INTERMOUNTAIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REGION REGIONAL COORDINATED TRANSIT AND HUMAN SERVICES PLAN

Prepared for:

Colorado Department of Transportation Division of Transit and Rail and Intermountain Transportation Planning Region

Prepared by:

Felsburg Holt & Ullevig 6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600 Centennial, CO 80111 303/721-1440

In Association with:

Cambridge Systematics Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates OV Consulting TransitPlus

> FHU# 12-206-01 December 2014

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ntermountain

This plan was developed with strong support from a variety of leaders and stakeholders from CDOT and throughout the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region (TPR). A special thank you to:

Intermountain TPR Transit Working Group Participants

Jim Andrew – Summit Stage Dave Betley – City of Glenwood Springs Jane Burden – Avon/Beaver Creek Transit Kelley Collier – ECO Transit Mary Cunningham – Edwards Workforce Center Cindi Gillespie – Copper Mountain Resort Geoff Guthrie - City of Glenwood Springs John Hoffmann – Town of Carbondale Ruth Hosteller – Aspen Seniors David Johnson – Roaring Fork Transportation Authority Susan Juergensmeier – Northwest Colorado Council of Governments John Klausz – Mountain Valley Developmental Services Tom Kassmel – Town of Vail Karen Koenemann - Eagle County Health and Human Services/Public Health John Krueger – City of Aspen Chris Lubbers – Beaver Creek Dial-a-Ride Maribeth Lewis-Baker – Town of Breckenridge Free Ride Kathleen Lyons - Eagle County Health and Human Services Melanie McMichael – Eagle County School District Mark Rogers – CDOT Region 3 David Peckler – Town of Snowmass Village Jeff Wetzel – ECO Transit

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Intermountain

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			<u>Page</u>
1.0	INTRO	DDUCTION	1
	1.1	Purpose of Plan	1
	1.2	Federal and State Planning Regulations	2
	1.3	Relevant Statewide Background Reports/Plans	4
	1.4	Relevant Intermountain TPR Background Studies/Plans	8
	1.5	Plan Methodology	10
	1.6	Relationship to Statewide Planning Efforts	
	1.7	Overview of Plan Contents	16
2.0	REGIO	DNAL OVERVIEW	17
	2.1	Transportation Planning Region Description	17
	2.2	Regional Transit Vision and Goals	19
	2.3	Population Characteristics	19
	2.4	Employment and Job Characteristics	36
	2.5	Summary of Community Characteristics	36
3.0	EXIST	ING TRANSIT PROVIDERS AND HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES	40
	3.1	Public Transit Providers	42
	3.2	Human Service Transportation Providers	43
	3.3	Other Human Service Agencies/Programs	45
	3.4	Privately Operated Public Transportation Services	45
	3.5	Existing Coordination Activities	47
	3.6	Summary of Existing Services	49
4.0	CURR	ENT AND POTENTIAL TRANSIT FUNDING	50
	4.1	Current Transit Expenditures	50
	4.2	Current Transit Revenue Sources	50
	4.3	Regional Transit Revenue Trends	52
	4.4	Current and Potential Transit and Transportation Funding Sources	52
	4.5	Future Funding Options	58
	4.6	Potential Revenue Estimates	61
	4.7	CDOT Grants Process	62
5.0	TRAN	SIT NEEDS AND SERVICE GAPS	64
	5.1	Quantitative Assessment of Needs and Gaps	64
	5.2	Qualitative Assessment of Needs and Gaps	65
6.0	FINA	ICIAL AND FUNDING OVERVIEW	68
	6.1	Current and Future Operating Expenses	68
	6.2	Current and Future Operating Revenues	69
	6.3	Status Quo Revenue and Expense Summary	71
7.0	IMPL	EMENTATION PLAN	72
	7.1	High Priority Strategies	72
	7.2	Implementation Plan Financial Summary	

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Page

Intermountain

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Existing and Proposed Statewide Routes	6
Figure 1-2	ICS and AGS Study Area	7
Figure 2-1	Major Activity Centers and Destinations Map	18
Figure 2-2	Population Growth	21
Figure 2-3	Projected Growth of Residents Age 65+	23
Figure 2-4	2011 Households with No Vehicle	25
Figure 2-5	2011 Population Below Federal Poverty Level	27
Figure 2-6	2011 Minority Population	29
Figure 2-7	2011 Limited English Proficiency Population	31
Figure 2-8	2012 Disabled Population	33
Figure 2-9	2011 Veteran Population	35
Figure 2-10	Job Growth	37
Figure 2-11	Employed Working Outside of County of Residence	38
Figure 2-12	Counties with Higher than Statewide and TPR Average Transit Needs Indicators	39
Figure 3-1	Transit Provider System Map	41
Figure 4-1	Operating Cost per Passenger Trip in Colorado Transportation Planning Regions	50
Figure 4-2	Comparison of National, State, and Regional Revenue Sources	51
Figure 4-3	Recent Trends in Regional Transit Revenues	52
Figure 6-1	Forecasted Operating Revenues in the Intermountain TPR	69

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Intermountain

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1	CDOT Division of Transit and Rail Performance Measures1	.4
Table 2-1	Projected Population Growth by County2	0
Table 2-2	Projected Growth of Residents Age 65+2	2
Table 2-3	2011 Households with No Vehicle	4
Table 2-4	2011 Population Below Federal Poverty Level	6
Table 2-5	2011 Race	8
Table 2-6	2011 Limited English Proficiency Population	0
Table 2-7	2012 Disabled Population	62
Table 2-8	2011 Veteran Population	4
Table 3-1	Public Transit Provider Services Overview4	2
Table 3-2	Human Service Transportation Provider Overview4	4
Table 3-3	Privately Operated Public Transportation Services Overview4	-5
Table 4-1	Estimates of Funds Generated Through Alternative Revenue Sources6	51
Table 6-1	Existing and Projected Operating Expenses and Revenues to Maintain Existing Service Levels (2013 – 2040)6	58
Table 6-2	Intermountain TPR Average Transit Operating Cost6	9
Table 7-1	Financial Summary7	

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	GLOSSARY OF TERMS
APPENDIX B	TRANSIT WORKING GROUP
APPENDIX C	PUBLIC OUTREACH MATERIALS AND ATTENDANCE
APPENDIX D	PROVIDER AND HUMAN SERVICE AGENCY SURVEYS
APPENDIX E	CDOT STATEWIDE SURVEY OF OLDER ADULTS AND ADULTS WITH DISABILITIES – INTERMOUNTAIN REPORT

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Public transportation is a lifeline for many residents throughout the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region (TPR) and state of Colorado. Transit services connect residents, employees, and visitors to major activity centers such as jobs, schools, shopping, medical care and recreation. These transit services are important contributing factors to the economic, social, and environmental health of the state and also provide many benefits to individuals and communities. The following are just a few of the benefits:

- Economic benefits of transit include providing access to jobs, shopping, and other destinations; creating jobs in public transit and related industries; reducing the cost of transportation for individuals and families with a portion of the cost savings redirected to the local economy; providing businesses with access to a broader labor market with more diverse skills; and providing savings associated with the reliability and effects of reduced congestion.
- Social benefits of transit include providing transportation options to access destinations; reducing household expenditures on transportation, allowing savings to be spent in the local economy; reducing non-transportation service costs; reducing travel time and accidents because of less congestion on the road; providing accessibility of transit by all segments of the population; providing health benefits associated with walking to/from transit; and providing an overall savings in time and money.
- Environmental benefits of transit include reducing emissions and the carbon footprint, reducing gas consumption, improving air quality with a reduction in associated health issues; and lessening impacts on the environment and neighborhoods due to transit's typically smaller footprint.

The Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) within the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), in cooperation with the Intermountain TPR, developed this Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan to meet all CDOT and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) planning requirements for funding eligibility and planning for Colorado's transit needs.

CDOT will use this plan to evaluate grant applications for state and federal funds received by regional transit and human service providers over the next five years. Transit and human service providers in the TPR will use this plan to prioritize transit investments in the next several years that work toward implementation of the TPR's long-term transit vision and goals, and priority strategies.

1.1 Purpose of Plan

This plan serves as the Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan for the region per FTA requirements. It identifies projects and strategies to enable the region's transit and human service providers to improve mobility of the populations who rely upon human service transportation or public transit, to minimize duplication of federally-funded services, and to leverage limited funds. The coordination projects and strategies identified generally have a short-term focus and are based on the prioritized needs of the TPR.

In addition, this plan identifies a regional transit vision and financial plan to guide transit investment over the next 20+ years. Along with the State's other Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plans, this plan will act as the foundation for Colorado's first Statewide Transit Plan setting the stage for CDOT's vision, goals, policies and strategies for long-term transit investment.

Key findings and recommendations from this Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan will be integrated into the Statewide Transit Plan and into the region's Regional Transportation Plan. Both of these documents will become part of the Statewide Transportation Plan which is a long-term comprehensive policy document intended to address the state's multimodal transportation needs.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

1.2 Federal and State Planning Regulations

There are a variety of federal and state planning regulations and requirements that are met through the development of this plan and its incorporation in the Statewide Transit Plan. These are described below.

1.2.1 Federal Planning Regulations

Federal planning regulations are codified in 23 Code of Federal Regulations 450, which requires each state to carry out a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive statewide multimodal transportation planning process. This includes the development of a long-range statewide transportation plan with a minimum 20-year forecast period for all areas of the state and a statewide transportation improvement program that facilitates the safe and efficient management, operation, and development of surface transportation systems that will serve the mobility needs of people and freight (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) and that fosters economic growth and development within and between states and urbanized areas, while minimizing transportation-related fuel consumption and air pollution in all areas of the state. The long-range transportation plan shall consider connections among public transportation, non-motorized modes (e.g., bicycle and pedestrian facilities), rail, commercial motor vehicle, and aviation facilities, particularly with respect to intercity travel.

The transportation planning process considers projects, strategies and services that address several planning factors including:

- Economic vitality of the US, state, metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas
- Safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users
- Security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users
- Accessibility and mobility of people and freight
- Protection and enhancement of the environment, promotion of energy conservation, improvement of the quality of life, and promotion of consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns
- Enhancement of integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes throughout the state, for people and freight
- Promotion of efficient system management and operations
- Preservation of the existing transportation system

The planning process is to be conducted in coordination with local officials in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas, federal land management agencies, Tribal governments, health and human service agencies, and agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation. In addition, preparation of the Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plans should be coordinated and consistent with the statewide transportation planning process.

1.2.2 MAP-21

On July 6, 2012, President Obama signed into law Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), providing approximately \$10 billion per year nationally for transit funding in fiscal years 2013 and 2014. CDOT receives and distributes a portion of these federal transit funds to transit and human service providers throughout Colorado through a competitive grant process. Under MAP-21 several of the transit programs were consolidated and streamlined and there is a new requirement that recipients of transit funds develop a Transit Asset Management Plan. There is also new emphasis on performance-based planning and establishment of performance measures and targets that must be incorporated into the long-range planning and short-term programming processes. Seven national goal areas were established: safety, infrastructure condition, congestion reduction, system reliability, freight movement and economic vitality, environmental sustainability, and reduced

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

project delivery delays. In August 2014, MAP-21, which was set to expire on September 30, 2014, was given a short-term extension to May 31, 2015.

Similar to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), the previous transportation authorization bill, MAP-21 requires that projects selected for federal funding under the Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities program (Section 5310) be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit human services transportation plan. This plan meets this requirement for the region. While not a requirement for other FTA funds, FTA recommends, as a best practice, that all projects be identified through a coordinated planning process and be consistent with a plan.

1.2.3 Title VI

Title VI is a federal statute that is intended to ensure that programs (including public transit and human services) receiving federal financial assistance do not discriminate or deny benefits to people based on race, color, or national origin, including the denial of meaningful access to transit-related programs and activities for people with limited English proficiency (LEP). Title VI applies to CDOT and all CDOT grant partners receiving federal funds. While this document is not intended to be a Title VI compliance report, it does provide information on the demographic characteristics in the region compared to services provided in the region to assist with a Title VI assessment. The process to develop this transit plan includes information and outreach to individuals by providing language assistance upon request and by providing public information materials in Spanish.

1.2.4 Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 calls on all federal agencies to make environmental justice part of their mission by identifying and addressing disproportionate and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. Similar to Title VI, this plan does not provide a comprehensive environmental justice evaluation. It does, however, provide information on low-income and minority populations in comparison service areas in the region to assist with understanding how well these populations are served by transit services in the region. The process used to develop this transit plan included information and outreach to low-income and minority populations in the Intermountain Region and throughout the state.

1.2.5 Colorado Planning Requirements

CDOT is the agency responsible for providing strategic planning for statewide transportation systems to meet the transportation needs and challenges faced by Colorado; promoting coordination between different modes of transportation; and enhancing the state's prospects to obtain federal funds by responding to federal mandates for multimodal planning. State planning regulations, consistent with federal planning regulations, call for a multimodal plan that considers the connectivity between modes of transportation, coordination with local land use planning, focuses on preservation of the existing transportation system to support the economic vitality of the region, enhances safety of the system, addresses strategic mobility and multimodal choice, supports urban and rural mass transit, promotes environmental stewardship, provides for effective, efficient and safe freight transport, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

In 2009, state legislation created DTR with responsibility for planning, developing, operating, and integrating transit and rail into the statewide transportation system. As part of that mandate, a statewide transit and passenger rail plan that identifies local, interregional and statewide transit and passenger rail needs and priorities shall be developed and integrated into the Statewide Transportation Plan.

As a first step, a State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan was developed by DTR and adopted by the Colorado Transportation Commission in March 2012 (see **Section 1.3.2** for a summary). The next step was to develop the Statewide Transit Plan, which was done concurrently to the development of this Regional Transit Plan. The

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

Division may also expend funds to construct, maintain, and operate interregional transit, advanced guideway, and passenger rail services, among other things.

In addition, DTR is responsible for the administration of federal and state transit grants. In accordance with FTA, DTR will use this plan to determine if grant applications are consistent and compatible with the Plan's vision, goals, and strategies. Those that are consistent will be eligible for state and federal funding allocations through CDOT.

1.3 Relevant Statewide Background Reports/Plans

The following section describes transportation planning documents that have been completed in the last five years and their key findings and recommendations relevant to this Regional Transit Plan.

