCR 3	Widening of roadway to six lanes.	Denver Ave.	LCR 3	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	v
38		4	North Front Range	US 34: Loveland to Kersey	US 34 Corridor Optimization Plan and Access Control Plan	US 34: Widening, Interchanges, and Operational Improvements	Widening of roadway from four to six lanes, construction of three interchanges, and operational improvements.	LCR 3	East of US 85	\$ 170.00	\$ 170.00	
39	22	4	North Front Range	US 34: Loveland to Kersey	US 85 PEL	US 34 / US 85 Interchange Reconfiguration	Improvements to the safety and capacity of interchange by making the geometric configuration more intuitive to drivers, adding grade separations, and improving access points. Due to its complexity this interchange has come to be known by locals as Spaghetti Junction.	US 85 (MP 112)	US 85 (MP 114)	\$ 99.00	\$ 100.00	
40		4	Upper Front Range	US 36: US 34 in Estes Park to SH 7 on the north side of Boulder	N/A	US 36: Estes Park to Boulder County Line	Mobility improvements including widening, and construction of passing lanes and pullouts.	Estes Park	Boulder County Line	\$8.00	\$8.00	
41		3	Northwest	US 40: Kremmling to Steamboat Springs	US 40: Steamboat Springs to Steamboat II Documented Cat Ex	US 40: Steamboat Springs to Steamboat II	Widening of roadway and addition of intersection turn lanes and dedicated bus lane.	Steamboat Springs	Steamboat II	\$ 28.00	\$ 28.00	v
42	10	3	Northwest	US 40: Empire to Kremmling	N/A	US 40: Fraser to Winter Park	Construction of capacity improvements on US 40 between Fraser and Winter Park, likely widening to a four lane facility.	Fraser (MP 226.5)	Winter Park (MP 229)	\$ 11.00	\$ 11.00	
43		3	Gunnison Valley	US 50: Montrose to Gunnison	US 50: Blue Creek Canyon CatEx and CSS	US 50: Little Blue Canyon	Reconstruction and widening of existing roadway template to meet current geometric design standards and improve roadside safety, drainage and access along the corridor. Addition of passing lanes and mitigation of geohazard land-slide within the project limits. Can be implemented in phases.	MP 121.5	MP 126.5	\$ 35.00	\$ 42.50	v

