Purpose of Today’s Meeting
- Provide an overview of the RTP update process
- Review regional mission statement and goals
- Learn what changes have occurred in the region
- Plan for Regional Transportation Forum

Purpose of RTP Update
- Meet SAFETEA-LU requirements
- Synchronize with MPO and STIP schedules
- Reflect resource allocation and funding changes

Goals of RTP Update
- Update from 2030 to 2035
- Focus on regional trends
- Determine if/how trends affect 2035 RTP
- Incorporate trends in regional goals and corridor visions
- Improve transit plan integration
- Identify priorities based on limited funds
Major Components

- Update demographic and environmental data
- Update transportation system inventory and analysis
- Incorporate impacts of economic development
- Update regional visions, goals and strategies
- Review corridor visions, prioritize corridors
- Develop implementation strategy

Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Forum / Data Collection</td>
<td>Summer 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Forum</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Report 1 – Major Trends</td>
<td>October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Output / TPR Meeting</td>
<td>November 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Plan</td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plan</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Plan</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UFR Mission Statement

"To provide a multi-modal transportation system that maximizes public input, fosters cooperation, and meets the transportation needs of all travelers in the Upper Front Range."

UFR Goals

- To provide a multi-modal transportation system for the safe and efficient movement of persons, goods and information
- To engage the public throughout the development of the transportation plan and its implementation
- To foster cooperation and to reduce institutional barriers between all entities involved in providing transportation to the region
- To coordinate with the transportation plans of other entities within the region (including Rocky Mountain National Park) and with those of adjacent communities, Transportation Planning Regions, and states
- To ensure adequate maintenance of the functional integrity of the existing transportation system
- To identify existing and projected deficiencies in the transportation system, including rights-of-way, and to establish methods to improve these deficiencies
- To identify and efficiently utilize potential sources of funds for transportation projects, take advantage of flexible funding, encourage enhanced funding by communicating the needs to decision makers, and encourage public/private partnership
- To acknowledge the interrelationship of transportation with existing and future land uses and to integrate transportation and land use planning
- To enhance the environment through the transportation system
- To ensure that the transportation needs of tourism, agriculture, industry and economic development are met, while protecting and improving the high quality of life in the region
- To provide enhanced access to Denver International Airport and to recognize the impacts of DIA and the E-470 corridor on the region
Recent Changes in the Region
- Development
  - Residential
  - Economic
  - Recreation
- Major traffic generators
- Travel pattern changes
- Priority changes
- Other

Regional Transportation Forum
- Purpose: attain input from public
- Date and location: TBD
- Who to invite
  - Community leaders
  - Business owners
  - Environmental groups
  - Political action groups
  - Transportation Advocates
  - Special interest groups
  - General public

Regional Transportation Forum (cont.)
- Presentation material
  - Previous Regional Transportation Plan
  - Updated inventory and analysis
  - Regional goals and strategies
  - Corridor Visions
- Open house structure
  - Interactive exercise
  - Identify priorities for improvements
    - by corridor, mode, investment category

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jenny Young – FHU</th>
<th>Project Manager (Regional Plan)</th>
<th>303-721-1440</th>
<th><a href="mailto:jenny.young@fhueng.com">jenny.young@fhueng.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Felsburg – FHU</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>303-721-1440</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bob.felsburg@fhueng.com">bob.felsburg@fhueng.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Staney – FHU</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>303-721-1440</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tyler.staney@fhueng.com">tyler.staney@fhueng.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Felschow – LSC</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>719-633-2868</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mfelschow@lsccs.com">mfelschow@lsccs.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Hocker – URS</td>
<td>Overall Project Manager</td>
<td>719-533-7857</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edward_hocker@urscorp.com">edward_hocker@urscorp.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING MINUTES
UPPER FRONT RANGE PRE-FORUM MEETING
July 18, 2006 at 1:00pm
1111 H Street, Greeley, CO

(see attached sign in sheet for list of attendees)

Rob Masden, Upper Front Range (UFR) Chairman, welcomed the group and introduced the consultants for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update.

Jenny Young, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig, presented an overview of the RTP update process including the goals, purpose, major components, and schedule.

The group reviewed the UFR Mission Statement and Goals from the 2030 RTP and proposed the modifications which are highlighted below:

- **Mission Statement:** "To provide a multi-modal transportation system that maximizes public input, fosters cooperation, and best meets the transportation needs of all travelers in the Upper Front Range."

- **Goal:** "To ensure adequate maintenance of the functional integrity of the existing transportation system."

These proposed modifications will be presented to the public at the Regional Transportation Forum along with the remaining ten goals.

The group was asked to help identify changes/trends in the region that might impact the transportation system or the priorities since the last RTP was completed. The following changes/trends were discussed:

- Morgan County has been experiencing a steady and significant growth in residential development.

- Morgan County has a new ethanol plant which generates 100 – 150 trucks per day.

- Larimer County has experienced some travel pattern shifts, with development occurring in some areas where it was not anticipated.

- There is a potential boundary modification between the Upper Front Range and DRCOG, which will need to be incorporated in this RTP update. The boundary change will entail a portion of southwest Weld County transferring into DRCOG.

- A development (Pioneer Development) with 8,000 – 12,000 residential units plus some commercial uses is being planned near I-76 and WCR 49.

- A new 1,000 bed prison is being planned in Hudson.

- The proposed Carma development along the I-25 corridor includes 5,000 – 6,000 residential units.
Please join your colleagues in discussing key issues and emerging trends that you believe are important considerations in developing a safe, efficient and effective transportation system for the Eastern Transportation Planning Region.

- Take an interactive poll about regional issues
- How does natural gas drilling affect transportation?
- How can the transportation system accommodate growth in the region?
- What are the costs of transportation?
- Are some people underserved by transportation?
- What are the priorities for transportation improvements?

**When:** September 28, 2006  
**Time:** 1:00pm – 4:00pm  
**Location:** Weld County Training Center  
1104 H Street  
Greeley, CO

- Refreshments will be provided

Hosted by your Regional Transportation Planning Commission  
ADA Accessible

Contact: Jenny Young 303. 721.1440  
jenny.young@fhueng.com
August 16, 2006

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Upper Front Range Transportation Planning Region (TPR) has begun the process of updating its Regional Transportation Plan. Felsburg Holt & Ullevig is a part of the consulting team brought on by the Colorado Department of Transportation to assist the Upper Front Range preparing the 2035 regional plan update.

