

<b>COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> <b>POLICY DIRECTIVE</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>PROCEDURAL DIRECTIVE</b>
<b>Subject</b> <b>Implementation of Policy Directive 1601—Requests for Interchange Access and Modifications to Existing Interchanges on the State Highway System</b>		<b>Number</b> <b>1601.1</b>
<b>Effective</b> <b>09/08/05</b>	<b>Supersedes</b> <b>N/A09/08/05</b>	<b>Originating Office</b> <b>Division of Transportation Development</b>

**Please Note:** This is a draft version of Procedural Directive 1601.1., which is subject to further change as the procedural directive is vetted and finalized. **The new TDM language is highlighted in yellow.**

## I. PURPOSE

The ~~Colorado~~ Transportation Commission of Colorado (the Transportation Commission) has directed in Policy Directive 1601 that all requests for new interchanges and major improvements to existing interchanges be reviewed and evaluated in a fair and consistent manner; that sufficient information be available to make an informed decision; and that duplicative analytical, regulatory and procedural requirement be minimized. To that end, this ~~P~~rocedural ~~D~~irective provides guidance that encourages the integration of the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) environmental and access permitting and approval procedures into the 1601 interchange approval process. The integration of these procedures can reduce unnecessary duplication, while still complying with applicable requirements.

The Transportation Commission recognized that each request has unique circumstances, and directed that the ~~P~~rocedural ~~D~~irective ensure a level of analysis appropriate to the circumstances surrounding each proposal. Therefore, this ~~P~~rocedural ~~D~~irective provides increased latitude to the Chief Engineer to determine the appropriate level of analysis at each step in the process and describes different approval procedures for three (3) different categories of proposals as outlined within the definitions section of these procedures.

It is the intent of this ~~P~~rocedural ~~D~~irective that the analysis completed through this ~~procedural~~ ~~Procedural~~ ~~directive~~ ~~Directive~~ serve as the Interchange Management Plan required under the Colorado State Highway Access Code, 2 CCR 601-1, Colorado State Access Control Code and be an integral part of the applicable required NEPA and FHWA analyses.

Finally, in order to clarify expectations and reduce the likelihood of misunderstanding by both CDOT and the applicant, this ~~P~~rocedural ~~D~~irective requires the development of an initial ~~I~~ntergovernmental ~~A~~greement that identifies the procedural, timing, and cost expectations for any proposal.

## II. AUTHORITY

Executive Director, § 43-1-1056, C.R.S.

~~Transportation Commission~~Chief Engineer, § 43-1-110, C.R.S.

### III. DEFINITIONS

“Interchange” - a system of interconnecting roadways in conjunction with one or more grade separations that provides for the movement of traffic between two or more roadways at different grades and provides directional ramps for access movements between the roadways. Interchanges vary from single ramps connecting to local streets or transit facilities to complex and comprehensive layouts.

“Freeways” - Highways that meet the functional classification definition of freeway. Please reference the CDOT's website – Straight Line Diagram at:

<http://dtdapps.coloradodot.info/otis/SLd>  
<http://arcimsexternal.dot.state.co.us/SLD>

“Access Code” - State of Colorado State Highway Access Code, Colorado Code of Regulations 2 CCR 601-1, as adopted and ~~amended~~updated by the Transportation Commission.

“Cost Sharing Agreement” – An agreement, proposed by a non-CDOT applicant, to share costs of an interchange or interchange modification with CDOT.

“Environmental Stewardship Guide” – Transportation Commission adopted document that outlines CDOT’s environmental ethic as well as the policies and procedures used to carry out that ethic. The guide is available online at:

<https://www.codot.gov/programs/environmental/resources/guidance-standards/cdot-environmental-stewardship-guide-nov-2017>  
<http://www.dot.state.co.us/environmental/StandardsForms/ESGuide5-12-05PrePress.pdf>

“NEPA” – National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the national charter for protecting the environment.

“Regional Transportation Plan” – the fiscally constrained long-range regional transportation plan adopted by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) or Transportation Planning Regions (TPRs).

“Regionally Significant Publicly Owned Facility” – A major facility owned by a unit of government, such as a major athletic or cultural facility, that serves a majority of vehicle trips from throughout the larger region.

“Regionally Significant Roadway” - A roadway classified as a principal arterial or higher classification in the most recently adopted Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) ~~R~~regional ~~T~~ransportation ~~P~~lan, or, in non-MPO areas, if the roadway has been identified as regionally

significant within an adopted Regional Transportation Plan, NEPA/environmental study, feasibility study, corridor optimization plan, or access management plan on which CDOT staff has participated and the Chief Engineer finds acceptable.

“Transportation Demand Management” – Transportation Demand Management (TDM) helps the traveling public by offering access to multiple transportation modes through strategies like promoting increased transit, integrating with mobility hubs, ridesharing, walking, biking, and teleworking in order to reduce reliance on travel in a single-occupant vehicle.

“Type 1 Improvements” - Consists of two categories: (1) proposals for new interchanges on the state highway system with a functional classification of Interstate or Freeway; and (2) Any type of proposal on the state highway system not initiated by CDOT that anticipates CDOT cost-sharing participation. Type 1 improvements must be approved by the Transportation Commission.

“Type 2 Improvements” - Proposal for new interchange not on the Interstate system or Freeway system and all modifications or reconfigurations to existing interchanges. Type 2 improvements must be approved by the Chief Engineer, and may be elevated by the Chief Engineer to the Transportation Commission for consideration.

“Type 2a Improvements” – A minor interchange improvements that will have little or no impact to the state highway system or surrounding local transportation system, consistent with the definitions and guidance provided in the FHWA Colorado Division Guidance on Minor Interchange Modifications Requests (Appendix ED). Type 2a approvals are delegated by the Chief Engineer to the Regional Transportation Director.