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Project ID	SB 228 Project ID	Region	TPR	Corridor	Study	Project Name	Project Description	Limits From	Limits To	\$ Funding Need	\$ Total	Project/ Related Phase in STIP
44		5	Central Front Range, San Luis Valley	US 50: Canon City to Poncha Springs	Region 5 Passing Lanes & Pullouts Study	US 50: Safety and Mobility Improvements between Salida and Coaldale (Passing Lanes and Vehicle Turn-outs)	Addition of passing lanes and vehicle turnouts.	MP 223	MP 243	\$ 4.60	\$ 6.60	v
45	6*	2	Pueblo Area	US 50: Pueblo to SH 115	US 50 West EA and FONSI US 50 West PEL	US 50 West of Pueblo	Widening of US50A westbound from two lanes to three lanes, widening eastbound from McCulloch to Purcell. Improvements to intersections by constructing jughandle intersections.	West of Purcell	Pueblo Blvd. / SH 45	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	v
46		2	Pueblo Area, Southeast	US 50: I-25 to Kansas	US 50 East: Kansas to Pueblo Programmatic EIS and ROD	US 50B Widening	Widening of roadway to four lanes.	Pueblo	East of Lamar	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00	
47		1	Greater Denver Area	US 85: C-470 to I-25	I-25/US 85: South EIS and ROD	US 85: Louviers to Meadows Widening	Reconstruction of two lane roadway to four lanes with a divided median and acceleration/deceleration lanes. Includes a 10 foot trail.	Louviers	Meadows	\$ 55.00	\$ 55.00	
48		4	Upper Front Range, North Front Range, Greater Denver Area	US 85: I-76 to SH 14	US 85 PEL	US 85: Corridor Improvements	Safety, intersection and interchange improvements.	MP 227	MP 309	\$ 197.25	\$ 200.00	v
49		5	Southwest	US 160: Four Corners to Archuleta/Mineral County line	N/A	US 160: Reconstruction and Shoulder Widening MP 0 to MP 8	Full depth reconstruction of the existing paved surface and shoulder widening.	MP 0	MP 8	\$16.00	\$16.00	
50		5	Southwest	US 160: New Mexico to Durango	Region 5 Passing Lanes & Pullouts Study	US 160: Towaoc Passing Lanes	Addition of passing lanes and vehicle turnouts.	MP 28	MP 32	\$ 9.10	\$ 9.10	v
51		5	Southwest	US 160: Four Corners to Archuleta/Mineral County line	N/A	US 160: Wildlife Mitigation	Wildlife mitigation from Mancos to Pagosa Springs.	MP 57	MP 143	\$10.00	\$10.00	v
52	32	5	Southwest	US 160: Durango to South Fork	US 160: Durango to Bayfield EIS and ROD	US 160: Dry Creek Passing and Mobility Improvements	Addition of passing opportunities and mobility improvements including an intersection relocation at CR 223. The project also includes shoulder widening and access consolidation.	MP 96	MP 100	\$ 21.50	\$ 21.50	v
53		5	Southwest	US 160: Archuleta/Mineral County Line to West of South Fork	N/A	US 160: Pagosa Reconstruction and Multi-Modal Improvements	Reconstruction to correct wheel rutting and addition of pedestrian facilities for safety.	MP 143.1	MP 144.4	\$22.00	\$22.00	
54	31	5	San Luis Valley	US 160: Durango to South Fork	US 160: East of Wolf Creek Pass EA and FONSI	US 160: Wolf Creek Pass East Mobility and Safety Improvements	This is the final project outlined in the US 550 East of Wolf Creek Pass EA. The design includes the addition of passing opportunities, mobility improvements, and safety improvements including shoulder widening, curve corrections, rock excavation and rockfall protection, chain station reconstruction, and fiber optic backbone installation.	Lake Creek (MP 175)	East of chain station (MP 180)	\$ 45.30	\$ 45.30	
55		5	San Luis Valley	US 160: Monte Vista to Alamosa	Region 5 Intersection Prioritization Study	US 160: Signal and Intersection Improvements at SH 17	Addition of signal and intersection improvements at SH 17.	MP 234	MP 234	\$2.40	\$5.00	v