As part of the planning process, the Upper Front Range has scheduled a Regional Transportation Forum on Thursday, September 28, 2006 from 1:00 to 4:00pm at the Weld County Training Center in Greeley (1104 H Street). In addition to inviting the general public, a special effort is being made to bring to the table representatives from the public and private sectors, such as yourself, who play a policy and decision making role in the region.

An important component of the Forum and the 2035 plan update process is the identification of key issues occurring in the Upper Front Range that may affect transportation priorities. It is important to note that at this phase of the update, issues and trends (and not specific projects) are of most concern. The issues and trends will be used to refine the future transportation priorities. Please take a few moments to help identify, from your professional perspective, developing issues and emerging trends that you believe are important considerations in developing a safe, efficient, and effective transportation system for the Upper Front Range TPR.

Specific trends and issues that may influence transportation priorities may include:

- Changes in population/employment
- Driving forces in the local/regional economy
- Transportation system issues (maintenance of the existing system, systems connectivity, congestion, safety, long term needs)
- Commuting patterns
- Major traffic generators
- Natural resource development
- Recreation/tourism industry
- Integration of the various transportation modes (auto, public transit, aviation, and rail) into an effective system
- Funding for transportation

To help us prepare for the Forum, let us know what issues and trends you believe are the most important to consider in this transportation plan update. Please forward your thoughts to Felsburg Holt & Ullevig by Monday, September 18, 2006 so we have sufficient time to incorporate your input into the Regional Transportation Forum.

Email: jenny.young@fhueng.com
Mail:  Jenny Young  
       Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
       6300 S. Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Phone: 303-721-1440

Thank you in advance for helping in the development of the 2035 Upper Front Range Regional Transportation Plan Update. Please mark your calendar for the September 28th Regional Transportation Forum!

Sincerely,

FELSBURG HOLT & ULLEVIG

Jenny A. Young, PE
Project Manager
Upper Front Range
2035 Regional
Transportation Forum

Time for Teamwork!
September 28, 2006

Regional Forum Outline
- Overview of statewide and regional plans and schedule
- Revisit 2006 statewide telephone survey (polling)
- 2030 plan overview and accomplishments
- Transportation system overview
- Regional trends and issues (polling)
- Statewide and regional system considerations
- Allocation exercise
- Final polling questions/wrap-up

Colorado Transportation Planning Regions (TPRs)

Upper Front Range TPR

Why Update Now?
- Respond to future funding scenarios
- Focus on regional trends
- Develop near term Implementation Strategy
- Meet federal requirements for 2009 STIP

Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Forum / Data Collection</td>
<td>Summer 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Forum</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Report 1 – Major Trends</td>
<td>October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Output / TPR Meeting</td>
<td>December 2006 or January 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Regional and Statewide Plan</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Regional Plan</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Statewide Plan</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revisiting the 2006 Statewide Telephone Survey

2030 Plan Overview

- 20 corridors with visions, goals, and strategies
- Project-based plan prioritized by project category
  - Highway
  - Bicycle/Pedestrian
  - System Preservation
  - Transportation Support Systems
- Vision plan includes four “pools”
- $864 Million in needs
- Fiscally Constrained Plan covers only 6% of total needs

UFR Corridors

2030 Fiscally Constrained Plan

Accomplishments (2005 – 2009)

$113 Million

System Overview
What other issues have a significant impact on the regional transportation system?

Project costs will be impacted by increasing energy and construction costs. CDOT’s projected revenue stream is expected to decrease sharply in coming years due to reductions in State and Federal funding.
Cost to Sustain Existing System & Services
(2030 Statewide Plan)

- Statewide Total Need $123 B
  - Unmet Need $48 B
  - CDOT $28 B
  - Other $47 B

Other includes:
- Local roadway funds
- Local Transit funds
- Aviation funds
- Rail funds

System Performance
(2030 Statewide Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Performance Level - Sustaining Level $123 B</th>
<th>Performance Level - Current Investment $79 B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement</td>
<td>68% Good/Fair</td>
<td>32% Good/Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>80% Good/Fair</td>
<td>60% Good/Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>B – Scale of A to F</td>
<td>F – Scale of A to F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>15% Congested Miles</td>
<td>20% Congested Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>1.47 Fatalities/MVMT*</td>
<td>1.47 Fatalities/MVMT*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Million Vehicle Miles Traveled

UFR Background

- 740 miles of state highway – 45% are in Poor condition
- 5,500 miles of local roads
- 16 bridges with Bridge Sufficiency Rating of 50 or less (on-system)
- 4 local transit agencies providing human services transportation
- Limited intercity bus service
- 5 general aviation airports

UFR Background (cont.)

- Population in UFR expected to grow from 115,000 to 344,000 between 2000 and 2035
- Jobs in Larimer, Morgan, and Weld Counties expected to increase from 252,000 to 544,000 between 2000 and 2035
- Daily VMT in UFR will grow from 5,100,000 to 11,100,000 between 2000 and 2035
- 4.7% of households have no vehicle available
- 6.0% of families are below poverty level

Cost of Transportation

- Today it costs about:
  - $2.9 M to reconstruct a mile of two-lane highway with shoulders
  - $100 M = 34 miles (30 yrs)
  - $900,000 to resurface a mile of highway (rehab plus overlays over 30 years)
  - $100 M = 110 miles (30 yrs)
  - $4 M to widen a mile of arterial from 2 to 4 lanes
  - $100 M = 25 miles
  - $20 M to widen a mile of freeway from 4 to 6 lanes
  - $100 M = 5 miles
  - $150,000 to purchase a bus plus $100,000 annually to maintain and operate
  - $25 M = 8 buses (30 yrs)

Upper Front Range Needs

$864 Million (per 2030 Plan) +
$653 Million (Resurfacing) +
$152 Million (Transit) +
$14 Million (Aviation) =
$1.7 Billion in Total Needs
Funding Sources

Regional Priorities Program
  Congestion Relief
  Surface Treatment
  Safety
  Traffic Operations
  Bridge
  Enhancement
  Transit
  Aviation

Allocating Limited Resources

Here is the problem: The TPR has a total need of $1.7 Billion. You have an estimated 30-year transportation budget of $600M for the TPR. Where are your priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>$353 M</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>$211 M</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing System</td>
<td>$953 M</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Modes</td>
<td>$166 M</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1.7 Billion</td>
<td>$600 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocation Exercise

- Allocate your $600M to:
  - Mobility
  - Roadway Surface Maintenance
  - Safety
  - Alternative Modes
- Optional: allocate your funds to specific corridors

Next Steps

- Compile and document information from forum
- Major trends technical report
- Post-forum meeting (December or January)
There were approximately 27 attendees (see attached sign in sheet). The distribution of attendees among the three counties in the Upper Front Range TRP was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weld</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 18

Rob Masden, Upper Front Range TPR Chairman, welcomed the group and introduced the consultants for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update.