1.3.1 Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

CDOT adopted Colorado's first Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan in October 2012. The plan focuses on the development of investment criteria for evaluating bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, and performance measures. These criteria are based on a vision and eight broadly supported goals that can be achieved in part through improved bicycle and transportation projects and increased bicycling and walking activity. The goals, identified through extensive public and stakeholder input, include the following:

- 1. Enhance safety
- 2. Increase bicycling and walking activity
- 3. Expand recreational opportunities and enhance quality of life
- 4. Improve public health
- 5. Improve environment, air quality, and fossil fuel independence
- 6. Provide transportation equity
- 7. Maximize transportation investments
- 8. Improve the state and regional economies

The plan points out that nearly all transit trips begin and end with a walking trip and many also include a bicycle trip at the origin and/or destination and that successful bicycle and pedestrian networks have the potential to greatly expand the reach and effectiveness of public transit. Colorado's major metropolitan transit agencies, as well as many mountain communities, operate buses with bike racks. The plan suggests that the next step will be to increase the percentage of transit stops and stations that are easily accessible by bike or on foot and the percentage that provide secure bicycle parking.

1.3.2 Colorado State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan

The Colorado State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan, completed in March 2012, offers recommendations for both short- and long-term investments in the state's rail system while embracing a performance-based evaluation process and positioning Colorado to receive federal funding for infrastructure projects. This plan provides guidance for investing in future rail needs and presents ways to enhance passenger and freight rail development to support economic growth and environmental sustainability. It is a project-based plan required to have a major update at least every five years. In 2014, CDOT amended the passenger rail elements with a high-speed transit vision, based on the conclusions of the Advanced Guideway System (AGS) Feasibility Study and the Interregional Connectivity Study (ICS). The high-speed transit vision encompasses 340 miles of high-speed passenger transit network through or affecting four I-70 Mountain Corridor counties west of the Denver region from Eagle County Regional Airport to Denver International Airport (DIA), and twelve I-25 Front Range counties from Fort Collins to Pueblo. The next update for the Plan is anticipated to begin in 2016.

Passenger rail elements of the Colorado State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan that could potentially impact travel in and to the Intermountain region are numerous. The State Rail Plan identifies these suggested projects

Regional Coordinated Transit and

Human Services Plan

without any statement about the feasibility or likelihood of action. The projects have been compiled based on recommendations/options from other plans or studies, as well as through stakeholder and public comment during the plan development. Projects include upgrades to the passenger rail cars on Amtrak's California Zephyr route, the acquisition of additional cars for Amtrak's California Zephyr route, possible passenger rail from Glenwood Springs to Aspen, possible passenger rail on Tennessee Pass Line from Gypsum to Leadville, possible passenger rail to connect to Amtrak's California Zephyr route between Pueblo and Dotsero via Tennessee Pass Line, and possible passenger rail from Glenwood Springs to Steamboat Springs.

1.3.3 Colorado 2011 Aviation System Plan

The Colorado Aviation System Plan Update, completed in 2011, is a performance-based plan that summarizes how airports of different classifications are meeting their assigned objectives and how the state airport system as a whole measures up. It identifies and describes actions and projects with the potential to improve system performance and offers generalized cost estimates for these policy choices.

This plan includes an objective for all airports in the Major and Intermediate categories to have access to ground transportation services for the millions of visitors who reach Colorado each year by air and support the Colorado economy. Ground transportation could include shuttles, taxis, buses, rail, and rental cars. There are no airports in the Intermountain region that have been identified in the plan as needing improved ground transportation.

1.3.4 Colorado Statewide Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan

The 2014 Colorado Statewide Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan updates the 2008 plan. The plan develops a regional network and provides policies for extending regional services within Colorado in addition to state-to-state trips served by intercity bus. It also provides a specific analysis of the I-70 corridor. Several types of service are evaluated in the plan including:

- Interregional Express Bus service Travels between regions, focuses on commuter service; it typically operates weekdays, and attempts to provide time sensitive travel times.
- Intercity Bus service Provides long-distance travel connecting major hubs throughout the nation, is typically funded with fares, and carries luggage and sometimes packages.
- Regional Bus service Provides travel into urban areas and resort communities, typically provides more frequent bus service each day than intercity bus service. Operating and administrative funds come from federal, state and/or local sources.
- Essential Bus service Focuses on meeting the needs of residents in rural areas for medical and essential services, and typically provides very infrequent service.

Recommendations made in this plan for the Intermountain TPR include an interregional express route from Glenwood Springs to Denver, an intercity route from Frisco to Kremmling, a regional route from Glenwood Springs to Gypsum, and the addition of an essential services route from Craig to Grand Junction. **Figure 1-1** includes the existing and proposed statewide routes identified in the Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan





Source: 2014 Colorado Statewide Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan

1.3.5 Interregional Connectivity Study and Advanced Guideway System Feasibility Study

The ICS and the AGS Feasibility Study, together, represent the vision for a comprehensive future high-speed transit system in the state. The two studies were conducted between April 2012 and 2014 and were coordinated throughout the planning processes, each examining the potential for high-speed transit alignments and ridership along different corridors. The ICS study limits included DIA to the east, the C-470/I-70 interchange near Golden to the west, the city of Fort Collins to the north, and the city of Pueblo to the south. The AGS study limits extended from the C-470/I-70 interchange near Golden west to Eagle County Regional Airport. **Figure 1-2** provides a snapshot of the study area.

Figure 1-2 ICS and AGS Study Area



Source: Interregional Connectivity Study, 2014

The recommendations for the ICS system, combined with the I-70 Mountain Corridor AGS system, estimate 18 million riders per year in 2035, with corresponding revenue of \$342 million to \$380 million annually. Implementation of the high-speed transit vision (both ICS and AGS combined) is estimated at over \$30 billion in capital costs. Implementation of the full high-speed transit vision from Fort Collins to Pueblo is assumed to begin with a Minimum Operating Segment such as DIA to Briargate to the south or DIA to Fort Collins to the north.

Detailed information and reports on each study can be found on CDOT's Transit and Rail Program website.

1.3.6 Southwest Energy Efficiency Project – Economic Benefits of Transit Systems: Colorado Case Studies

In September 2013, the Southwest Energy Efficiency Project released their report, "Economic Benefits of Transit Systems: Colorado Case Studies," which examined Fort Collins, the Roaring Fork Valley, and Grand Valley. This study showed quantifiable annual net benefits created by transit systems in each of the respective communities. Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) provides an annual net benefit of \$38.6 to \$49.9 million to the Roaring Fork Valley. These benefit calculations took into account gasoline savings, vehicle maintenance savings, reduced congestion savings, avoided public assistance payments, reduced parking infrastructure demand, reduced cost of medical trips, and income from employment accessible by transit. Other benefits of transit that cannot be monetarily quantified include increased independence for elderly and disabled citizens, improved air quality, and health benefits of walking or biking to and from transit stops.

1.4 Relevant Intermountain TPR Background Studies/Plans

Past studies conducted within the Intermountain TPR provide a framework for understanding the transportation needs throughout the region. Relevant reports and plans are listed below with a brief description and key findings.

1.4.1 2035 Intermountain Local Transit and Human Service Transportation Coordination Plan

In 2008, the Intermountain TPR completed its Local Transit and Human Service Transportation Coordination Plan as part of its 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. The Intermountain region had three plans developed for subareas within the region: Intermountain Central (Eagle and Lake counties), Intermountain East (Summit County) and Intermountain West (Garfield and Pitkin counties). The information and outcomes from these plans were incorporated into the Intermountain 2035 Regional Transportation Plan to reflect the multimodal needs of the region. The recommendations included in the transit plans were used as a starting place for discussion of transit needs and in developing this document.