56		5	San Luis Valley	US 160: Monte Vista to Alamosa	N/A	US 160: Alamosa	Improvements to Rio Grande bridge, realignment of roadway, and addition of bike and pedestrian facilities in Alamosa (4th Street to SH 17).	MP 234	MP 235	\$10.00	\$10.00	
57		5	San Luis Valley	US 285: Alamosa to Poncha Springs	Region 5 Passing Lanes & Pullouts Study	US 285: Safety and Mobility Improvements between Center to Saguache (Widen Shoulders)	Shoulder widening from Center to Saguache.	MP 63	MP 86	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.00	v
58		5	San Luis Valley	US 285: Poncha Springs to Fairplay	Region 5 Passing Lanes & Pullouts Study	US 285: Safety and Mobility Improvements between Buena Vista and Poncha Springs (Turn Lanes/Passing Lanes)	Addition of turn lanes/passing lanes between Buena Vista and Poncha Springs and addition of wildlife fencing.	MP 128	MP 211	\$ 0.05	\$ 5.00	v
59		1	Greater Denver Area	US 285: Park County to SH 8	US 285: Foxton Rd. to Bailey EA and FONSI	US 285: Richmond Hill to Shaffer's Crossing	Widening of roadway to four lanes with median and construction of grade separated interchange at King's Valley.	Shaffer's Crossing (MP 230)	Richmond Hill (MP 232)	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	
60	8	2	Southeast	US 287: Oklahoma to Eads	US 287: Lamar Reliever Route EA and FONSI	US 287: Lamar Reliever Route	Phased construction of new two lane roadway.	US 287 (MP 73) US 50 (MP 433)	US 287 (MP 79) US 50 (MP 435)	\$ 160.00	\$ 160.00	
61		4	North Front Range	US 287: Fort Collins to Wyoming	US 287 Environmental Overview Study	US 287: Widening Fort Collins	Widening of roadway from four to six lanes.	Harmony Rd	SH392	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Project ID	SB 228 Project ID	Region	TPR	Corridor	Study	Project Name	Project Description	Limits From	Limits To	\$ Funding Need	\$ Total	Project/ Related Phase in STIP
62		4	North Front Range	US 287: SH 14 to Wyoming	N/A	US 287: SH 14—Ted's Place	Intersection improvements.	SH 14		\$1.60	\$1.60	
63		4	Upper Front Range, North Front Range	US 287: SH 14 to Wyoming	N/A	US 287: Ted's Place to Wyoming Border	Construction of passing lanes and other safety improvements.	SH 14	Wyoming State Line	\$20.00	\$20.00	v
64		4	Upper Front Range	US 287: SH 14 to Wyoming	N/A	US 287: CR 72 (Owl Canyon Road)	Intersection improvements.	LCR 72		\$2.00	\$2.00	
65		4	Upper Front Range	US 287: SH 14 to Wyoming	N/A	US 287: LCR 80C (West)	Intersection improvements.	LCR 80C		\$0.60	\$0.60	
66		4	Eastern	US 385	US 385/US 40: High Plains Highway Corridor Development and Management Plan	US 385: Intersection, Shoulders, and Other Safety Improvements at Problem Locations	Intersection, shoulders, and other safety Improvements at problem locations.	Cheyenne / Kiowa County Line	Nebraska State Line	\$ 961.46	\$ 965.00	v
67		5	Southwest	US 550: New Mexico to Durango	US 550 EA and FONSI	US 550 South: Sunnyside	Major reconstruction requiring widening to a four lane roadway, including earthwork, drainage, irrigation, utilities, HMA paving, pedestrian bridge, sound wall, small and large mammal crossings.	MP 8	MP 10	\$ 26.60	\$ 26.60	v
68	33*	5	Southwest	US 550: New Mexico to Durango	US 550 EA and FONSI	US 550 South: Gap	Reconstruction to four lanes, including drainage, utilities, large and small mammal crossings, and intersection improvements.	MP 9	MP 12	\$ 27.30	\$ 30.00	v