Aaron Willis, CDOT DTD, provided an overview of the regional and statewide transportation planning process and described why we are updating the plans at this time.

Jenny Young, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig, conducted the remainder of the meeting, which included:
- An overview of the 2030 Plan
- Accomplishments since the 2030 Plan
- Transportation system overview
- Statewide and regional system considerations

The forum included three sets of polling questions that the audience was asked to vote on. The purpose of the questions was to poll the group and to generate discussion; no decisions have been made as a result of the polling. The following pages provide a list of the questions and the polling results, along with a summary of the discussion generated by each question.
The first three questions were from CDOT’s 2006 Statewide Survey on Transportation Issues in Colorado. The results shown in the upper right hand corner are the phone survey results from respondents in the Upper Front Range, and the results shown on the bottom are from the regional transportation forum.
The forum results varied greatly from the phone survey results. The likely reason for this variation is that the forum participants tend to be more involved in transportation issues and decisions and have a better understanding of the maintenance needs to sustain the transportation system.
• Again, the forum participants placed more emphasis on maintaining the system than the phone survey respondents.
In the 2030 Plan, approximately $39.3M was allocated to specific corridors (excluding regional projects and pools). The money was allocated to the following corridors:

- I-76, Denver East (52%)
- SH 52 Western Section (25%)
- US 36 Mountain Section (19%)
- SH 1 (3%)
- SH 71 Northeast Plains Section (1%)
- US 85 Urban Section (<1%)

Does this prioritization and funding allocation seem reasonable?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

- Although there happened to be important projects on these corridors, they are not necessarily the highest priority corridors in the region. SH 1 and SH 71, in particular, seem out of place in a list of the highest priority corridors.
- The US 85 corridor (both the southern and northern sections) should be a high priority for safety projects such as median cable guard rails.
- We should be looking at where the congestion is going to be in the future to determine what the highest priority corridors are.
The wording on this question should be modified to read, “Yes, the funding for improvements to I-25 should be strictly through the “7th Pot” or other state funding sources.” There will likely not be sufficient 7th Pot money.

There is not enough money in the Upper Front Range to help I-25; therefore, the funding should be used to address more regional (as opposed to statewide) transportation needs.

Supplementing I-25 with RPP dollars may be a way to leverage CDOT dollars.

It may make sense to allocate RPP dollars to specific interchange improvements along I-25.
An intersection pool was established in the 2030 plan with a funding allocation of 16.6% of RPP and Congestion Relief funds. Do you think this pool is important and has an appropriate level of funding allocated to it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the intersection pool is important and 16.6% is appropriate</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the intersection pool is important and should receive a higher percentage of funding</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the intersection pool is important but should receive a lower percentage of funding</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, the intersection pool does not address regional transportation issues and should not be included in the Plan</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 out of 18 respondents support the intersection improvement pool. More importantly, 15 out of 18 respondents believe this pool should be funded at least at its current level.
The 2030 Plan includes three other pools which were partially or fully funded in the Fiscally Constrained Plan and placed at the top of the prioritized list of projects. A $4M Bridge Rehabilitation Pool was established to supplement CDOT’s on-system bridge funding. Half of the $4M was included in the Fiscally Constrained Plan. Do you agree that the bridge pool is important and has an appropriate allocation?

1. Yes, the bridge pool is important and $2M is an appropriate allocation
2. Yes, the bridge pool is important and it should be fully funded ($4M)
3. Yes, the bridge pool is important but should receive a lower funding allocation
4. No, the bridge pool should not be included in the Fiscally Constrained Plan

- 100% of respondents support the bridge pool. A high percentage believe it should be fully funded.
An $8.96M Traffic/Safety Management Pool was established to supplement CDOT’s safety funding. Half of the $8.96M was included in the Fiscally Constrained Plan. Do you agree that this pool is important and has an appropriate allocation?

- 100% of respondents support the Traffic/Safety Management Pool. Most (16 out of 18) believe it should be funded at either its current level or at a higher level.
While generally supported, some participants thought that CDOT should be able to perform this work without a separate pool of funds.
In the 2030 Plan, Regional Priorities Program (RPP) dollars were allocated to Highway, Bicycle/Pedestrian, System Preservation, and Transportation Support System projects. No Regional Priorities Program (RPP) dollars were allocated to transit or aviation. Do you agree with the allocation?

- Participants thought that if the question had been separated out by transit and aviation that the results may have been different.
There are gaps in local and/or regional public transportation. Where should the focus be in the short term?

1. Elderly/disabled
2. Regional transit service to Denver, Fort Collins, Greeley
3. Local transit for general public
4. Keep at current level

- Transit from Denver to Fort Collins is needed.
- More transit for the aging is needed.
There are too many unknowns about the Prairie Falcon Parkway Express to gauge whether or not it will be beneficial for the Upper Front Range.

Based on the track record of E-470 and Northwest Parkway, this type of toll facility would not be able to pay for itself.

Travel time versus cost is the question; people would not drive 25 miles out of the way to use this type of facility.

Any alternative to I-25 would be of statewide benefit.
What is the most important regional transportation issue?

1. Maintain and repair the transportation system
2. Improve safety
3. Provide travel options that relieve congestion
4. Public transportation
5. Other

Total: 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slide: 17
• NOTE: the polling software failed at this point. This question was discussed, but a poll was not taken.

• No one volunteered that they thought we should continue to prioritize transportation improvements with existing revenues.

• Weld and Larimer Counties are currently looking into a Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) to provide additional funding for transportation improvements.

• The highway patrol is funded through the transportation budget – this should come from another funding source, freeing up more dollars for transportation improvements.

• Land use decisions by the local jurisdictions play a factor in the funding of transportation projects.
The group was asked what other issues or trends have affected transportation over the last few years since the 2030 plan was completed.