1.4.2 Aspen Airport Master Plan (2012)

The Aspen/Pitkin County Airport's Master Plan is a guide that presents a comprehensive overview of the airport's needs, including the timing and cost for proposed improvements, an analysis of financing options, and an implementation plan. Recommendations in the plan include completing a study of best practices for mass transit service at other similar airports and that the airport should define specific measures to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation. Additionally, the airport, Pitkin County, RFTA, and CDOT shall continue to coordinate as the terminal, bus rapid transit station, and pedestrian underpass designs progress to ensure that all projects are linked and integrated. The Final Report can be found at

http://aspenairportplanning.com/index.php?option=com_content &view=article&id=1&Itemid=3.

1.4.3 Breckenridge Transit Plan (2009)

The 2009 Breckenridge Transit Plan completed an operations analysis for the existing FREE RIDE and evaluated the needs for future service expansion. Recommendations include how to make the system more efficient, develop new route structures and schedules, and provide information for making key decisions on future levels of service and how that service is structured both internally in terms of staffing and externally in terms of actual operations. The Final Plan can be found at http://breckfreeride.com/index.aspx?page=1505.

1.4.4 CDOT Statewide Survey of Older Adults and Adults with Disabilities (2013)

In 2013, CDOT DTR conducted a statewide survey to learn about the travel behavior and characteristics of older adult (65 years or older) and disabled (18 years or older) residents of Colorado, and to determine their

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

transportation priorities, needs, and preferences. The survey also gathered information on the gaps and barriers to using transit and identified areas of focus to help address the transportation needs of older adults and adults with disabilities. The survey was conducted through direct mail efforts and also distributed by agencies throughout the state that serve older adults and adults with disabilities. Both Spanish and English versions were available for respondents. Survey results are reported at the statewide level as well as by TPR. Additional information and findings from the survey are included in Chapter 5 of this plan. **Appendix E** includes the full survey report for the Intermountain region.

1.4.5 City of Rifle Transit Circulator Feasibility Study (2011)

The City of Rifle and RFTA Transit Circulator Feasibility Study conducted an exploration into the viability and feasibility for providing transit services within the City of Rifle. The study found the potential for a new local transit service to meet the needs of the general public and recommended the City begin an implementation plan to establish funding streams and public support for the service. The Draft Final Report can be found at http://www.rifleco.org/documents/14/47/RIFLE-RFTACirculatorFeasibilityStudy_FINAL.PDF.

1.4.6 Eagle County Airport Master Plan (2014)

The Eagle County Airport's Master Plan is a 20-year guide that presents a comprehensive overview of the airport's needs, including the timing and cost for proposed improvements, an analysis of financing options, and an implementation plan. The plan indicates that the Eagle County Airport is very mature, and a small amount of growth in passenger enplanements is expected over the planning horizon (1.7 percent annually). The plan also shows that the majority of flights are generated or supported in some way by resort communities and that there is significant seasonal influx of passengers in the first quarter of the year. There are no direct recommendations in the plan relevant to transit. The Final Plan can be found at

http://www.eaglecounty.us/Airport/Master Plan/Project Documents/.

1.4.7 Feasibility Study – Integrating Town of Breckenridge and Breckenridge Ski Resort Transit Services (2012)

This Feasibility Study evaluates the opportunity to integrate the Town of Breckenridge and Breckenridge Ski Resort transit services. Recommendations from the study identify the desire to take a phased approach to pursuing integration with an implementation plan identifying the need to build a strong working relationship which may eventually result in the complete consolidation of the two services. The Final Study can be found at http://breckfreeride.com/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=5796.

1.4.8 Glenwood Springs State Highway 82 Corridor Optimization Plan (2010)

The SH 82 Corridor Optimization Plan serves as the third in a series of documents designed to identify transportation concerns and alternatives for addressing future transportation demand on the highway, which serves as "Main Street" in Glenwood Springs. The plan focuses on alternatives and does not recommend a preferred alternative; included strategies are transit operations and capacity, transportation demand management, roadway operations, transportation system management, local circulation improvements, highway relocation, new bridge, interchange, and highway expansion. The Final Plan can be found at http://www.ci.glenwood-springs.co.us/departments/publicworks/Engineering/10-12-14%20Final%20SH%2082%20COP.pdf.

1.4.9 RFTA Midvalley Local Transit Service Feasibility Study (2011)

The RFTA Midvalley Local Transit Feasibility Study was conducted to plan for future transit service needs in the communities of Basalt, Carbondale, El Jebel, and the immediately surrounding unincorporated areas of Garfield, Eagle, and Pitkin counties. The plan recommendations include initial and ultimate plan recommendations that

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

expand existing fixed route services and Americans with Disabilities Act paratransit service with attention to the connection with VelociRFTA service. The Final Report can be found at http://www.lsccs.com/projects/rfta/final.htm.

1.4.10 Rifle Downtown Transit Oriented Development Strategic Plan (2013)

The Rifle Downtown Transit Oriented Development Strategic Plan builds upon the City's 2008 Downtown Master Plan by identifying needs, assessing market realities, and providing a planning strategy for the downtown over a 15-year planning horizon. Transit recommendations were developed by completing an Integrated Transit Vision and Phased Long Range Transit Plan, which identified future local transit routes, a plan for the future development of a regional high capacity transit system in the I-70 corridor, a new park-n-ride facility, and design considerations for accommodating transit along local streets. The Final Report can be found at http://www.downtownrifle.net/.

1.5 Plan Methodology

Many strategies were used to obtain the data and public input needed to develop this Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan. One of the foundational elements of the methodology was to use the Guiding Principles developed by CDOT's Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) to guide the process. A Statewide Steering Committee (SSC) was formed to create a framework for the development of the regional and statewide transit plans, to create a statewide vision, supporting goals and objectives for transit, and to guide the overall plan development process. Demographic data were used to identify regional characteristics and growth projections for transit demand in the future. Additionally, the Intermountain region created a Transit Working Group (TWG) that met three times over the course of the planning process, developed a survey to obtain operational data and issues and needs from stakeholders, and held public open houses to gather input from the public.

1.5.1 Transit and Rail Advisory Committee Guiding Principles

The following are the Guiding Principles developed by the TRAC, which serve as a foundation for developing transit policies at CDOT. The guiding principles were also used to guide the development of this plan.

TRAC Guiding Principles

- When planning and designing for future transportation improvements, CDOT will consider the role of transit in meeting the mobility needs of the multimodal transportation system. CDOT will facilitate increased modal options and interface to facilities for all transportation system users.
- CDOT will consider the role of transit in maintaining, maximizing and expanding system capacity, and extending the useful life of existing transportation facilities, networks, and right-of-way.
- CDOT will promote system connectivity and transit mobility by linking networks of local, regional, and interstate transportation services.
- CDOT will work toward integrating transit to support economic growth and development, and the state's economic vitality. CDOT will pursue transit investments that support economic goals in an environmentally responsible manner.
- CDOT will establish collaborative partnerships with local agencies, transit providers, the private sector, and other stakeholders to meet the state's transit needs through open and transparent processes.
- CDOT will advocate for state and federal support of transit in Colorado including dedicated, stable and reliable funding sources for transit. Through partnerships, CDOT will leverage the limited transit funds available to seek new dollars for transit in Colorado.