69	23	5	Southwest	US 550: New Mexico to Durango	US 550: 160 South Connection EIS and ROD	US 550/US 160 Connection	Completion of the connection of US 550 to US 160 at the Grandview Interchange. Phase 1 (\$71 M) provides 2 lane configuration. Phase 2 (\$20 M) provides for additional 2 lanes.	US 160 (MP 15)		\$ 90.00	\$ 91.00	v
70		5	Gunnison Valley	US 550: Durango to Montrose	Region 5 Passing Lanes & Pullouts Study	US 550: Ridgeway to Ouray Shoulder Widening	Shoulder widening between Ridgeway and Ouray.	MP 96	MP 103	\$11.45	\$ 15.00	v
71		5	Gunnison Valley	US 550: Durango to Ridgeway	Region 5 Passing Lanes & Pullouts Study	US 550: Shoulder Improvements, Deer Fencing and Animal Underpasses between Uncompahgre River and Colona (Billy Creek)	Addition of shoulders between Uncompahgre River and Colona (Billy Creek). Construction of deer fencing and animal underpasses.	MP 112	MP 115	\$ 27.00	\$ 27.00	v
72		3	Intermountain	SH 9: I-70 to US 285	SH 9 EIS and ROD	SH 9: Frisco North	Completion of corridor including minimal widening, water quality and drainage improvements, and improvements to two intersections including the potential for the replacement of a signal with a roundabout.	MP 84.8	MP 96	\$ 9.00	\$ 10.00	
73	28	3	Intermountain	SH 13	SH 13 CatEx and CSS	SH 13: Rifle North	Reconstruction of NHS and high volume truck route to add shoulders, game fence and wildlife underpasses.	Rifle (MP 4)	Rio Blanco County Line (MP 16)	\$ 52.00	\$ 60.00	v
74		3	Northwest	SH 13	SH 13 CatEx and CSS	SH 13: Rio Blanco South to County Line Shoulders and Passing Lanes	Addition of shoulders and passing lanes. Can be implemented in phases.	MP 16	MP 122.7	\$ 14.00	\$ 30.00	v
75		3	Northwest	SH 13	SH 13 CatEx and CSS	SH 13: Wyoming South	Reconstruction of NHS and high volume truck route to add shoulders, game fence and wildlife underpasses. Can be implemented in phases.	MP 123.03	MP 110.83	\$ 25.00	\$ 35.00	v
76		4	North Front Range	SH 14: US 287 to I-25	N/A	SH 14: Widening I-25 to Riverside	Widening of roadway from four to six lanes.	I-25	Riverside	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00	
77		5	San Luis Valley	SH 17	N/A	SH 17: Safety and Mobility Improvements North of Mosca (Widen shoulders)	Shoulder widening north of Mosca.	MP 105	MP 118	\$ 6.00	\$ 7.00	v
78		2	Pikes Peak Area	SH 21 Colorado Springs	SH 21: Powers Blvd. Central EA and FONSI	SH 21: Widening	Widening from Milton E. Proby Pkwy. to East Fountain Blvd.	Milton E. Proby Pkwy.	East Fountain Blvd.	\$ 13.00	\$ 13.00	
79		2	Pikes Peak Area	SH 21 Colorado Springs	SH 21 Powers North EA and FONSI	SH 21: Constitution and North Carefree Interchanges	Construct Continuous Flow Interchanges at Constitution and North Carefree.	Constitution Blvd	North Carefree Blvd	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	
80	17	2	Pikes Peak Area	SH 21 Colorado Springs	SH 21: Powers Blvd. North EA and FONSI	SH 21: Research Pkwy. Interchange	Construction of new grade-separated interchange at SH 21 and Research Pkwy.	North of Woodmen Rd.	South of Briargate Pkwy.	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00	
81		4	Upper Front Range, Greater Denver Area	SH 52: SH 119 to US 85	N/A	SH 52: SH 119 to US 85 Corridor Improvements	Widening, safety, and intersection improvements.	SH 119	US 85	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	v
82		4	Upper Front Range	I-76: E-470 to Wyoming	N/A	SH 52 Interchange in Hudson	Reconstruction of interchange.	I-76 / SH 52		\$ 20.03	\$ 25.00	
83		4	Greater Denver Area	SH 66: US 36 to US 85	SH 66 PEL	SH 66: Corridor Improvements West	Widening, safety, and intersection improvements.	Hover Rd.	I-25	\$ 98.50	\$ 100.00	v