- Growth in the region is exceeding expectations.
- Growth will continue in the region if water is accessible.
- Gravel trucks on US 85 cause significant delay.
- There are houses being erected in rural areas without enough thought going into the domino effect of increased demands on public services and transportation infrastructure. Tax revenues collected from new housing developments are not sufficient to play to maintain current roads.

The audience members were each given $600 million “TransBUCKS,” and they were asked to allocate them to various improvements types (Mobility, Safety, System Quality, and Alternative Modes). The following is the breakdown of the TransBUCKS allocation, and pictures of the maps are included on the following pages:

- 40% surface treatment (maintain existing system)
- 34% congestion (mobility)
- 16% safety
- 10% alternative modes

The majority of the TransBUCKS on the congestion board were clustered in the south west Weld County area. The allocation by corridor on the other boards was relatively dispersed throughout the region.

**Next Steps**

- The information presented at the regional transportation forum will be documented in a technical report.
- The results of the polling and TransBUCKS exercises will be taken to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) in December. Any decisions on the prioritization of corridors and allocation of resources will be made by the RPC. The next RPC meeting is scheduled for December 14, 2006.
2035 Regional Transportation Plan

Jenny Young (Felsburg Holt & Ullevig) presented information related to the Upper Front Range 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. The following is a summary of the information presented and the decisions made by the Executive Committee.

**Corridor Prioritization**

The corridor prioritization process was presented including the evaluation criteria, weighting, scoring, and resulting high, medium, and low priority corridors. The Executive Committee recommended the following changes:

- Remove the Public Support/Need evaluation criterion from the corridor prioritization; the need for improvements is captured in the other five evaluation criteria.
- The weighting of evaluation criteria has been adjusted to the following:
  - Mobility – 25
  - Safety – 25
  - System Quality – 25
  - Environmental – 10
  - Economic Impact – 15
- The above modifications result in the following High, Medium, and Low priority corridors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Priority Corridors</th>
<th>Medium Priority Corridors</th>
<th>Low Priority Corridors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 5: I-25 Front Range</td>
<td>Corridor 2: SH 7 Mountain</td>
<td>Corridor 1: SH 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 8: US 34 Big Thompson</td>
<td>Corridor 3: SH 14 Mountain</td>
<td>Corridor 7: US 34 RMNP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 14: SH 66</td>
<td>Corridor 4: SH 14 Plains</td>
<td>Corridor 13: SH 52 Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 16: I-76</td>
<td>Corridor 6: I-25 North</td>
<td>Corridor 19: SH 144 Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor 17: US 85 Urban</td>
<td>Corridor 9: US 34 Plains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor 10: US 34 Northeastern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor 11: US 36 Mountain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor 12: SH 52 Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor 15: SH 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor 18: US 85 Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor 20: US 287 Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corridor Visions**

Technical Report #2 – Visions and Priorities was distributed to the Executive Committee. The discussion was focused on the corridors for which significant changes to the 2030 corridor visions are recommended. The Executive Committee made the following recommendations related to the corridor visions:
• Corridor 9: US 34 Plains – change the primary investment category from System Quality to Safety
• Corridor 18: US 85 Rural – change the primary investment category from System Quality to Safety
• Corridor 19: SH 144 Rural – leave the primary investment as System Quality
• Corridor 20: US 287 North Rural – change the primary investment category from System Quality to Safety

Resource Allocation

The Executive Committee made the following recommendations related to resource allocation:

• No Regional Priorities Program or Congestion Relief monies should be allocated to transit or aviation
• Allocate 20% of available funding to intersection improvement pool
• Fully fund the bridge rehabilitation pool (12% of available funding)
• Fully fund the traffic/safety management pool (27% of available funding)
• Fully fund the six year scoping pool (1% of available funding)
• Allocate the remaining 40% of available funding to the High Priority Corridors as a group, allowing for maximum flexibility
• No funding has been allocated to the Medium and Low Priority Corridors; however, projects on these corridors would be eligible for funding through the intersection improvement pool, the bridge rehabilitation pool, and the traffic/safety management pool
• Any post-7th Pot strategic projects funding that becomes available should be allocated to the High Priority Corridors

Midterm Implementation Strategies

The Executive Committee agreed with the policy statements included in the implementation strategies. The committee asked that the highest priority strategies be identified for each of the five High Priority Corridors as a part of the midterm implementation strategies.
Upper Front Range
2035 Regional Transportation Plan

Prioritization Meeting with RPC
April 19, 2007

RTP History

• First Upper Front Range Regional Transportation Plan (2015) – completed in 1994
• UFR 2020 RTP – completed in 2000
• UFR 2030 RTP – completed in 2004

Purpose of Update

• Update RTP to 2035
• Convert to corridor-based plan
• Revisit region’s priorities
• Meet federal requirements (SAFETEA-LU)
• Develop near term implementation strategies in light of increasing costs and declining revenues

2035 RTP Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Forum / Data Collection</td>
<td>Summer 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Forum</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Report 1 – Major Trends</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Report 2 – Visions and Priorities</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization Meeting</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Regional and Statewide Plan</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Regional Plan</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Statewide Plan</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RTP Discussion Overview

• Corridor Visions
  • Technical Report #2
  • Corridors with Significant Changes
• Corridor Prioritization
  • Evaluation Criteria
  • Corridor Scoring
  • Weighting of Evaluation Criteria
  • High, Medium, and Low Priority Corridors
• Resource Allocation
  • Allocation of available funds to pools and corridors
• Midterm Implementation Strategies
  • Policy statements
  • Strategies for high priority corridors

Corridor Visions
**Corridors with Significant Changes**

- Corridor #5: I-25 Front Range
  - Consolidate goals and strategies
  - Reflect alternatives in North I-25 EIS
- Corridor #9: US 34 Plains
  - Change primary investment category from System Quality to Safety
- Corridor #18: US 85 Rural
  - Change primary investment category from System Quality to Safety
- Corridor #20: US 287 North Rural
  - Change primary investment category from System Quality to Safety

**Evaluation Criteria**

- Mobility
- Safety
- System Quality
- Environmental
- Economic Impact

**Corridor Prioritization**

**Corridor Scoring**

- Two or three measures for each of the five evaluation criteria
- Corridor score of High (3), Medium (2), or Low (1) for each measurement
- High (3) score indicates:
  - Highest importance to the region or
  - Poor condition and greatest need for improvement or
  - Fewest barriers to implementing improvements
- Low (1) score indicates:
  - Relatively low importance to the region or
  - Good condition and least need for improvement or
  - Significant barriers to implementing improvements