### Appendices

Appendix A: Policy Directive 1601.0

Appendix B: ~~System Level Study Guidance/FHWA Interstate Interchange Modification Request guidance—2 CCR 601-1 “State Highway Access Code”, Rule 2.3(5) (Traffic Impact Studies)~~

Appendix C: ~~Access Control Code Traffic Impact Analysis Requirements FHWA Policy on Access to Interstate System (effective May 22, 2017)~~

Appendix D: ~~FHWA Colorado Division Control of Access to the Interstate and its Right-of-Way (effective February 2005)Minor Interchange Modification Request Guidance~~

Appendix E: ~~FHWA Colorado Division Guidance for Interstate Access Request~~

Appendix EF: ~~FHWA Colorado Division Guidance for the Preparation of a Minor Interchange Modification Request (effective February 2005)Sample Initial and Final Intergovernmental Agreements~~

Appendix ~~FG~~: FHWA Colorado Division Guidance for Temporary Construction Access on the Interstate (effective February 2005)~~Sample resolution for approval TC action for Type 1 Interchange Requests~~

Appendix ~~GH~~: Sample Initial and Final Intergovernmental Agreements  
~~Sample Transmittal Memo to Chief Engineer for Type 2 Interchange Requests~~

Appendix ~~HI~~: Sample Resolution for approval TC Action for Type 1 Interchange Requests  
~~Process Flow Chart~~

Appendix I: Sample Transmittal Memo to Chief Engineer for Type 2 Interchange Requests

Appendix J: Process Flow Chart

#### IV. PROCEDURES

**A. Principles:** In accordance with Policy Directive 1601.0, the procedures included in this procedural ~~D~~irective should be followed when considering a potential 1601 application.

1. Due to the long-term financial commitments and other legal limitations associated with the requirements of this policy directive, only governmental or quasi-governmental entities or agencies (which includes political subdivisions and quasi-governmental entities such as special districts, public highway authorities such as E-470 and NW Parkway, and regional transportation authorities)~~as special districts, E470, NW Parkway~~ may be an applicant under this process.
2. Applicants must notify the Regional Transportation Director for the applicable CDOT Region and the applicable Transportation Planning Region of their desire to initiate development of a new interchange or major improvements to an existing interchange. The applicable CDOT Regional Transportation Director will serve as the point of contact for all 1601-related issues.
3. The CDOT Chief Engineer has approval authority for all 1601 related Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs).
4. The CDOT Chief Engineer shall make an annual report to the Transportation Commission summarizing the number, type and location of all 1601 interchange applications initiated over the previous year, the cost to CDOT of processing the applications, the reimbursement received from the applicants, the distribution of the costs and responsibilities identified in IGAs~~Intergovernmental Agreements~~ finalized in the previous year, other pertinent information and any recommended changes in the policy or procedures.

#### **B. Interchange Requests Initiated By CDOT:**

1. Interchange requests initiated by CDOT are often identified and evaluated through the NEPA/project development process. The information and analysis developed during the initial stages of the NEPA effort should be used to supplement the System Level Study presented to the Transportation Commission (Type 1 requests) or Chief Engineer (Type 2 requests), as appropriate.

2. Type 1 interchange requests, and when the Region chooses to submit a separate Systems Level Study prior to submission of the NEPA document to the Chief Engineer for consideration, should consist of a technical memorandum clearly summarizing:

- a) the purpose and need for the project,
- b) the range of alternatives considered,
- c) the criteria used to evaluate the alternatives (consistent with Step 3 of this Procedural Directive),
- d) public comment received to date,
- e) the results of the screening,
- f) the preliminary financing plan, and
- g) recommended “reasonable” alternative(s) that meet the purpose and need for the project and should proceed to the next levels of evaluation in the NEPA process.

3. Type 2 system interchange requests initiated by CDOT may combine the Systems Level Study with the NEPA document prepared in compliance with the CDOT Environmental Stewardship Guide and submitted for approval by the Chief Engineer.

### **C. Interchange Requests Initiated by Governmental or Quasi-Governmental Entities or Agencies**

#### **STEP 1: 1601 Pre-Application Meeting(s)**

1. Applicants are required to have a pre-application project scoping meeting, or a series of pre-application meetings, with the appropriate CDOT Region representatives to determine the scope and anticipated process and schedule for any proposed interchange project. A process flowchart is attached as Appendix J. The following are the preferred sequence of steps for the 1601 interchange approval process. Any adjustments to this preferred sequence should be discussed at the pre-application meeting. CDOT staff from the following offices should participate in the pre-application meeting with the applicant: program and project engineer, traffic, planning, environmental, access, MPO/TPR staff and other parties as deemed appropriate by the Regional Transportation Director. FHWA shall be invited to participate when an access request affects the Interstate System or when there is the potential to use federal funds. This meeting may also serve as the initial scoping meeting required in the Environmental Stewardship Guide as well as the pre-application meeting to discuss compliance with the Access Code.