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Project ID	SB 228 Project ID	Region	TPR	Corridor	Study	Project Name	Project Description	Limits From	Limits To	\$ Funding Need	\$ Total	Project/ Related Phase in STIP
84		4	Upper Front Range, Greater Denver Area	SH 66: US 36 to US 85	SH 66 PEL	SH 66: Corridor Improvements East	Safety and intersection improvements.	I-25	US 85	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	v
85		2	Central Front Range	SH 67	N/A	SH 67: Divide to Victor Shoulder Widening and Safety improvements	Shoulder widening and safety improvements.	Divide	Victor	\$ 25.00	\$ 25.00	
86	29	4	Upper Front Range, Eastern, Southeast	SH 71	Eastern Colorado Mobility Study	SH 71 Super 2	Reconstruction of corridor to Super 2 configuration.	I-70	Nebraska State Line	\$ 99.21	\$ 100.00	
87		3	Intermountain	SH 82: Glenwood Springs to Aspen	N/A	SH 82: Safety Improvements	Mobility improvements in Glenwood Springs, completion of entrance to Aspen, expansion of transit, bicycle and pedestrian mobility, and improved wildlife mitigation.	MP 2.4	MP 40	\$100.00	\$100.00	v
88		4	Greater Denver Area, Eastern	SH 86: I-25 to I-70	N/A	SH 86: I-25 Castle Rock east to I-70	Surface treatment and intersection improvements.	I-25	I-70	\$35.00	\$35.00	
89		3	Gunnison Valley	SH 92: Delta to Hotchkiss	N/A	SH 92: Safety Improvements	Safety improvements including reconstruction of the surface, addition of 4-8' paved shoulders across Rogers Mesa, and other safety improvements including access and intersection improvements.	MP 3.8	MP 20.7	\$50.00	\$50.00	v
90		4	Greater Denver Area	SH 119	SH 119 PEL and BRT Study	SH 119: Managed Lanes	Construction of managed lanes.	MP 43	MP 58	\$ 75.00	\$ 75.00	
91		4	Greater Denver Area	SH 119	N/A	SH 119 / SH 52 Interchange	Construction of new interchange.	MP 49	MP50	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00	
92		3	Northwest	SH 139: Loma to Rangely	N/A	SH 139: Little Horse South	Safety improvements including reconstruction of the surface and addition of 4-8' paved shoulders,	MP 47	MP 53	\$10.00	\$10.00	v
93		5	Southwest	SH 140: New Mexico border to west of Durango at Hesperus	N/A	SH 140 NM State Line to Hesperus	Widen shoulders and rehab/reconstruct three bridges.	MP 1	MP 23	\$10.00	\$10.00	v
94		5	Gunnison Valley	SH 145	Region 5 Passing Lanes & Pullouts Study	SH 145: Safety and Mobility Improvements between Sawpit and Keystone Hill (Shoulder Widening and/or Passing Lanes)	Shoulder widening and/or addition of passing lane between Sawpit and Keystone Hill.	MP 72	MP 80	\$ 5.80	\$ 9.70	v
95		3	Grand Valley	SH 340: 20 Road to Spruce St (Grand Junction)	N/A	SH 340: Safety and Capacity improvements	Construction of a roundabout and other safety improvements.	MP 9.5	MP 13.341	\$20.00	\$20.00	v
96		4	Upper Front Range, North Front Range	SH 392: US 287 to SH 14	SH 392 Environmental Overview Study	SH 392: Corridor Improvements	Widening, safety, and intersection improvements.	I-25	Briggsdale	\$ 110.00	\$ 110.00	
97		4	North Front Range	SH 402	SH 402 EA and FONSI	SH 402: Widening, Intersection and Safety Improvements	Widening, safety, and intersection improvements.	US 287	I-25	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	
TOTAL										\$ 7,794.77	\$ 8,982.90	
Transit Projects												
T1		1	Greater Denver Area	I-25: El Paso County Line to C-470	Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	Castle Rock Park-n-Ride	CDOT contribution to construction of Park-n-Ride in Castle Rock.			\$ 1.00	\$ 2.00	
T2	T16	1, 4	Greater Denver Area	I-25 North	I-25 North EIS and Phased ROD; North I-25 Commuter Rail Update	North I-25 Commuter Rail Right of Way (ROW)	Purchase of ROW to facilitate development of commuter rail services in the North I-25 Corridor.			\$ 38.00	\$ 38.00	
T3	T16	1, 4	Greater Denver Area	I-25 North	Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	North Metro Rail Line - Park-n-Ride Connection with Interregional Services	Construction of Park-n-Ride that connects interregional services (Bustang) to North I-25 Commuter Rail Line.			\$ 10.00	\$ 168.00	
T4		1	Greater Denver Area	I-70 Mountain	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	Idaho Springs Park-n-Ride	CDOT contribution to construction of Park-n-Ride in Idaho Springs.			\$ 1.00	\$ 2.00	
T5	T12	2	Pueblo Area	I-25 through Pueblo	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	Pueblo Park-n-Ride	Construction of a new Park-n-Ride in Pueblo.			\$ 2.50	\$ 2.50	
T6		2	Pikes Peak Area	I-25 through Colorado Springs	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	Woodmen Rd. Park-n-Ride Relocation	Relocation of Woodman Rd. Park-n-Ride in Colorado Springs.			\$ 1.50	\$ 1.50	
T7		3	Intermountain	I-70: Parachute to Glenwood Springs	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	New Castle Park-n-Ride	Construction of New Castle Park-n-Ride to support RFTA regional services and Bustang interregional services.			\$ 0.80	\$ 0.80	
T8		3	Northwest	US 40: Empire to Kremmling	SW Transit Plan	Winter Park Train Platform	Construction of new passenger loading platform to support Winter Park express passenger train services.			\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	
T9		3	Intermountain	I-70: Glenwood Springs to Vail	Intermountain TPR Plan	Simba Run Underpass	Construction of underpass under I-70.			\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00	
T10		4	Greater Denver Area	I-25 North	Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	Carbon Valley (SH 52 / I-25) Park-n-Ride	CDOT contribution to construction of Park-n-Ride in the Carbon Valley.			\$ 1.00	\$ 2.00	