**Corridor Scores**

- Corridor 1: SH 121
- Corridor 2: SH 7 Mountain Section
- Corridor 3: SH 14 Mountain Section
- Corridor 4: SH 14 Plains Section
- Corridor 5: I-25 Front Range
- Corridor 6: I-25 North Section
- Corridor 7: US 34 RMNP/Mountain Section
- Corridor 8: US 34 Big Thompson Section
- Corridor 9: US 34 Plains Section
- Corridor 10: US 34 Northeastern Plains Section
- Corridor 11: US 36 Mountain Section
- Corridor 12: SH 52 Western Section
- Corridor 13: SH 52 Middle Section
- Corridor 14: SH 66
- Corridor 15: SH 71 Northeastern Plains Section
- Corridor 16: I-76, Denver East
- Corridor 17: US 85 Urban Section
- Corridor 18: US 85 Rural Section
- Corridor 19: SH 144 Plains Section
- Corridor 20: US 287 Rural Section
# Weighting of Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Quality</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Corridor Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11: US 36 Mountain</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: SH 71</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: SH 52 Western</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: SH 144 Plains</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: I-25 North</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: I-76</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: SH 58 Middle</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: SH 14 Plains</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: SH 66</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: US 287 Rural</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: US 85 Rural</td>
<td>Low Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: US 34 Northeastern</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: US 34 Plains</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: SH 1 Mountain</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: SH 7 Mountain</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: US 85 Urban</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: US 34 RMNCP</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: US 34 Big Thompson</td>
<td>Medium Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Estimated Available Resources (2008 – 2035)

- Regional Priority Program (RPP): $40.2 M
- Congestion Relief: $3.74 M
- **TOTAL FLEXIBLE FUNDS: $43.94 M**
- 20% less than estimated in 2030 RTP

# Resource Allocation

- Historically funded through RPP or Congestion Relief:
  - Highway capacity, safety, operations
  - System preservation (complete reconstruction)
  - Bicycle/pedestrian
  - Transportation support systems (studies, ITS programs)
  - Railroad crossings
- Funded through other federal/state sources:
  - Surface treatment
  - Safety
  - Bridge replacement
  - Transit
  - Aviation

# Resource Allocation – Policy Direction from Executive Committee (cont.)

- No RPP allocation to Transit or Aviation
  - Separate funding sources available through FTA and FAA
- Fund "pools" with RPP dollars (all pools available for any of the 20 corridors in the region)
  - Intersection Improvement Pool
  - Bridge Rehabilitation Pool
    - For use on bridges that do not qualify for federal bridge replacement funding
    - Allocate 12% of flexible funds to bridge pool (fully funded)
Resource Allocation – Policy Direction from Executive Committee

- "Pools" (cont.)
  - Traffic/Safety Management Pool
    - Used to fund relatively low-cost traffic/safety improvements
    - Allocate 10% of flexible funds to traffic/safety pool (fully funded)
  - Scoping Pool
    - Used to investigate details/extent of future projects and provide realistic cost estimates prior to inclusion in STIP
    - Allocate 1% of flexible funds to scoping pool (fully funded)

Allocate remaining RPP and Congestion Relief funding to High Priority Corridors

- Maximize flexibility within top corridors
- All corridors eligible for "pool" funding

Allocate Unprogrammed Strategic Projects funding to High Priority Corridors

- Current 7th Pot strategic projects expected to be completed by 2025
- If Senate Bill 1 funds continue to be directed to transportation, there will be additional funds for transportation
- Transportation Commission has not identified next generation of strategic projects

Midterm Implementation Strategies

- Increasing construction costs
- Declining revenues

Policy Statements

- Encourage local governments to develop comprehensive plans
- Encourage development of and implementation of access management plans
- Support Special Improvement Districts and Rural Transportation Authorities
- Support state initiatives to increase state and federal funding for transportation
- Support modification of Energy Impact Funds to increase revenues available for transportation improvements

Midterm Strategies

- Utilize "pools" to address immediate, low-cost needs
  - Intersection improvement pool
  - Traffic/safety management pool
  - Bridge rehabilitation pool
- Focus on top strategies for High Priority Corridors
  - Maintain infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays and rehabilitating/replacing bridges
  - Implement and promote TDM such as carpooling, vanpooling, telecommuting and flexible work hours
  - Improve ITS incident response, traveler information and traffic management
  - Consolidate and limit access and develop access management plans
  - Construct intersection improvements such as auxiliary lanes and traffic signals
Next Steps

- Finalize Technical Report #2
- Draft UFR 2035 Regional Transportation Plan
  - To be presented at July 26, 2007 RPC meeting
- Final UFR 2035 Regional Transportation Plan
  - To be presented at November 15, 2007 RPC meeting
Minutes Upper Front Range Regional Transportation Planning Council (UFRRPC) Meeting April 19, 2007

Attendance:
Robert Masden, Weld County Commissioner
Stan Elmquist, CDOT
Myron Hora, CDOT
Michael Felschow, LSC
Kathy Engelson, CDOT DTD
Ken Weaver, Greeley CTAB
Steve Shafer, Town of Plattville
Patsy Drewer, Weld County Transportation
Mark Peterson, Larimer County Engineer
Dick Leffler, Town of Frederick
Jenny Young, FHU
Francie Collins, Weld County
Drew Scheltinga, Weld County Engineer
Andy Anderson, Morgan County Commissioner
Gail Hoffman, CDOT
John Valerio, CDOT-DTD, Transit
Joe Racine, Town of Hudson
Gary Thomas, SAINT Transit
Crystal Hedberg, Weld County Transportation
Brett Locke, CDOT
Mike Friesen, Town of Mead
Bob Felsburg, FHU
John Sweeney, CDOT Aeronautics

BUSINESS MEETING: Meeting was called to order by Chairman Masden at 1:04 PM, UFRTPR Chairman

Based on roll call, a quorum was not present. Entities represented at today’s meeting are Town of Frederick, CDOT, Town of Hudson, Larimer County, Town of Mead, Morgan County, Town of Plattville, and Weld County.