2. The purpose of the pre-application meeting(s) is to:

- a) Determine whether the proposed interchange is consistent with Transportation Commission Policy Directive 1601.0 regarding connections to the state highway system.
- b) Identify significant issues: Evaluate the general feasibility of a proposed project, including early identification of any anticipated operational, environmental, air quality conformity, access management, public concern and other technical and/or controversial issues. CDOT staff will determine if any recently adopted and/or approved corridor optimization plans, access control plans or other related studies which CDOT staff deems relevant to the potential application can contribute to the analysis required for the application. The applicant should be aware that FHWA has issued guidance on temporary interstate access during construction (see Appendix F).
- c) Plan consistency: Review the proposed project for consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan and the applicable corridor vision, goals and strategies in the Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan.
- d) Identify the improvement type: Type 1, 2, 2a and the appropriate scope of study required for the Systems Level Study will be determined at the pre-application meeting. The appropriate level of detail and effort will be determined at the pre-application meeting depending on the type and complexity of the interchange proposal. For new interchanges and major interchange modifications, CDOT will expect the applicant to analyze the proposed improvement using the FHWA Interstate Interchange Modification Request Guidance Policy on Access to the Interstate System (Appendix CB).
- e) Initial determination of NEPA category: CDOT staff will provide an initial assessment of whether the proposal should be classified as a Categorical Exclusion, Environmental Assessment, or Environmental Impact Statement as well as any other permits that may be required. This initial assessment is subject to revision and modification if additional environmental issues arise.
- f) Identify access permitting requirements: CDOT staff will outline access permitting procedures and circumstances when modifications to existing access permits are necessary. Special emphasis will be placed on ensuring the project applicant understands any State Highway Access Code requirements and an Interchange Management Plan is required for any proposed new interchanges – Type 1 or Type 2. Interchange Management Plans require approval from the Chief Engineer.
- g) Discuss the cost of application processing: The applicant is responsible for all costs associated with the preparation and processing of the application. An initial estimate of CDOT costs associated with application review and processing should be prepared by the Region and provided to the applicant following this step in the process.
- h) Discuss FHWA consultation and involvement: The FHWA representative shall be consulted to determine if the proposal requires federal involvement and if so, the



necessary level of detail and the most appropriate time to submit a formal request for a determination of engineering and operations acceptability. Additionally, regarding access control to the Interstate and its right-of-way, CDOT staff will determine FHWA involvement consistent with Appendix D.

i) The applicant will implement traffic reduction or Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to preserve the long-term functionality of the constructed interchange improvement. TDM requirements apply to new Type 1 and Type 2 interchange proposals. The proposed TDM improvements will be included for analysis in the ~~Systems~~ Level Study. At the discretion of the Chief Engineer, TDM strategies would apply to all Type 2 interchange modifications on interstate facilities where the current LOS is F, for the current year, during peak hours for the mainline in at least one direction of travel as identified in the System Level Study. Additionally, TDM strategies would be required for Type 2 interchange modifications, if the LOS is predicted to be at level 'F' at the 20-year design year timeframe under a no-build scenario.

As a goal, the recommended TDM strategies should result in a 3% or greater average daily traffic (ADT) reduction for the preferred alternative in Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Boundary Areas and a 1% or greater ADT reduction for the preferred alternative outside the MPO Boundary Areas. The reduction threshold goal shall be calculated from the opening day of the new facility, or 5-years from opening day, if the TDM strategies are implemented on a phased schedule for traffic conditions with the assumption that the interchange improvements have been built. The trip reduction goal applies to the traffic volumes for the interchange ramps (all movements) as identified in the ~~systems level study~~ System Level Study. The 3% ADT reduction threshold would apply for Type 2 interchange modifications.

The trip reduction goal applies to the new interchange ramps for opening day (or 5 years if TDM strategies are implemented on a phased approach) as identified in the ~~systems level study~~ System Level Study. The applicant shall demonstrate how the project will achieve this goal by implementing a strategy or set of strategies identified in the TDM scorecard corresponding to the scoring range for the interchange type and location. If TDM strategies are implemented incrementally, the reduction goal should be set at an interim point (5-years after opening day) and a design year of 20-years.

CDOT staff and the applicant will agree upon whether the proposed interchange is located inside or outside of an MPO Boundary Area. Additionally, consideration will be given in instances where the proposed interchange is located in a rural area that is adjacent to an MPO Boundary Area. For proposed interchanges outside of the MPO Boundary Area, but are within a census designated Urbanized Area (UZA) areas, the Chief Engineer will consider if the MPO Boundary area scoring range would apply.

The applicant may appeal to the Chief Engineer for a waiver or reduction of the required TDM strategies. That determination may be made based on the following factors:

- (i) The project interchange is being installed for access to a freight transfer or intermodal facility and TDM strategies would have minimal effectiveness on ADT at the proposed interchange location.
- (ii) The project interchange is being installed in an area that already has functioning TDM strategies, capable of sufficiently reducing future traffic demand at the interchange location.
- (iii) The project interchange is being installed in a rural area to improve safety and resiliency of the overall system, and by its rural nature, is not conducive to TDM strategies at the interchange. In such cases, exemptions or corridor-based TDM strategies may be considered as identified in the rural area consideration section.

CDOT staff and the applicant will use the TDM scorecard to identify a range of appropriate TDM strategies to implement and help to achieve the desired traffic reduction goal. The TDM scorecard is consistent with the [Statewide Transportation Demand Management Plan \(2019\)](#) and can be used to arrive at the following scoring goals based on the following types of interchange improvements:

<i>Interchange Improvement Type</i>	<i>MPO Boundary Area / Rural Area</i>	<i>Scoring Range (Total Points)</i>
Type 1 (New Interchange / Interstate System)	MPO Boundary Area	100-80
Type 1 (New Interchange / Interstate System)	Rural Area	80-60
Type 2 (New Interchange / State Highway System)	MPO Boundary Area	80-50
Type 2 (New Interchange / State Highway System)	Rural Area	60-40
Type 2 Modification (Interstate System)	MPO Boundary Area	70-50



**Rural Area Consideration**

CDOT recognizes that TDM strategies can be challenging to implement in parts of the state with low population density and that are rural in nature. To that end, when an applicant is seeking a waiver or reduction of the TDM requirements, staff will consider a rural area waiver or reduction in certain areas of the state, that are rural low density areas that fall both within and outside of MPO boundary areas. Therefore, if the proposed interchange is located in a census defined rural area, and none of the interchange specific strategies identified in this procedural directive are deemed effective, CDOT will consider the following TDM approach:

- (i) If an existing Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL), NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act 42 U.S.C. Section 4321) Study or other type of transportation planning study that has been adopted that includes the proposed interchange location, and that study also includes TDM strategies within the same corridor, the applicant could implement those strategies and receive the corresponding TDM scoring point value.
- (ii) TDM strategies identified in the PEL or planning study should be within the same MPO boundary area, if applicable, and within the project study area as identified in the System Level Study. TDM strategies must be identified in a planning study that has been approved within the last 5 years from the pre-application meeting.