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Project ID	SB 228 Project ID	Region	TPR	Corridor	Study	Project Name	Project Description	Limits From	Limits To	\$ Funding Need	\$ Total	Project/ Related Phase in STIP
T11	T13	4	North Front Range	I-25 North	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	Harmony Rd. Park-n-Ride Expansion	Expansion of existitng Harmony Rd. Park-n-Ride at Harmony Rd. and I-25.			\$ 1.50	\$ 1.50	
T12		4	North Front Range	US 85: I-76 to SH 14; US 34: Loveland to Kersey	SW Transit Plan	Greeley Transit Facility Cost Escalation	Expansion of the existing Greeley-Evans Transit System facility to accommodate ICB services and local transit system.			\$ 1.20	\$ 1.20	
T13		4	North Front Range, Upper Front Range	US 85: I-76 to SH 14	SW Transit Plan	US 85 Park-n-Ride Cost Escalation	Completion of work on US 85 Park-n-Rides.			\$ 0.20	\$ 0.20	
T14	T14	4	North Front Range	SH 402	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	SH 402 Park-n-Ride Improvements	Rehab and expansion of existing Park-n-Ride at SH 402 and I-25.			\$ 2.00	\$ 2.00	
T15		5	Gunnison Valley	SH 145	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	SH 145 Park-n-Ride	Construction of a new Park-n-Ride on county owned property outside of Telluride near the intersection of SH 145 and Society Dr.			\$ 2.50	\$ 2.50	
T16		Statewide	Multiple	Multiple	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	(5) 50 Passenger Over the Road (OTR) Coaches	Purchase of five OTR 50 passenger coaches to support the expansion of Bustang and develop the CDOT Rural/Regional bus network.			\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	
T17		Statewide	Multiple	Multiple	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	(3) 50 Passenger Over the Road (OTR) Coaches	Purchase of three OTR 50 passenger coaches to support the expansion of current Bustang services.			\$ 1.80	\$ 1.80	
T18		Statewide	Multiple	Multiple	SW Transit Plan; Intercity and Regional Bus Plan	(20) 30 Passenger Over the Road (OTR) Coaches	Purchase of 20 OTR 30 passenger coaches to support the expansion of Bustang and develop the CDOT Rural/Regional bus network.			\$ 7.00	\$ 7.00	
TOTAL										\$ 79.00	\$ 240.00	
Bike/Ped Projects												
TBD												
Operations Projects												
O1		Statewide	Multiple	Multiple	N/A	Traffic Incident Management (TIM) Program	Expansion of TIM program throughout the state including staffing, vehicles, operations, maintenance, and vendor contracts.			TBD	TBD	
O2		Statewide	Multiple	Multiple	N/A	Traffic Management Operations Centers (TMOc)	Updates and modernizations to existing TMOcs, and potential new TMOcs in Regions 4 and 5.			TBD	TBD	
O3		Statewide	Multiple	Multiple	N/A	ITS Programmatic Improvements	Replacement and expansion of ITS including addiioanl ramp metering, expansion of communications networks, expanded app and software development to support public information, roadway weather management and information, and other new technologies.			TBD	TBD	
O4		Statewide	Multiple	Multiple	N/A	Corridor Operations Plan Development and Implementation	Development and implementation of Corridor Operations Plans. Improvements include maintenance turn around areas, chain up stations, and managed roadway technologies.			TBD	TBD	
O5		Statewide	Multiple	Multiple	N/A	Planning, Performance, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	TSMO planning and coordination, including expansion of TDM program, and support for corridor coalitions.			TBD	TBD	
O6		Statewide	Multiple	Multiple	N/A	RoadX Connected/Autonomous Vehicles Technology	Development of data platform to support connected/autonomous vehicles technology and RoadX corridor projects.			TBD	TBD	
TOTAL										TBD	TBD	