Approval of the December 14, 2006, meeting minutes will be deferred until the July 26, 2007, meeting because of the lack of a quorum.
April 19, 2007, UFRTPR
Page 2

Items discussed:

- Chairman Masden discussed the status of the Towns of Eaton and Severance’s request to join the NFR MPO. Because there was not a quorum at this meeting, a proposed resolution will be sent, via email, to UFRTPR Council members for approval of Eaton’s and Severance’s request. Once approved by 50% of the UFRTPR Council members, Chairman Masden will sign the resolution and it will be forwarded to the NFRMPO.

- Rob reported on the progress of a portion of southwest Weld County being included in the Denver Regional MPO for the purposes of transportation planning. Stan Elmquist asked if there was a time-table. Rob does not see Weld County making a decision this year.

- Jenny Young presented the Summary of Recommendations for the 2035 Transportation Plan that was developed from the March 29, 2007, UFR Executive Committee meeting. Many issues were discussed by Council members and staff. The main topics of discussion were corridor prioritization and resource allocation. Two important changes were the allocation of 1% of flexible funding to transit and the identification of an 80% / 20% funding split between high and medium priority corridors; the 80% must be used on high priority corridors, while the 20% can be used on either medium or high priority corridors. Jenny said that she will have the 2035 Transportation Plan drafted for the July, 26, 2007, UFRTPR meeting and will include the changes discussed at this Council meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15.

Respectfully submitted,

Francie Collins
UFRTPR Secretary
2035 Draft Statewide and Regional Transportation Plans
Joint Public Outreach Open House

The Upper Front Range Transportation Planning Region and the Colorado Department of Transportation are hosting a meeting to present the Draft Regional and Statewide Transportation Plans and receive comments. Your input is valued.

Date: November 8, 2007
Place: CDOT Region 4 Offices
       1420 2nd Street
       Greeley, CO
Time: 4:00pm - 6:00pm
      (Presentation at 5:00pm)

FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Web: http://www.dot.state.co.us/StateWidePlanning/PlansStudies/2035Plan.asp
Project contact: Leah Ware (303) 757-9761
Email: 2035transportationplan@urscorp.com
Special ADA Accommodations: Leah Ware (303) 757-9761
Para información en español, por favor llame: Leah Ware (303) 757-9761
Key Issues and Emerging Trends

- Tourism
- Energy Development (wind, ethanol, biodiesel)
- Population Growth and Increase in Commuter Traffic
**Regional Socioeconomics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Growth</strong></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weld</td>
<td>228,729</td>
<td>551,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>28,347</td>
<td>52,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>271,990</td>
<td>473,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Growth</strong></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Jobs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weld</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>24,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>13,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>16,038</td>
<td>14,347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traffic**

Increases Throughout Region by 2035

- **2005**: 30 miles of congested highways
- **2035**: 122 miles of congested highways
**Truck Traffic**

Increases Throughout Region by 2035

**2005**

**2035**

---

**Transit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Fleet</th>
<th>Annual Ridership</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County Dial-A-Ride (Larimer County)</td>
<td>On-demand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County Services (Larimer County)</td>
<td>On-demand</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,519</td>
<td>114,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estes Park Service</td>
<td>Fixed Route and On-demand</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>108,495</td>
<td>661,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NECALE - County Express (includes service area outside of UFR)</td>
<td>Fixed Route and On-demand</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>105,131</td>
<td>1,171,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Senior Center (Town of Wellington)</td>
<td>On-demand</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain National Park</td>
<td>Fixed Route</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What We Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Liquid Transit Service</td>
<td>$66.50</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation Pool</td>
<td>$33.25</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Six-Year Rolling Pool</td>
<td>$117.82</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Intersection Improvement Pool</td>
<td>$8.79</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation Pool</td>
<td>$12.1%</td>
<td>$5.32</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Traffic/Safety Management Pool</td>
<td>$10%</td>
<td>$4.39</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Six-Year Scoping Pool</td>
<td>$0.6%</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What We Can Afford Through 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FPP and Congestion Relief %</th>
<th>2035 Constrained Total (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (Pools)</td>
<td>1 US 36 Northeastern Plains</td>
<td>$12.1%</td>
<td>$53.91</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1 US 36 Southeast</td>
<td>$17.32</td>
<td>$61.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2 US 36 Southeast</td>
<td>$17.32</td>
<td>$61.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3 US 36 Southeast</td>
<td>$17.32</td>
<td>$61.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4 US 36 Southeast</td>
<td>$17.32</td>
<td>$61.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5 US 36 Southeast</td>
<td>$17.32</td>
<td>$61.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6 US 36 Southeast</td>
<td>$17.32</td>
<td>$61.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7 US 34 RMNP/Mountain</td>
<td>$53.91</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8 US 34 Mountain</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>9 US 34 Plains</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>10 US 34 Northeastern Plains</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>11 US 34 Plains</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12 SH 52 Western</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13 US 85 Rural</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14 SH 144 Plains</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15 SH 144 Plains</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16 SH 144 Plains</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17 US 85 Urban</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18 US 85 Rural</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19 US 85 Rural</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20 US 85 Rural</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>$4.94</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding allocated to Medium Priority Corridors can be used for either Medium or High Priority Corridors.

**Total Funding includes $0.42M in RPP and $53.47M in other transit funding.
### Midterm Implementation Strategies

**Focus for the Next 10 Years**

#### Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Strategies for Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement and promote appropriate TDM mechanisms such as carpooling, vanpooling, telecommuting, and flexible work hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote ITS strategies, such as variable message signs, incident response, traveler information, and traffic management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve mobility by constructing interchange and intersection improvements, such as traffic signals and auxiliary lanes at ramp terminal interchanges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve and maintain the system of local roads parallel to I-25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure consistency with North I-25 EIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add roadway pullouts for breakdowns, buses, and slow vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve ITS incident response, traveler information, and traffic management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays and repairing/replacing bridges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct auxiliary lanes (passing, turn, acceleration).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonize and standardize geometric and design aspects management plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve ITS incident response, traveler information, and traffic management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety by refining curves, improving sight lines, and adding guardrails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays and repairing/replacing bridges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct auxiliary lanes (passing, turn, acceleration).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement recommendations from US 85 Access Control Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add and maintain new interchange/diamond at US 85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve ITS incident response, traveler information, and traffic management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add guardrails (cable rail).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays and repairing/replacing bridges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**2035 Upper Front Range Regional Transportation Plan**

- **1-29 Front Range**
  - Improves mobility by constructing interchange and intersection improvements, such as traffic signals and auxiliary lanes at ramp terminal interchanges.
  - Improve and maintain the system of local roads parallel to I-25.
  - Ensure consistency with North I-25 EIS.
  - Add roadway pullouts for breakdowns, buses, and slow vehicles.
  - Improve ITS incident response, traveler information, and traffic management.
  - Include infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays and repairing/replacing bridges.
  - Construct auxiliary lanes (passing, turn, acceleration).