**STEP 2: Initial Inter-Governmental Agreement Approval (IGA)**

3. The Regional Transportation Director must approve the progression of any application to Step 2.

**STEP 2: Initial Inter-Governmental Agreement Approval (IGA)**

~~a1)-~~ The applicant is responsible for all costs associated with the development, administration, and evaluation of proposals for new interchanges or modifications to existing interchanges.

~~b2)-~~ An initial ~~Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)~~ must be developed for Type 1 and 2 improvements, and may be developed for a Type 2a improvement at the discretion of the Regional Transportation Director. If an IGA is developed, then the IGA must be between the applicant and CDOT addressing responsibility for:

- ~~(i.a)~~ Anticipated improvement type – Type 1, 2, 2a.
- ~~(ii.b)~~ Anticipated administrative and application costs,
- ~~(iii.e)~~ Anticipated analytical procedures, identification of existing applicable studies
- ~~(iv.d)~~ Anticipated level of design detail
- ~~(v.e)~~ Anticipated schedule
- ~~(vi.f)~~ NEPA category
- ~~(vii.g)~~ Consistency with Regional and Statewide Plan(s)

- (viii.h) Access Permitting Requirements  
 (ixei) Other necessary issues identified in the pre-application scoping meeting in Step 1.

~~Initial IGA's for Type 2a proposals may be developed at the discretion of the CDOT Regional Transportation Director.~~

### STEP 3: Systems Level Study (SLS) Preparation and Interchange Management Plan

~~43.~~ A sample IGA is included in Appendix ~~GF~~.

### STEP 3: Systems Level Study (SLS) Preparation and Interchange Management Plan

~~a)1.~~ A Systems Level Study and Interchange Management Plans are required for both Type 1 and Type 2 proposals.

~~b)2.~~ Type 2a proposals do not require a Systems Level Study but should have sufficient data to substantiate the determination of “no potential for significant impact”. Type 2a projects are evaluated in accordance with the FHWA Minor Interchange Modification Request Criteria (Appendix ~~ED~~) and any other procedures necessary to address specific characteristics of the proposal as determined by the Chief Engineer and Regional Transportation Director.

~~c)3.~~ The purpose of the Systems Level Study is to identify the short and long-term environmental, community, safety and operational impacts of the proposed interchange, or interchange modification, on the ~~s~~State ~~h~~Highway system and surrounding transportation system to the degree necessary for the Transportation Commission, Chief Engineer, and/or the ~~FHWA~~Federal Highway Administration as appropriate, to make an informed decision whether a proposed new interchange or interchange modification is in the public interest.

~~d)4.~~ The design years for the Systems Level Study shall be the anticipated opening year of the proposed interchange and the year of the applicable long range transportation plan.

~~5.~~ The Systems Level Study should include substantive information necessary to identify the general location of the proposed improvement and a reasonable range of improvement alternatives necessary for the Chief Engineer and Transportation Commission to make an informed decision on whether to proceed with consideration of the proposed improvement. The data and analysis used to support the Systems Level Study should be used as appropriate in subsequent analysis and evaluation procedures, such as NEPA, access permitting and FHWA Interchange Acceptability Review requirements.

~~6.~~ The Chief Engineer and/or the Transportation Commission will inform the applicant if the Systems Level Study contains sufficient data and analysis to make an informed decision.

7. See Appendix B for more detailed guidance on the Systems Level Study.

8. The Systems Level Study must address the following requirements:

~~A.a) FHWA Interchange Access Modification Request and Acceptability/Transportation System Analysis: FHWA has established eight policy points which the interchange application must address for interstate related proposals in the FHWA Interstate Interchange Modification Request guidance. These policy points should also be used to guide evaluation of proposals not on the interstate system. The necessary detail and extent of analysis will depend on the location and/or complexity of the interchange application and be determined during the initial scoping meeting(s).~~

~~Recently completed applicable environmental studies, corridor optimization studies and/or access control plans, or other related technical analyses may be used to fulfill the System Level Study requirements in whole or part at the discretion of the Chief Engineer.~~

~~As of May 2017, FHWA has updated the Policy on Access to the Interstate System (see Appendix C). The policy focuses on the technical feasibility of any proposal change in access in support of FHWA's determination of safety, operational, and engineering acceptability. CDOT is allowed to submit one technical report describing the types and results of technical analyses conducted to show that the change in access will not have significant negative impact on the safety and operations of the Interstate System. FHWA will rely on the information developed for NEPA reviews to account for the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the change in access. FHWA will consider and analyze information regarding the technical feasibility of the change in access as a separate review. FHWA's determination of acceptability, along with the supporting information, will be included as an appendix to the NEPA documentation.~~

~~B. FHWA Acceptability: FHWA should be involved in all system level studies that have the potential to affect the interstate system or have the potential of using federal funding or requiring other federal action. Prior to completion of the System Level Study and identification of a range of alternatives for proposals on or affecting the interstate system, CDOT staff should meet with the FHWA Colorado Division Operations Engineer to discuss if any of the alternatives have flaws that would prevent a determination of engineering and operational acceptability. Continuous coordination with FHWA is critical to ensure that any significant FHWA concerns with a proposal are known at the time of consideration of the Systems Level Study by the Chief Engineer and/or Transportation Commission.~~

~~During the Systems Level Study FHWA should be consulted to determine if the proposal requires federal involvement and if so, the necessary level of detail and the most appropriate time to submit a formal request for a determination of engineering and operations acceptability. The request typically occurs after the preferred~~

~~alternative is identified in the NEPA process. The FHWA Colorado Division Guidance for the Preparation of a FHWA Interstate Access Request is included in Appendix B.~~

b)C. Environmental Analysis Documentation:

(i) Unless otherwise determined by CDOT staff during the pre-application phase, the applicant should include in the Systems Level Study a screening level evaluation of all reasonably appropriate alternatives for the location of the proposed interchange.