1.5.2 Plan Development Process

At the inception of the planning process for the Intermountain region, the planning team identified key stakeholders to be invited to participate in a TWG to guide and direct the development of the Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan. The TWG included representatives from public and private transit agencies, human service organizations, workforce centers, area agencies on aging, veteran organizations, community centered boards, elected officials, municipal staff, CDOT DTR, DTD, and regional staff, and key consultant team members. The TWG convened at key intervals throughout the planning process with the following objectives:

- **Meeting 1 (July 2013)**: Identify the region's transit and human service transportation issues/needs and provide information on plan approach. Develop draft transit vision and goals.
- **Meeting 2 (October 2013)**: Finalize regional transit vision and goals; gather input on approach to prioritization of regional transit projects; and identify potential regional coordination strategies.
- **Meeting 3 (February 2014)**: Review key concepts and major findings; identification of final plan strategies; overview of financial scenarios; and concurrence on plan recommendations.

The TWG identified visionary concepts for transit within their region at Meeting 1, and from that juncture, the planning team drafted a transit vision statement and key supporting goals. At Meeting 2, the TWG reviewed the statewide transit vision, goals, and objectives developed by the SSC to ensure that their region was also compatible with the larger statewide transit vision and goals. The TWG refined and provided comment on the region's transit vision and goals to ensure that it met the needs of the region. The transit vision and supporting goals were used to vet key strategies and projects to include in the plan. At Meeting 3, the TWG identified high-priority strategies for inclusion in the implementation portion of this plan. **Appendix B** includes a list of TWG invitees, TWG meeting materials and minutes, and TWG meeting sign in sheets.

Additionally, as part of the plan development process a transit provider and human service agency survey was developed and distributed to obtain provider service, operational and financial information. The TWG assisted with completion of the surveys. Survey results were used to identify needs and gaps in service for human services and general public transit, to develop financial summaries of agencies in the TPR, and to support the development of high priority strategies for implementation in the TPR. **Appendix D** includes provider and human service agency survey respondents, and survey questionnaires.

Another element of the planning process was the review of demographic characteristics, growth projections and the development of a future transit demand methodology. The methodology developed included the use of general population growth projections through 2040, as well as the growth of the population aged 65+ through 2040.

1.5.3 Public Involvement Process

Public outreach and involvement for the Statewide Transit Plan and Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plans was conducted to be inclusive of all interested stakeholders. Strategies included public open houses, three TWG meetings, a Transit Plan website for sharing plan information, and an online comment form. The website provided up-to-date information on SSC meetings, TWG meetings, and public meetings in each TPR. Exhibit boards, PowerPoint presentations, meeting materials and meeting notes for all meetings were made available on the website.

INTERMOUNTAIN

..a la reunión pública sobre el

cios de tradu

Plan Estatal de Transporte Público de CDOT

ción, para solicitar ac

nas con incapacidad, o para pedir se yendo lenguaje de signos}, llamar a

Si no puede asistir a la re

l lugar de la r

vited

Tuesday October 8 GS City Council Ch 101 West 8th Street

For more information, or for those who require accommodation for disabilities or a language interpreter, including hearing impaired please contact Berth Vogelsang at (303)569-5651 no later than 3 business days before the meeting. The facility is accessible for disable individuals.

Can't make the meeting? materials and provide comments at our project website. http://cloaradotransportationmatters.com/other-cdot-pie Comments can also be made using the CDDT PrinToit at http://dtapps.coloradodot.info/pintransit

El Plan Estatal de Transporte Público de CDOT responde a las necesidades locales y regionales de tra y de transporte para personas en su región y en todo el estado. ¡Su opinión será muy valiosa!

cil Chambers

Glenwood Springs, CO 81050 Hora: 4:00 pm - 6:00 pm

Transportation Planning Region

🗄 Statewide

Transit Plan

...to the CDOT Statewide Transit Plan

Public Open House!

CDOT's Statewide Transit Plan addresses the local and regional transit and human service transportation

needs in your region and across the state.

Your input is greatly needed!

Please join us for one of the two public meetings in your area

Por favor, haga planes para participar en una de estas dos reunior públicas en su área:

mmit County Senior Center Locatio

CO 80m - 6:30 pm

REGIÓN INTERMOUNTAIN

0083 Nancy's Pla Frisco, CO 80443 4:30 pm - 6:30 pm Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

DOT

Seventeen public open house meetings were held throughout the rural areas of the state across the 10 rural TPRs. Notification of the open houses was provided to the TWG members, local agencies, transit providers, local libraries, community centers, senior centers, and local media. Information was prepared in both Spanish and English. Translation services were provided upon request for language and hearing impaired. Meetings were held in ADA accessible facilities. **Appendix C** includes sign-in sheets and meeting materials from the Intermountain TPR public meetings.

The Intermountain TPR public open house meetings were held on October 2, 2013, at the Summit County Senior Center in Frisco and on October 8, 2013, at the Glenwood Springs City Council Chambers. The meetings were open house format with the project team making a presentation. Public comments were collected via computer, hard copy comment forms, and the plan website. Additionally, an online GIS-based mapping tool was created to record geographically based comments. Attendees included the general public, transit providers, elected officials, and agency staff. Input received from attendees included the following key comments:

- Maintaining existing services is a priority.
- Regional connections along I-70 within the Intermountain TPR and to Denver are important.
- > There is a need for improved connections between Eagle and Glenwood Springs.
- There is limited service between Glenwood Springs and Summit County.
- Current and future funding is needed for transit operations.
- There needs to be a link among RFTA, ECO Transit, and Summit Stage; cooperation and coordination are the keys to better efficiency.
- There is a lack of service for recreational activities in all counties.
- There is a lack of medial transportation services.
- > There is a need to provide local and regional transit service for the elderly and disabled.

1.6 Relationship to Statewide Planning Efforts

As previously mentioned, this Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan will be integrated into the Statewide Transit Plan, as well as the Regional Transportation Plan. The Statewide Transit Plan and Regional Transportation Plan will then be integrated in the Statewide Transportation Plan, which is a long-term comprehensive policy document intended to address the state's multimodal transportation needs.

The Statewide Transit Plan is a performance-based plan that includes a statewide transit vision statement and a set of performance measures to track CDOT's progress at achieving the statewide transit vision and goals over time.

1.6.1 Statewide Transit Vision and Goals

This region's transit vision and goals directly support the statewide transit vision, supporting goals, and objectives that were developed through the statewide planning process. The statewide transit vision and goals

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

are broad and reflective of the entire state. They were developed through a series of meetings with the SSC over the course of this plan's development.

Statewide Transit Vision

Colorado's public transit system will enhance mobility for residents and visitors in an effective, safe, efficient, and sustainable manner; will offer meaningful transportation choices to all segments of the state's population; and will improve access to and connectivity among transportation modes.