- **US 34 Big Thompson**
  - Improve safety by refining curves, improving sight lines, and adding guardrails.
  - Include infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays and repairing/replacing bridges.

- **SH 66**
  - Improve geometrics (flatten slopes and curves, improve visibility at night times).
  - Construct interchange improvements.
  - Improve safety by adding guardrails and improving hot spots.
  - Include infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays, reconstructing the roadway, and repairing/replacing bridges.
  - Implement recommendations from US 85 Access Control Plan.
  - Add and maintain new interchange/diamond at US 85.
  - Improve ITS incident response, traveler information, and traffic management.
  - Add guardrails (cable rail).
  - Include infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays and repairing/replacing bridges.

- **I-70**
  - Improve safety by adding guardrails and improving hot spots.
  - Include infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays, reconstructing the roadway, and repairing/replacing bridges.

- **US 85 Urban**
  - Implement recommendations from US 85 Access Control Plan.
  - Add and maintain new interchange/diamond at US 85.
  - Improve ITS incident response, traveler information, and traffic management.
  - Add guardrails (cable rail).
  - Include infrastructure by adding surface treatments/overlays and repairing/replacing bridges.
### Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Decision Makers: such as Colorado Transportation Commission, State and local elected officials, and Indian tribal governments</td>
<td>• Provided input to the Transportation Commission Policy, Revenue Projections, and Resource Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Public: All citizens of Colorado have an opportunity to review and comment on draft plans</td>
<td>• Considered during the development of both Regional and Statewide Transportation Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholders: such as transportation providers, private sector interests, advocacy groups and the public interested in transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outreach Activities

- Customer Survey on Transportation issues
- Regional Transportation Forums on Key issues and concerns
- Statewide Transportation Forum on Tough Choices to Stretch Transportation Dollars or Reduce Services
- Environmental Forum to identify significant environmental and planning concerns
- Security Workshop to discuss issues with agencies involved in operational security activities
- Transportation Commission and Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee* Meetings on Transportation issues
- Joint Public Meetings on regional and state-wide transportation plans to be held at planning regions

* Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) - comprised of representatives from each Transportation Planning Region to act in a liaison capacity for the Regional Planning Commissions as an advisory board to the Colorado Department of Transportation.

### Recent Accomplishments

- **February 2007 Joint Transportation Directors/STAC Meeting**
- **March 2007 Statewide Environmental Forum**
- **Regional Transportation Forums**
- **Statewide Transportation Forum**
- **Environmental Forum**
- **Security Workshop**
- **Transportation Commission and STAC Meetings**
- **Joint Public Meetings**

### Step-by-Step Process

1. **Participants**
   - Decision Makers: such as Colorado Transportation Commission, State and local elected officials, and Indian tribal governments
   - The Public: All citizens of Colorado have an opportunity to review and comment on draft plans
   - Stakeholders: such as transportation providers, private sector interests, advocacy groups and the public interested in transportation

2. **Input**
   - Provided input to the Transportation Commission Policy, Revenue Projections, and Resource Allocation
   - Considered during the development of both Regional and Statewide Transportation Plans

3. **Outreach Activities**
   - Customer Survey on Transportation issues
   - Regional Transportation Forums on Key issues and concerns
   - Statewide Transportation Forum on Tough Choices to Stretch Transportation Dollars or Reduce Services
   - Environmental Forum to identify significant environmental and planning concerns
   - Security Workshop to discuss issues with agencies involved in operational security activities
   - Transportation Commission and Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee* Meetings on Transportation issues
   - Joint Public Meetings on regional and state-wide transportation plans to be held at planning regions

* Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) - comprised of representatives from each Transportation Planning Region to act in a liaison capacity for the Regional Planning Commissions as an advisory board to the Colorado Department of Transportation.
Statewide Socioeconomics

Population

Leading Industries

Employment

Economic Drivers
ENERGY AND TOURISM HELP SUPPORT COLORADO'S ECONOMY

ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

TOURISM

Travel Spending by Purpose of Trip
(TOTAL $8.9 B)

OUTDOORS $1.1 BILLION (13%)
TOURING $1 BILLION (11%)
SKI $1.4 BILLION (16%)
BUSINESS $1.3 BILLION (15%)
VISIT FRIENDS/RELATIVES $2.5 BILLION (28%)
OTHER PLEASURE $1.5 BILLION (17%)
Statewide Congestion

MILES OF CONGESTION INCREASES 300% BY 2035

Vehicle miles traveled on state highways growing faster than population and state highway lane miles.

**Projected Growth of Freight** in Colorado

- Domestic: Freight originates, terminates, or is internal to Colorado
- NAFTA: Freight originates or terminates in Mexico or Canada and originates or terminates in Colorado

Data Source: 2004 TRANSEARCH Database, Global Insights

Regional Freight Characteristics: Percentage of Total Freight by Weight

- Western Colorado: 37%
- Front Range: 45%
- Eastern Colorado: 18%

Additional resources:
- Rail Freight Logistics
- Truck Freight Logistics
- Air Freight Logistics

---

**Colorado Freight Corridors**

Freight doubles in weight and value by 2035.
Service Conditions
HIGHWAY AND BRIDGE

BRIDGE CONDITION
3,775 BRIDGES
GOOD 67%
FAIR 29%
POOR 4%
Based on 2007 Data

HIGHWAY CONDITION
9,161 MILES
FAIR 24%
GOOD 39%
POOR 37%
Based on 2006 Data

Corridor Visions & Environmental Coordination
RESPONDING TO KEY ISSUES & EMERGING TRENDS

Statewide System
Regional Corridors
Regional Corridor Strategies
Environmental Resources
Statewide Mitigation Strategies