(ii) The System Level Study should include the draft purpose and need for the proposed interchange/modification and summarize, at a screening level, any potentially significant environmental implications for the range of possible alternatives evaluated in the ~~systems level analysis~~ System Level Study.

(iii) Public involvement and agency coordination activities related to the proposal that have occurred prior to initiation of this process should be summarized and documented in the System Level Study report. This public involvement and systems level environmental analysis and documentation should be incorporated into and support the subsequent appropriate NEPA document.

c)D. Access Code Analysis: In addition to the analyses necessary to support items A - C above, analysis necessary to comply with the traffic impact study required under the Access Code should be incorporated into the ~~systems level analysis~~ System Level Study. If this is done, the ~~systems level analysis~~ System Level Study may be used as the traffic impact analysis study required under the Access Code (Appendix ~~BC~~ includes the requirements for a Traffic Impact Study required under the Access Code).

d)E. Preliminary Financial Plan: The Systems Level Study must include a preliminary financial plan that identifies all sources of funding necessary to construct the proposed improvement, as well as the costs, and responsibility, for design, right of way acquisition, construction, mitigation, operations, maintenance, and replacement of all components of the proposed interchange, as well as the proposed ownership of all components associated with the proposal. The financial plan should discuss the effect of proposed funding on the fiscally constrained ~~R~~regional ~~T~~transportation ~~P~~plan.

9. Interchange Management Plan: The Interchange Management Plan should consider local agency public improvement plans, capital improvement plans, and metro districts and should consider implementation timeframe or illustration of phasing. The Interchange Management Plan should illustrate the support for local roadway network.

## 10. TDM Requirement

a) CDOT recognizes that local conditions combined with complex TDM strategies may make it difficult for a traffic model to accurately estimate trip reductions

due to implementation of TDM. To that end, CDOT has developed the following TDM scorecard that identifies numerous strategies. Strategies with higher point levels provide a higher probability of an applicant reaching the stated goal for the proposed interchange improvement. The point values are intended to serve as a guide and the applicant must still demonstrate how the proposed strategies will achieve the stated reduction goal. The selection of these strategies serves as a good-faith effort by the applicant to achieve the stated traffic reduction goal for the proposed interchange improvement.

**TDM Strategy Scorecard:**

TDM Strategies	Points	Time Commitment of Strategy
<p><b>Mobility Hubs</b> – the mobility hub will include two or more transit services/multimodal options available) The applicant will be responsible for the construction of the mobility hub site and funding for two or more multimodal services or multimodal options for 5 years.</p> <p>The applicant should not have an expectation of Bustang (or CDOT sponsored regional transit service) or CDOT funding for any proposed mobility hub projects.</p> <p>Mobility hubs should be consistent with the most recent Statewide Transportation Plan and Statewide Transit Plan and the CDOT Mobility Hub Guidebook.</p>	80	Maintenance of the facility in perpetuity
<p><b>Shuttles, Feeders, and Paratransit</b> - a public or privately operated shuttle service that serves the new development located at the new interchange.</p>	80	5 Years
<p><b>Vanpool Programs*</b>- A vanpool program that provides service to the development located at new interchange.</p>	80	5 Years

<p><b>Mixed-Use/Development</b> - the new interchange is constructed within a high-quality pedestrian-friendly environment with transit-oriented development features and is identified and approved in a local comprehensive plan.</p>	80	Maintenance in perpetuity
<p><b>Intercity Transit</b> – transit improvements include a new applicant sponsored service that serves the development at the new interchange. The new transit service could be implemented on adjacent or parallel facilities if that approach is determined appropriate by CDOT staff and the applicant.</p>	80	5 Years
<p><b>Comprehensive ITS Solution</b> – Examples include congestion-reducing adaptive signal optimization, connected vehicles, transit signal priority, count stations, and CCTV cameras to monitor the traffic and safety of all modes.</p>	80	Maintenance in perpetuity
<p><b>Parking Management</b> - located at the new interchange at business parks, commercial retail locations, or residential communities; the applicant will consider free parking for vanpools and carpools and paid parking for employees.</p>	60	10 Years
<p><b>Bus Only Lanes, Transit Queue Jumps, Bus Slip Ramps</b> - facilities can be either on-system or off-system and can be built on adjacent or parallel facilities if CDOT staff and the applicant determine that is the preferred approach for improved connectivity.</p>	60	Maintenance in perpetuity



<p><b>Local Transit</b> – the expansion of local transit must serve any new development that will be located at the new interchange location.</p>	60	5 Years
<p><b>Park-and-Ride Lots</b> – applicant would include a park-and-ride as a part of the interchange proposal.</p>	50	Maintenance in perpetuity
<p><b>Creation of a Transportation Management Organizations (TMO) or Transportation Management Associations (TMA)</b> or financial participation in an existing TMO or TMA that would implement the TDM strategies.</p>	50	3-5 Years
<p><b>Event-Related TDM Program*</b> examples include Winter or Summer Bike to Work Day, Alternative Mode Challenge Programs and Incentives, and include three or more events held per year.</p>	50	5 Years
<p><b>School Pool Program</b> – the applicant can implement this program for either K-12 or Higher Education locations or both.</p>	50	3 Years
<p><b>CV &amp; AV (Connected Vehicle and Autonomous Vehicle) Readiness Projects</b> – examples include implementing a fiber network, Real-time driver information, etc.</p>	50	Maintenance in perpetuity