Supporting Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives that are related to the impacts of transit on the statewide transportation network were crafted in the planning process. Statewide goals and objectives include:

Transit System Development and Partnerships

Increase communication, collaboration, and coordination within the statewide transportation network by supporting and implementing strategies that:

- Meet travelers' needs
- Remove barriers to service
- Develop and leverage key partnerships
- Encourage coordination of services to enhance system efficiency

Mobility/Accessibility

Improve travel opportunities within and between communities by supporting and implementing strategies that:

- Strive to provide convenient transit opportunities for all populations
- Make transit more time-competitive with automobile travel
- Create a passenger-friendly environment, including information about available services
- Increase service capacity
- Enhance connectivity among local, intercity, and regional transit services and other modes
- Support multimodal connectivity and services

Environmental Stewardship

Develop a framework of a transit system that is environmentally beneficial over time by supporting and implementing strategies that:

- Reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions
- Support energy efficient facilities and amenities

Economic Vitality

Create a transit system that will contribute to the economic vitality of the state, its regions, and its communities to reduce transportation costs for residents, businesses, and visitors by supporting and implementing strategies that:

- Increase the availability and attractiveness of transit
- Inform the public about transit opportunities locally, regionally, and statewide
- Further integrate transit services into land use planning and development

System Preservation and Expansion

Establish public transit as an important element within an integrated multimodal transportation system by supporting and implementing strategies that:

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

- Preserve existing infrastructure and protect future infrastructure and right-of-way
- Expand transit services based on a prioritization process
- Allocate resources toward both preservation and expansion
- Identify grant and other funding opportunities to sustain and further transit services statewide
- Develop and leverage private sector investments

Safety and Security

Create a transit system in which travelers feel safe and secure and in which transit facilities are protected by supporting and implementing strategies that:

- Help agencies maintain safer fleets, facilities and service
- > Provide guidance on safety and security measures for transit systems

1.6.2 Statewide Transit Performance Measures

Under MAP-21, the U.S. DOT will establish performance measures and state DOTs will develop complementary performance targets. For transit, MAP-21 focuses on the state of good repair and asset management. Transit agencies receiving federal assistance are required to develop performance targets for state of good repair. They will also be required to develop asset management plans, which include capital asset inventories, condition assessments, decision support tools, and investment prioritization. Within four years of the enactment of MAP-21 and every other year thereafter, states are required to submit reports on the progress made toward achieving performance targets.

DTR initiated the development of transit performance measures in their document entitled *Establishing a Framework for Transit and Rail Performance Measures*, December 2012. They have continued the effort through the inclusion of measures in CDOT Policy Directive 14, which provides a framework for the statewide transportation planning process, which will guide development of a multimodal, Statewide Transportation Plan and distribution of resources for the Statewide Transportation Plan, the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, and the annual budget.

Based on this work, an initial set of performance measures was developed and reviewed with the SSC for the Statewide Transit Plan. Comments and suggestions from the SSC were then taken to the TRAC performance measure subcommittee and the TRAC statewide transit plan subcommittee for review followed by approval of the full TRAC. Through this process, the performance measures below were identified as a reasonable starting point for DTR to initiate its performance based planning work. These performance measures meet the requirements of MAP-21.

At the regional level, transit agencies are encouraged to review and use these categories and performance measures to identify and implement projects that help achieve the state's transit vision and meet the national goals.

Category	Goal	Performance Measure
System Preservation and Expansion	Establish public transit as an important element within an integrated multimodal transportation system.	 Portion of CDOT grantees with Asset Management Plans in place for state or federally funded vehicles, buildings, and equipment by 2017 (PD 14) Percentage of vehicles in rural Colorado transit fleet in fair, good, or excellent condition, per FTA definitions (PD 14) Annual revenue service miles of regional, interregional, and intercity passenger service (PD 14)

Table 1-1 CDOT Division of Transit and Rail Performance Measures

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

termountain

Transportation Planning Region

Category	Goal	Performance Measure			
Mobility/Accessibility	Improve travel opportunities within and between communities.	 Percentage of rural population served by public transit Annual revenue service miles of regional, interregional, and intercity passenger service (PD 14) Percent of agencies providing up-to-date online map/schedule information Annual small urban and rural transit grantee ridership compared to five year rolling average (PD 14) 			
Transit System Development and Partnerships	Increase communication, collaboration and coordination within the statewide transportation network.	 Percentage of grantee agencies reporting active involvement in local/regional coordinating councils or other transit coordinating agency 			
Environmental Stewardship	Develop a framework of a transit system that is environmentally beneficial over time.	 Percentage of statewide grantee fleet using compressed natural gas, hybrid electric or clean diesel vehicles or other low emission vehicles Passenger miles traveled on fixed-route transit 			
Economic Vitality	Create a transit system that will contribute to the economic vitality of the state, its regions, and its communities to reduce transportation costs for residents, businesses, and visitors.	 Percentage of major employment and activity centers that are served by public transit 			
Safety and Security	Create a transit system in which travelers feel safe and secure and in which transit facilities are protected.	 Percentage of vehicles in rural Colorado transit fleet in fair, good, or excellent condition, per FTA definitions (PD 14) Number of fatalities involving transit vehicles per 100,000 transit vehicle miles Percentage of grantees that have certified CDOT Safety and Security Plans which meet FTA guidance 			

1.6.3 Transit Asset Management

Asset management is a critical area of focus for any transportation provider regardless of mode. In fact, it is seen as so important that it will soon become the driving force behind CDOT's department-wide approach to resource allocation and project prioritization.

With the adoption of MAP-21, Transit Asset Management (TAM) is now a priority area of focus for FTA. MAP-21 requires that all FTA grant recipients develop TAM plans and that the states certify these plans. CDOT's approach to helping its grant partners meet this new set of requirements is based on a combination of general oversight of asset management practices at the agency level and providing focused and direct technical assistance where appropriate.

At the time of this writing, FTA had not yet provided final rules or guidance regarding how to satisfy the new asset management requirements in MAP-21. However, the legislation itself articulates two basic requirements that TAM plans must contain: an inventory of all transit capital assets and a prioritized capital development/replacement plan. CDOT is helping its grant partners meet these most basic requirements through the ongoing Statewide Transit Capital Inventory (STCI) project, which will provide a comprehensive inventory of transit assets throughout the state, including rolling stock, facilities, and park and rides. In addition to completing an asset inventory for each recipient of federal funds, CDOT and its STCI consultant team will prepare prioritized capital development/replacement plans for each transit provider. In the case that an agency has already developed an asset management plan, CDOT will review the plan for conformity with FTA's expectations and regulations.

Regional Coordinated Transit and

ntermountain

Human Services Plan

CDOT is also providing technical assistance in the form of a guide to the preparation of Asset Management Plans, a revised guide to implementing a preventative maintenance program for rolling stock, as well as training and information sessions at conferences. A Transit Infrastructure Specialist is an available resource to all grant partners as a subject matter expert on the creation and implementation of TAM plans, maintenance procedures and policies, and the development of capital projects.

Progress on CDOT's asset management initiatives will be measured by several performance metrics. Some of these are identified in CDOT's Policy Directive 14, and others have been developed as a part of this plan. Asset management related strategies are discussed in Chapter 7.

1.7 Overview of Plan Contents

The Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan is organized into seven chapters as described below. Overall, the plan is intended to paint a picture of the region, document the transportation needs based on various demographic data and trends, illustrate available funding, identify the transit needs and recommend strategies for meeting the needs over the short-, mid-, and long-term. This plan is intended to be an action plan and used to guide the region in making decisions about how best to invest limited resources to implement transit projects that improve mobility and offer transportation choices for the region.

Chapter 1 – Introduction: Describes why the plan was developed, the process used to develop the plan, and the planning requirements fulfilled by this plan.

Chapter 2 – Regional Overview: Describes the region's major activity centers and destinations, key demographics, and travel patterns. It includes existing data on populations that are often associated with transit demand in a community (people over age 65, low-income people and households without vehicles). Other data are included on persons with disabilities, veterans, race, ethnicity, and English proficiency to provide a comprehensive picture of the region's need for transit.