Top 10 Corridor Vision Strategies
from Regional Transportation Plans*

Statewide Mitigation Strategies

CDOT's Environmental Stewardship Ethic

Environmental Stewardship Activities

Equity

Global Warming

Issues and Activities

Environmental Stewardship Activities
- Shiraguchi Park
- Biottenham
- Build Colorado's outdoor recreation areas
- Protecting Colorado's native wildlife and grassland
- Enhancing the state's natural beauty
- Promoting outdoor recreation
- Improving public health

CDOT's Environmental Stewardship Ethic
- Protecting Colorado's natural environment
- Enhancing the state's outdoor recreation areas
- Promoting sustainable transportation
- Improving public health
- Preserving Colorado's natural beauty
### Performance of the Statewide System

#### Estimated 2035 Local Roadway, Transit / Rail and Aviation System Performance Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENT SCENARIO</th>
<th>Forecast Revenue</th>
<th>Cost to Sustain Current Performance</th>
<th>Cost to Accomplish Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INVESTMENT*</td>
<td>$48B</td>
<td>$75B</td>
<td>$104B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General State of the System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roadway</td>
<td>$28B</td>
<td>$64B</td>
<td>$125B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit / Rail</td>
<td>$4B</td>
<td>$4B</td>
<td>$4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Estimated 2035 State Highway System Performance Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENT SCENARIO</th>
<th>Forecast Revenue</th>
<th>Cost to Sustain Current Performance</th>
<th>Cost to Accomplish Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INVESTMENT*</td>
<td>$28B</td>
<td>$64B</td>
<td>$125B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General State of the System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Vision Improvements / Modal Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Grade</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition</td>
<td>Good/Fair</td>
<td>Good/Fair</td>
<td>Good/Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Condition</td>
<td>Good/Fair</td>
<td>Good/Fair</td>
<td>Good/Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of road travelers per 100M vehicle kilometers traveled</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Statewide Existing Revenue and Spending

### Statewide Forecast of Estimated Revenues 2008-2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2008-2035 $(76B estimated (2008 dollars))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Highway</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund (SB 1 and HB 1310)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transit</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT HUTF</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CDOT Revenue</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CDOT Revenue</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Spending by Mode 2008-2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>2008-2035 $(76B estimated (2008 dollars))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Spending by Investment Category 2008-2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2008-2035 $(76B estimated (2008 dollars))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Quality</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Delivery</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IMPO dollars based on 2030 plans
What Will the Future Be?

CDOT is working to stretch available dollars to maintain the transportation system. Revenues are not keeping pace with projected growth, rising costs, and an aging infrastructure. While transportation investment comes with a hefty price tag, the cost of not investing is even higher.

**With Existing or Anticipated Funding**
- Reduction in services
- Deterioration of existing conditions
- Longer delay sitting in traffic
- Local roadways and transit/rail systems deteriorate
- Focus on most critical programs, corridors and/or lower standards
- Trade-offs could establish priority roadways

**With Additional Funding**
- Maintain or improve existing system
- Maintain existing conditions
- No increase over today’s traffic delay
- Maintain local roadways, transit/rail and aviation systems
- Take steps toward Colorado’s Transportation Vision
- Support Colorado’s economic vitality with an efficient transportation system

### Estimated 2035 Funding Gap by Investment Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Scenario</th>
<th>Current Performance</th>
<th>Achieve Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment</strong></td>
<td><strong>$76B</strong></td>
<td><strong>$139B</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated 2035 Funding Gap by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Forecast v. Sustain</th>
<th>Step Forecast v. Vehicle</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Roadway</td>
<td>$8B</td>
<td>$8B</td>
<td>$0B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$28B</td>
<td>$64B</td>
<td>$36B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit/Rail</td>
<td>$25B</td>
<td>$28B</td>
<td>$3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation System (Total)</td>
<td>$76B</td>
<td>$139B</td>
<td>$63B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Midterm Implementation Strategy - Overview

- Need to make tough choices to stretch dollars by refocusing investments for only the most critical purposes, significant corridors, lowering performance standards, or combination of the three.
- Consider measures that refocus funding in programs such as maintenance, bridge and surface treatment.
- Need to develop improved tools to aid the Transportation Commission in analyzing and making the best trade-offs when establishing funding priorities. These trade-offs could include establishing priority roadways based on criteria such as roadway usage, truck traffic, system connectivity or striking routes to communities.

### What the Investment Level Will Buy in 2035

#### Forecast Revenue Projections

- Current revenue projections of $76.8 billion from 2008 to 2035 are not enough to maintain the transportation system’s current quality and performance levels.
- Average daily driver delay on congested corridors will increase from 22 minutes to nearly 70 minutes in 2035.
- Roadway surfaces in the state highway system with a good/fair condition will fall from 80% to 25% in 2035.
- Of the State’s 3,775 bridges currently 94% are rated good/fair, that is expected to decrease to 80% in 2035.
- System maintenance will fall from today’s grade of “B” to a failing grade of “F” in 2035. Examples of maintenance include: cleaning within the right-of-way and minor roadway repair such as potholes, nuts, etc.
- The statewide fatal crash rate will improve to 1-24 fatal crashes per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in 2035.
- Less than half of the estimated demand for public transit will be met in 2035.

#### Revenues to Sustain Current Conditions

- In order to sustain the transportation system at the current performance levels, an estimated $139 billion ($63 billion beyond currently forecasted revenues) is needed through 2035.
- Average daily driver delay on congested corridors will remain at 22 minutes.
- Roadway surfaces of the state highway system with a good/fair condition rating will remain at 80%.
- The number of state-owned bridges in good/fair condition will remain at 94%.
- System maintenance will be sustained at a “B” grade.
- The statewide fatal crash rate will improve to 1.00 fatal crashes per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in 2035.
- Service levels for aviation, transit, and local roads would be sustained at current performance levels.

#### Revenues to Implement Corridor Visions

- Accomplishing the corridor visions would require a total of $227 billion, nearly three times the currently forecasted revenues.
- Even with the significant growth in population, average daily driver delay on congested corridors will remain at 32 minutes.
- Roadway surfaces on the state highway system with a good/fair rating condition will improve to 75%.
- The number of state-owned bridges in good/fair condition will improve to 100%.
- System maintenance will be sustained at a “B” grade.
- The statewide fatal crash rate will improve to 1.00 fatal crashes per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in 2035.
- Significant improvements will be achieved for transit, rail, aviation, and local roadways.
- Regional priorities in vision plans such as adding shoulders, improving intersections, and widening roads, could move forward.