**Implementation of Policy Directive 1601—Requests for Interchange Access and Modifications to Existing Interchanges on the State Highway System**

1601.1

<p><b>Telecommuting (Remote work) Program</b> – a telecommuting program offered to employees located at the businesses at the new interchange location. The telecommuting program could be managed by a TMO/TMA or Metropolitan Planning Organization.</p>	40	5 Years
<p><b>Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities</b> – the interchange proposal would including infrastructure such as bike lanes, bike trails, multi-use trails, sidewalks, or a pedestrian overpass. Bike and pedestrian improvements can be built, at the new interchange location or on adjacent or parallel facilities, if CDOT staff and the applicant determine that is the preferred approach for connectivity or safety reasons.</p>	40	Maintenance in perpetuity
<p><b>Regional Ridesharing Programs</b> - including carpool matching and vanpool programs that could be provided by a Metropolitan Planning Organization or TMA/TMO.</p>	40	5 Years
<p><b>Car-Sharing</b> – a partnership with a carsharing service provider that would serve the development at the new interchange and include designated car-share parking spaces.</p>	40	5 Years
<p><b>Micro-Mobility Sharing Programs</b> - including bike-sharing, scooter-sharing, and E-bikes that would be located at the businesses at the new interchange location.</p>	40	3 Years
<p><b>Conventional Transit Service Upgrades</b> - this may include operational improvements such as bus signal queue jumps, or infrastructure improvements such as covered bus shelters.</p>	40	Maintenance in perpetuity
<p><b>Modal Subsidies and Vouchers</b> - examples include RTD Eco-passes or vanpool program subsidies.</p>	40	5 Years

<b>Transportation Management Organization's Participation</b> – applicant becomes a financial participant or member of an already established TMA/TMO.	30	3 Years
<b>Bicycling to Work</b> - implementation of a Bike to Work Day event or program	20	5 Years
<b>Variable Work Hours</b> – implementation of variable work hours program for employees located at the businesses at the new interchange	20	5 Years
<b>Guaranteed Ride Home*</b> - implementation of the Guaranteed Ride Home Program for employees who commute by alternative modes.	20	5 Years
<b>Bike and Pedestrian Supporting Infrastructure</b> - infrastructure like bike repair station or E-Bike chargers, bike parking, bike lockers, and/or bike shelter*	10	Maintenance in perpetuity
<b>Applicant funds staff position to implement TDM program</b>	10	3 Years
<b>Education and promotions of the recommended TDM strategies and programs*</b>	10	3 Years

\* Complimentary or supportive strategies that should be combined with existing TDM programs or other proposed TDM strategies that have a higher point value.

**b)** The applicant will pair one or more of the TDM strategies to meet the desired scoring range of the respective interchange improvement type. Applicant and CDOT staff are encouraged to use the TDM strategy list to determine appropriate TDM strategies. If the applicant proposes an additional TDM strategy, which is not listed on the scorecard, the applicant will analyze the strategy for its potential to reduce ADT and improve LOS and provide this assessment to CDOT. CDOT will then decide and assign a point value to the proposed TDM strategy.

### **c) Project Specific TDM Plan**

Upon review of the proposed TDM scoring goal and strategy scorecard, the applicant will develop a project-specific TDM plan, as a part of the System Level Study, which will demonstrate how the selected TDM strategy/strategies will achieve the appropriate target goal. The applicant is expected to put forth a good-faith effort in developing a project-specific TDM plan that includes the following elements:

- **(i)** Explanation of the proposed TDM strategy or strategies. If the applicant selects more than one strategy, the applicant will include a discussion on how those strategies function together and provide co-benefits.
- **(ii)** Inclusion of the TDM strategy in the interchange design if applicable.
- **(iii)** Explanation of how proposed TDM strategies will function within the context of the proposed new interchange improvement.
- **(iv)** TDM strategy implementation schedule.
- **(v)** Explanation of how the proposed TDM strategies will function to complement existing TDM programs and infrastructure to ensure that the proposed TDM improvements do not detract or serve as a replacement from existing TDM strategies. The applicant will include a discussion on how the proposed strategies will coordinate with existing TDM efforts.
- **(vi)** Analysis of how the proposed TDM strategies will achieve the stated goal. This analysis can be performed through traffic modeling or a reasonable estimate developed by a traffic engineer.
- **(vii)** An estimated cost for the proposed TDM strategies and a discussion of the funding sources and the amounts committed from each of the respective sources.
- **(viii)** Description of any marketing or promotion strategies for the proposed TDM improvements
- **(ix)** If appropriate, the applicant could consider interim TDM strategies that are implemented to improve mobility during construction.
- **(x)** Identification of responsible parties and partner organizations for TDM implementation and include any agreements in the final IGA.
- **(xi)** The applicant should propose a TDM evaluation framework to identify strategy effectiveness and report TDM performance to CDOT for a minimum of one-year after the opening of the new interchange facility.

The agreed-upon TDM strategies will be included in the final IGA identified in Step 7 of this process.

#### **STEP 4: Approval of Systems Level Study**

**11.** Approval of the Systems Level Study does not pre-determine a preferred alternative or screen out other alternatives before the supporting analyses are presented for comment to the public through the appropriate NEPA process (The NEPA public involvement/scoping process should be initiated prior to consideration of the Systems Level Study by the Transportation Commission or Chief Engineer).