Chapter 3 – Existing Transit Provider and Human Service Agencies: Summarizes the key features of the region's public and private transit providers, as well as the human service agencies in the region. Information is provided on service areas, types of service, eligibility, and ridership.

Chapter 4 – Current and Potential Funding: Describes the variety of transit funding sources at various levels of government and the challenges faced by transit and human service transportation providers in seeking these various funding sources.

Chapter 5 – Transit Needs and Service Gaps: Describes key findings from the review of the region's demographic profile and the existing and future unmet transit needs.

Chapter 6 – Financial and Funding Overview: Summarizes the anticipated funding through 2040 and the funding needed through 2040 based on population growth.

Chapter 7 – Implementation Plan: Provides an overview of the high priority strategies identified in the region to meet the region's transit vision and goals over the next 15 years to 2030.

ntermountain

2.0 REGIONAL OVERVIEW

This Chapter includes an overview of the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region (TPR), provides a map that identifies major activity centers and destinations in the region, and provides demographic information about populations that are typically aligned with transit use.

2.1 Transportation Planning Region Description

The Intermountain TPR includes five counties – Eagle, Garfield, Lake, Pitkin, and Summit. The region includes more than 30 incorporated towns and cities, with a few of the largest towns and cities being Aspen, Breckenridge, Eagle, Glenwood Springs, and Vail. The approximate population in the TPR in 2013 was 170,000, which represents about 3 percent of the state's total population. The TPR is 6,600 square miles, and of that, 4,950 square miles is public and forest land. The topography of the region is mostly mountainous with the majority of the population living in areas in and near incorporated towns and cities. Given the low density of development throughout the region, many trips require long distance travel.

The Intermountain TPR is a major year-round tourist destination for activities such as skiing, hiking, camping, biking, golfing, and fishing. There are 12 major ski resorts in the region, including Arapahoe Basin, Breckenridge, Copper Mountain and Keystone in Summit County; Beaver Creek and Vail in Eagle County; Snowmass, Buttermilk, Aspen Highlands, and Aspen Mountain in Pitkin County; Ski Cooper in Lake County; and Sunlight Mountain Resort in Garfield County. The TPR is also home to Arapaho National Forest and White River National Forest, which is the third most visited park in the United States.

Given the vast recreational opportunities in the region, it is not surprising that the top employment industry in the Intermountain region is tourism and outdoor recreation. Health and wellness, and energy and natural resources are the other top two industries in the region.

The major transportation corridors/facilities in the TPR are I-70, State Highway (SH) 82, US 6, US 24, SH 9, SH 91, SH 133, and SH 131. The two primary airports in the region with commercial service are Eagle County Regional Airport and the Aspen Airport. Amtrak provides general public passenger rail service (California Zephyr) in the region that comes from Granby, stops in Glenwood Springs, and continues on to Grand Junction.

Figure 2-1 identifies many of the major activity centers and destinations within the Intermountain TPR. Major activity centers for the purpose of this plan include human service agencies, correctional institutions, grocery stores, hospitals, higher education institutions, senior citizens' services, workforce centers, mental health services, employers with 50+ employees, and ski areas. The Intermountain region's major activity centers and destinations are mostly located along the I-70 corridor, along SH 82 between Glenwood Springs and Aspen, throughout central and southern Summit County and in Leadville. Mapping the selected activity centers listed above provides a general understanding of where people who are using transit and/or are in need of human service transportation are likely to be traveling to and from within the region.



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 2-1 Major Activity Centers and Destinations Map





2.2 Regional Transit Vision and Goals

The Intermountain Transit Working Group (TWG) developed a high level vision and supporting goals for transit in the region. These were developed with consideration for the vision and goals developed for the Statewide Transit Plan by the Statewide Steering Committee (SSC). The TWG was charged with crafting a regional transit vision and supporting goals that align with the Statewide transit vision and goals. The outcome of this process resulted in the following transit vision and goals for the Intermountain TPR:

Intermountain Transit Vision:

The Intermountain TPR will provide an integrated transit network that offers access and connectivity to, from, and within the region to enhance the quality of life of all residents, businesses, employees, and visitors.

Supporting Goals:

- Improve connectivity and coordination between regional transit and transportation systems to better provide access to jobs, recreation, education, health and human services, and medical facilities.
- Ensure transit is a competitive transportation choice for all users, and support and plan for increasing shifts away from the single-occupant vehicle.
- Enhance local and regional transit service to provide congestion relief.
- Ensure transportation/mobility options are available for transit dependent populations.
- Coordinate land use and multimodal transportation planning to enhance connectivity and attractiveness of transit.
- Support transit investments that attract tourists and contribute to the economic vitality of the region and state.

2.3 **Population Characteristics**

An understanding of the distribution and density of population and employment is an integral part of the transportation planning process. Demographics such as population, employment, and age distribution can tell a story about the complex travel needs of residents and employees, especially as they relate to the use of transit service. The presentation of relevant data focusing on transit-dependent persons including older adults, persons with disabilities (including some veterans and older adults), and low-income individuals, in this Chapter is based largely on a series of maps and tables. They show key population characteristics emphasizing the transit-dependent populations that tend to have limited mobility options and a higher propensity to use and need public transit services.

Some segments of the population have a greater need for public transit and depend on it as their primary form of transportation. Typically, the reasons relate to economics, ability, or age, and whether individuals own or have access to a private vehicle. Transit dependency characteristics based on age include both youth (individuals 18 or younger) and older adults (persons age 65 or older). Others who typically rely on public transit include people with disabilities, individuals with low income, zero-vehicle households, veterans, and persons with limited English proficiency (LEP).

In general, the two key markets for public transportation services are:

- "Transit Dependent" riders who do not always have access to a private automobile. This grouping includes individuals who may not be physically (or legally) able to operate a vehicle or those who may not be able to afford to own a vehicle.
- Choice" riders are those who usually or always have access to a private automobile (either by driving a car or getting picked up by someone) but choose to take transit because it offers them

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

more or comparable convenience. For example, a choice rider might choose to add 10 minutes to their overall trip via bus to save a \$10 all-day parking charge. A commuter might choose to take a bus if they can work along the way rather than focusing on driving.

Another newer trend that has increased transit ridership over the last several years is the increase in the Millennial population choosing to use public transportation as a lifestyle choice. This generational shift is occurring across the United States as the Millennials and many other Americans are increasingly choosing to use modes of transportation other than the private automobile, such as transit, carpools, vanpools, biking, and walking. Millennials are choosing to live in walkable communities closer to jobs, recreation, and amenities so that they can use transit and eliminate the expense of vehicle ownership. This is impacting the typical travel patterns that have been seen in the United States since the coming of age of the automobile in the 1950s. Transit agencies must now consider not only the transit dependent users but also the impact that the Millennial generation will have on transit system ridership.

The following sections detail various demographic data as collected from the U.S. Census and from the State Demographer, that are typically aligned with the primary markets for transit ridership and use. They also analyze the spatial distribution of people who are more likely to take transit as well as the location of activity centers and destinations that are likely to generate transit ridership. Population within the Intermountain TPR is heavily aligned with the Interstate 70 corridor and other spurs of state highways. Thus, you see higher transit dependent populations along these corridors as well. The key demographic characteristics highlighted in this plan include older adults (65+), households with no vehicle, low-income, race and ethnicity, LEP, persons with disabilities, and veteran population.