Project ID		Project Location						Project Overview					Project Funding			
Project ID	SB 228 Project ID	Region	TC District	TPR	County	Corridor	Route	Study	Project Name	Project Description	Limits From	Limits To	\$ Funding Need	\$ Total	FY 16-25 RPP	Project/ Related Phase in STIP
39	N/A	3	7	Gunnison Valley	Gunnison	US 50: Montrose to Gunnison	050A	US 50: Blue Creek Canyon CatEx and CSS	US 50: Little Blue Canyon	Reconstruction and widening of existing roadway template to meet current geometric design standards and improve roadside safety, drainage and access along the corridor. Addition of passing lanes and mitigation of geohazard landslide within the project limits. Can be implemented in phases.	MP 121.5	MP 126.5	\$ 35.00	\$ 42.50	v	v

Regional Transportation Plan					Needs and Other Attributes													
Included in 2040 Plan	Regional Priority Investment Corridor	Region Priority	2040 SWP Goal Areas	2040 SWP Strategies	Safety		Asset Life		Mobility			Economic Vitality						
					LOSS 3/4	<= 2' Shoulder	Low DL	Poor Structure	V/C >= 0.85	Top Delay	Low Vertical Clearance Bridge	Freight Corridor Designation	NHS Corridor Designation	Congressional Corridor Designation	Energy Corridor Designation	Activity Center Access	Federal Lands Access	
v	v	High TPR priority	Mobility, Economic Vitality, Maintaining The System	Capacity, Freight, System Preservation	v								v	v			v	v