##### a)2. Types of Proposals

Type 1 Proposals: The Transportation Commission will take action following consideration of the Systems Level Study report for Type 1 proposals. If the preferred alternative identified in the environmental document is materially different from that identified in the Type I Systems Level Study approved by the Transportation Commission, the Chief Engineer must consult with the Transportation Commission prior to signing the applicable environmental document. A sample resolution for approval by the Transportation Commission is attached as Appendix H.

Type 2 Proposals: The Chief Engineer will take action following consideration of the Systems Level Study report for Type 2 proposals. A transmittal memo to the Chief Engineer is attached as Appendix I. The Chief Engineer may elevate any Type 2 proposal to the Transportation Commission for consideration.

Type 2a Proposals: The Chief Engineer may delegate Type 2a proposals to the Regional Transportation Director. No System Level Study is required for a Type 2a proposal.

b)3. Chief Engineer Appeals: An applicant may appeal the Chief Engineers decision to the Transportation Commission only if the applicant alleges the decision is inconsistent with Transportation Commission policy.

c)4. Approval Conditions: Approvals of the Systems Level Study by the Transportation Commission or the Chief Engineer are conditioned on:

(ia)4. The proposed interchange being included in the fiscally constrained portion of the applicable Regional Transportation Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, State Transportation Plan and State Transportation Improvement Program. Approval of a 1601 application by the Transportation Commission or the Chief Engineer does not ensure incorporation of the proposed interchange in the fiscally constrained Regional Transportation Plan by the corresponding MPO/TPR.;

~~(iib)2.~~ Approval of the applicable FHWA interchange access, design and environmental decision documents by the Chief Engineer and/or FHWA as described in Step 6; and

~~(iiie)3.~~ Approval of the Final Maintenance and Operations IGA by the Chief Engineer consistent with the financial plan included in the ~~Systems~~ Level Study report as described in Step 7.

~~d)5.~~ **Demonstration of Progress:** The ~~S~~systems ~~L~~level ~~S~~study approval lapses if the applicant has not shown significant progress towards implementation within three ~~(3)~~ years of the ~~S~~system ~~L~~level ~~S~~study approval. The applicant may submit a written request to the Chief Engineer for a one-year time extension. No more than two ~~(2)~~ one-year extensions may be granted by the Chief Engineer.

### **STEP 5: MPO/TPR Board Approval**

~~12.~~ The applicant shall provide a copy of the ~~S~~systems ~~L~~level ~~S~~study to the affected MPO/TPR upon completion, for consideration during the regional plan amendment process.

~~132.~~ The proposed interchange must be consistent with the applicable fiscally constrained Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in air quality non-attainment areas before the environmental decision document can be signed by FHWA or the Chief Engineer.

~~143.~~ **If the project is not already identified in the current Regional Transportation Plan RTP,** ~~t~~The applicant should allow for the ~~necessary~~ time ~~necessary~~ for the MPO/TPR to consider regionally significant interchange modifications to the system ~~if the project is not already identified in the current RTP~~. The applicant should work with CDOT staff and the applicable MPO/TPR to ensure the plan amendment process is followed and to minimize delays. The plan amendment process may be initiated prior to the approval of the application by the Transportation Commission or the Chief Engineer; however, the final MPO/TPR Board action should not occur until the proposal has been acted on by the Transportation Commission or Chief Engineer.

~~15.4.~~ On occasion a Regional Planning Council/MPO may have included an interchange in the fiscally constrained ~~R~~regional ~~T~~ransportation ~~P~~lan prior to 1601 consideration by the Transportation Commission or Chief Engineer. In such cases, CDOT should request that the Regional Planning Council explicitly note in the regional plan:

- ~~a) 1.~~ that the interchange must be funded with local dollars; and
- ~~b) 2.~~ that inclusion of the interchange in the plan does indicate support or approval of the interchange by the Transportation Commission or CDOT; and
- ~~c) 3.~~ that the proposed interchange is subject to the requirements of Policy Directive 1601, and



~~d) 4.~~ May not be implemented unless approved in accordance with Policy Directive 1601.

### **STEP 6: Design and NEPA Approval Process**

16. Conceptual design and environmental documents must be approved by the Chief Engineer and FHWA as appropriate with the exception of Type 2a improvements that have been delegated by the Chief Engineer to the Region ~~al~~ Transportation Director.

172. The final environmental document must comply with all applicable NEPA requirements and be consistent with the policies and procedures outlined in CDOT's Environmental Stewardship Guide.

183. Design must be consistent with applicable state standards and specifications and completed to the detail necessary for the Chief Engineer to ensure the safe and functional operation of the interchange through the design year and to ensure that construction, mitigation, operations, maintenance, and ownership agreements are clearly analyzed and documented at a level necessary to support the Design and Operations IGA specified in Step 7.

~~19.4.~~ ~~The Chief Engineer may not give F~~final approval ~~of~~ ~~to~~ any application ~~will not be given~~ unless ~~and until~~ the following findings can be made:

a) Regional/Statewide Transportation Plan: The proposed project is consistent with the fiscally constrained Regional and Statewide Transportation Plan.

b) Environmental Analysis: The NEPA process has been completed and an appropriate decision document has been approved by the CDOT Chief Engineer (non-federal action) or FHWA (federal action), as appropriate. If the preferred alternative identified in the environmental document is materially different from the Type I ~~systems level study~~ System Level Study approved by the ~~Transportation~~ Commission, the Chief Engineer must consult with the ~~Transportation~~ Commission prior to signing the applicable environmental document.

c) FHWA Interchange Access Approval: FHWA has granted final approval of the access for interstate-related proposals. This may require additional FHWA review after completion of the NEPA decision document.

d) Access Code: The design report addresses any Access Code related requirements not already addressed in the design, NEPA or ~~S~~systems ~~L~~level ~~S~~studies.

### **STEP 7: Final IGA**

~~204.~~ Upon completion and approval of the final IGA, CDOT will issue a CDOT state highway access permit and a notice to proceed given by the Region Transportation Director or delegee. The IGA must define a funding plan which identifies all sources of funding

necessary to construct the proposed improvement, the costs and responsibility for design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, mitigation, operations, maintenance, and replacement of all components of the proposed interchange, as well as the proposed ownership of all components associated with the proposal. This funding plan must clearly identify the costs associated with each of the elements identified in item 2 below, which are the responsibility of the applicant unless otherwise agreed to by the Transportation Commission as documented in the IGA.

- ~~a)2.~~ The applicant is responsible for all costs associated with construction, operation, maintenance and replacement of a new interchange on the state highway system at a level sufficient to safely and efficiently handle design year traffic levels.
- ~~3.b)~~ In instances where a ~~C~~cost-~~S~~sharing ~~A~~greement in a proposed IGA is materially different from the preliminary financial plan approved by the Transportation Commission as part of the ~~S~~ystems-~~S~~ystem Level Study report, the financial plan must be resubmitted to the Transportation Commission for approval before proceeding to the next step.
- ~~4.c)~~ Any funding plan that anticipates federal or state highway funds that are not included in, or are inconsistent with, the adopted State and Regional Transportation Plans, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and/or Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and the current annual construction budget cannot proceed until the applicable Transportation Plan, TIP and STIP is amended by the MPO and the Transportation Commission, as appropriate, to reflect the changed use of state or federal funds.

~~215.~~ The applicant must complete a final ~~IGA~~Inter-Governmental Agreement, consistent with ~~the P~~olicy ~~D~~irective 1601.0, which addresses the following:

- ~~a)a-~~ Designation of ownership of all physical features and related facilities including but not limited to the following:
  - ~~(i)~~ The interchange structure including associated signing, lighting, culverts, etc.
  - ~~(ii)~~ Right-of-way (ROW) and access management associated with the interchange
  - ~~(iii)~~ Ramps associated with the interchange
  - ~~(iv)~~ Other related facilities such as signals, traffic control devices, bike paths, pedestrian facilities, park-n-ride facilities, environmental mitigation, etc.
- ~~b) b-~~ The costs associated with the development and construction of the interchange to standards prescribed by the Chief Engineer, including but not limited to the following categories:
  - ~~(i)~~ Completion of all environmental studies and permits
  - ~~(ii)~~ Costs for any environmental mitigation (including long-term monitoring) identified in the environmental document and applicable permits
  - ~~(iii)~~ Access Permit fees

- (iv) Preliminary design
- (v) Purchase of any required ROW
- (vi) Utility relocation costs
- (vii) Final design
- (viii) Actual construction costs
- (ix) Costs for construction management
- (x) Costs for minimum landscaping
- (xi) Costs for landscaping above minimum standards, consistent with mitigation measures identified in the environmental document.
- (xii) Costs for minimum lighting
- (xiii) Costs for lighting above minimum standards
- (xiv) Traffic control signals and signs
- (xv) Additional improvements to the corridor/Future capacity improvements
- (xvi) Transit Related improvements
- (xvii) Upgrades or redesigns of the structure in the future
- (xviii) CDOT staff costs for design reviews, construction inspection and oversight

c) ~~e~~—The costs for maintenance activities which are to be conducted as prescribed by generally accepted CDOT practices, including but not limited to the following categories:

<b>Maintenance</b>	<b>Rehabilitation</b>	<b>Replacement</b>
Surface condition on ramps/structures	Resurfacing ramps/structures	Roadway reconstruction on ramps/structures
General maintenance of the structure	Rehabilitation of the structure/painting	Replacement of the structure
Landscaping	Landscaping	Landscaping
Lighting	Lighting	Lighting
Traffic signals/ITS devices	Traffic signals/ITS devices	Traffic signals/ ITS devices
Signs	Signs	Signs
Structure inspection costs		
Utilities	Utilities	Utilities
Drainage	Drainage Rehab.	Drainage Reconstruction
Frontage and service roads	Frontage and service roads	Frontage and service roads
Safety features such as guardrail, etc.	Safety features such as guardrail, etc	Safety features such as guardrail, etc.
Pavement markings	Pavement markings	Pavement markings
Snow and ice control		
Overall general maintenance such as sweeping, painting, trash pick-up, etc.		
Bike paths, pedestrian, park-n-Ride, etc. facilities	Bike paths, pedestrian, park-n-Ride, etc. facilities	Bike paths, pedestrian, park-n-Ride, etc. facilities
Operation of traffic control equipment		Replacement of traffic control equipment
Other transportation demand management activities		

d) In instances where an interim intersection or phased interchange construction is planned prior to the construction of the complete interchange, the final IGA shall include a phasing plan, indicating milestones, and define performance, financial or other triggers that will mandate construction of the various phases planned.

e) The final IGA shall be submitted to the Chief Engineer for action. The applicant will be notified of the Chief Engineers decision.

f) Upon completion and approval of the Final IGA, CDOT will issue a CDOT state highway access permit. The Final IGA and the access permit will serve as the enforcement document to ensure all parties abide by the items agreed upon within the IGA. A sample Final IGA is attached as Appendix G.

## V. FISCAL IMPACT

This Procedural Directive should result in a positive fiscal impact to CDOT since it requires local applicants to cover CDOT costs for processing and administering these procedural requirements and reduces duplicative regulatory procedures.

## VI. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Upon adoption, all divisions of the Colorado Department of Transportation shall implement this Procedural Directive.

The Office of Policy and Government Relations shall post this Procedural Directive on CDOT's intranet as well as on public announcements.

## VII. REVIEW DATE

This Procedural Directive shall be reviewed on or before November 2026

---

Shoshana Lew  
Executive Director

---

Date of Approval