Traffic Data				
AADT	Truck AADT	% Truck	VMT	V/C Ratio
2,600	312	12.00%	42,341	0.57



COLORADO
Department of Transportation
Division of Transportation Development
Multimodal Planning Branch
4201 E. Arkansas Ave. Shumate Bldg.
Denver, CO 80222-3400

DATE: January 11, 2016
TO: State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
FROM: Michelle Scheuerman, Statewide Planning Manager
Subject: Statewide Plan Development Lessons Learned Process and STAC Input

Background

At the December 2015 STAC meeting, staff provided STAC with highlights of two key planning efforts that will occur over the next several months. These include documenting lessons learned on the development of the 2040 Statewide Transportation Plan (SWP) and Regional Plans (RTPs), and an overall assessment of the planning process to identify potential areas of improvement and/or enhancement.

Purpose

Staff intends to develop a white paper on lessons learned which will include recommendations for future plan development. This paper will:

- Identify the specific lessons learned from the SWP and RTP development processes;
- Include an assessment of successes, limitations, and transferable knowledge;
- Document and analyze lessons learned and discuss how to apply them when developing future transportation plans and conducting planning discussions/activities especially in relationship to CDOT's approach to the planning process;
- Provide a quick reference guide of the top 5-10 major lessons learned with more detail provided in the document.

Next Steps

- At the January STAC meeting, staff will outline a draft approach for documenting lessons learned and seek input from STAC.
- Staff will prepare for STAC Workshops.



January 29, 2016

TO: Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
 FROM: Michelle Scheuerman, Statewide Planning Manager
 SUBJECT: ***Approval of the Non-Metropolitan Local Officials Consultation Guide and the Guide to the Transportation Planning and Programming Public Involvement Process Documents***

Purpose

This memorandum provides an overview of STAC and public comments received by staff.

Action

Staff is requesting that STAC approve these two public involvement documents.

Background

CDOT follows a process that is “continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive to the degree appropriate” (23 United States Code [USC] §135) and involves a wide range of stakeholders.

In accordance with, CFR §450.210(a) states “In carrying out the statewide transportation planning process, including development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP, the State shall develop and use a documented public involvement process that provides opportunities for public review and comment at key decision points”, the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) has developed the Guide to the Transportation Planning and Programming Public Involvement Process that describes the processes and techniques CDOT employs to comprehensively solicit information from stakeholders and the public.

In addition, in accordance with CFR §450.210(b) states “The State shall provide for non-metropolitan local official participation in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP. The State shall have a documented process(is) for consulting with non-metropolitan local officials representing units of general purpose local government and/or local officials with responsibility for transportation that is separate and discrete from the public involvement process and provides an opportunity for their participation in the development of the long-range statewide transportation plan and the STIP”, the CDOT has developed the Non-Metropolitan Local Officials Consultation Guide outlining the goals for conducting a comprehensive consultation process for non-metropolitan local officials.

STAC Comments on draft documents

The STAC was provided an opportunity to review these documents prior to their release for public review and comment. Staff received minor comments from the North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) on the Non-Metropolitan Local Officials Consultation Guide and those comments were addressed prior the document being released for public review and comment. No other comments were received from STAC.

Public Review and Comments on draft documents

The Non-Metro Local Officials Consultation Process was made available for public review and comment from November 23, 2015 through January 22, 2016, while the Guide to the Transportation Planning and Programming Public Involvement Process was available for public review and comment from November 23, 2015 through January 13, 2016. Both of document have different federally mandated review and comment periods, 60 and 45 days respectively. CDOT staff notified the public of the availability of these documents by way of the STAC, GovDelivery e-mail blasts, twitter and facebook posts and informational agenda items at TPR meetings. The comments received consisted of minor wordsmithing and grammatical changes, updates to the CDOT organizational chart, minor edits, changes and clarifications provided by North Front Range MPO staff and FHWA. All appropriate changes have been incorporated into both documents.

Key Benefits

Both of these public involvement documents help to further demonstrate CDOT's on-going commitment to ensuring anyone can participate in Colorado statewide and regional transportation planning and programming. The documents also expand upon the public involvement tools and techniques used during the development of the 2040 Statewide and Regional Transportation Plans.

Next Steps

Following STAC's recommendation, staff will forward final versions of both documents to the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration for informational purposes. Final versions of both documents will also be distributed to all CDOT regions, divisions, and offices and will be publicly available via the coloradotransportationmatters.com website.