2.3.1 **Population Growth**

Table 2-1 and **Figure 2-2** summarize the growth in population anticipated in each county in the Intermountain region. The counties with the highest overall populations in the region in 2013 are Eagle and Garfield counties and the projections indicate that this will continue into 2040. Each county within the Intermountain TPR is anticipated to see substantial growth in population by the year 2040, with the highest growth shown in Summit County (92.7 percent), Garfield County (85.3 percent), and Eagle County (84.4 percent). The total population in the TPR is projected to grow overall by approximately 142,000 or 84.1 percent by 2040 from the base year of 2013. Comparatively, the projected growth from the entire state during the same timeframe is 47.1 percent.

County	2013	2020	2030	2040	Total % Growth from 2013 to 2040
Eagle	55,582	68,350	82,362	102,472	84.4%
Garfield	59,306	72,691	92,608	109,887	85.3%
Lake	7,839	9,514	11,924	13,047	66.4%
Pitkin	17,598	20,585	25,517	30,344	72.4%
Summit	29,499	37,543	48,187	56,857	92.7%
TPR Overall	169,824	208,683	260,598	312,607	84.1%
Statewide Total	5,267,800	5,915,922	6,888,181	7,749,477	47.1%

Table 2-1Projected Population Growth by County

Source: Based on 2012 estimates provided by the Colorado State Demographer's Office through the Department of Local Affairs

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 2-2 Population Growth

Population growth based on 2012 estimates provided by the State Demographer's Office through the Colorado Department of Local Affairs and 2000 - 2010 U.S. Census Summary File 1 100% Population Count statistics.



2.3.2 Population Growth Ages 65+

Table 2-2 illustrates the anticipated growth in the population over the age of 65 from a base year of 2013 extending out to 2040. The highest anticipated growth in the 65+ population is in Eagle County, which projects a growth of 329 percent by 2040. The overall anticipated growth of the 65+ population in the Intermountain TPR from 2013 to 2040 is 226 percent. The total projected statewide growth of residents over the age of 65 is 120 percent from 2013 to 2040.

Total % Growth from 2013 2020 2030 2040 2013 to 2040 County Eagle 4,289 7,771 13,064 18,436 329.8% Garfield 221.5% 5,791 9,423 14,726 18,616 Lake 103.3% 756 1,103 1,334 1,537 Pitkin 76.7% 3,977 2,461 3,296 4,349 Summit 242.9% 3,061 5,226 8,103 10,495 **TPR Overall** 16,358 26,819 41,204 53,433 226.6% Statewide Total 645,735 891,805 1,240,944 1,423,691 120.5%

Table 2-2Projected Growth of Residents Age 65+

Source: Based on 2012 estimates provided by the Colorado State Demographer's Office through the Department of Local Affairs

Figure 2-3 shows the growth of the total population of residents age 65+ in 10-year increments to 2040.



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan





2.3.3 Zero Vehicle Households

Table 2-3 and **Figure 2-4** identify the number of households without vehicles in the five-county Intermountain region. Pitkin County has the highest percentage of households with no vehicle at 4.9 percent, and Garfield County follows at 4.3 percent. The total number of households without vehicles in the region is approximately 2,100, which is 3.8 percent of total households. The TPR falls below the statewide average of 5.7 percent of households with no vehicle in each of the five counties.

Table 2-32011 Households with No Vehicle

County	2011	% Households with No Vehicle
Eagle	393	2.1%
Garfield	861	4.3%
Lake	96	3.6%
Pitkin	360	4.9%
Summit	431	3.9%
TPR Overall	2,141	3.8%
Statewide Total	111,148	5.7%

Source: 2011 U.S. Census American Community Survey Five-Year Estimate



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 2-4 2011 Households with No Vehicle

Zero vehicle household data extracted from 2011 U.S. Census American Community Survey Table B08201 - Household size by vehicles available



2.3.4 **Poverty Level**

Table 2-4 and **Figure 2-5** illustrate the number of people who fall below the federal poverty level in the Intermountain region. While Garfield County has the highest number of people in this category, Lake County has the highest overall percentage (21.7 percent) of the population that falls below the federal poverty level and Pitkin County has the lowest (9.6 percent). The average percent of the population below the federal poverty level is 12.4 percent, which is comparable to the statewide average of 12.5 percent.

Table 2-42011 Population Below Federal Poverty Level

County	2011	% Below Federal Poverty Level
Eagle	5,266	10.2%
Garfield	5,759	10.3%
Lake	1,524	21.7%
Pitkin	1,605	9.6%
Summit	2,759	10.0%
TPR Overall	16,913	12.4%
Statewide Total	607,727	12.5%

Source: 2011 U.S. Census American Community Survey Five-Year Estimate

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 2-52011 Population Below Federal Poverty Level



Intermountain

Poverty status data extracted from 2011 U.S. Census American Community Survey Table S1701 - Poverty Status in the past 12 months.

2.3.5 Race and Ethnicity

Table 2-5 and **Figure 2-6** provide an indication of the number of the racial composition of the region and an overall understanding of the distribution of minority populations within the Intermountain TPR's five counties. Lake County has the highest minority (non-white alone) population at 25.9 percent, while Pitkin County has the lowest minority population at 4.3 percent. Every county in the TPR, except for Lake, falls below the statewide average of 16.1 percent minority population. However, the Intermountain TPR has a relatively high Hispanic and Latino population, approximately 24 percent. Throughout the state, Hispanic and Latino people account for approximately 20 percent of the population.

In addition, 24 percent of the Intermountain TPR population identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino. This is 4 percent higher than the statewide average of 20 percent.

County	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	Asian Alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone	Some Other Race Alone	Two or More Races	Minority Percentage (Non-White Alone)
Eagle	46,407	137	132	502	19	3,160	1,100	9.8%
Garfield	50,794	422	239	360	104	2,561	230	8.8%
Lake	5,194	49	154	52	24	1,409	128	25.9%
Pitkin	15,992	22	60	257	0	142	236	4.3%
Summit	25,388	136	162	319	0	1,151	340	7.7%
TPR Overall	143,775	766	747	1,490	147	8,423	2,034	11.3%
Statewide Total	4,167,044	195,640	48,201	134,228	5,798	255,364	159,786	16.1%

Table 2-5 2011 Race

Source: 2011 U.S. Census American Community Survey Five-Year Estimate



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 2-6 2011 Minority Population

Minority population data extracted from 2011 U.S. Census American Community Survey Table B02001 - Race



2.3.6 Limited English Proficiency Population

Table 2-6 and **Figure 2-7** illustrate the number of people within the region that have LEP. The American Community Survey categorizes this information based on how much English people are able to speak. For the purposes of this plan, the portion of the population that is classified as having LEP is those that speak English "not at all, not well or well" but not fluently. As a percent of the total population, Eagle County has the highest number of LEP people at 16.7 percent, with Lake County following at 14.1 percent. The overall percent of the LEP population in the TPR is 10.9 percent, which is nearly double the overall statewide total of 5.7 percent.

Table 2-6 2011 Limited English Proficiency Population

County	2011	% Limited English Proficiency
Eagle	7,959	16.7%
Garfield	6,129	12.0%
Lake	907	14.1%
Pitkin	666	4.2%
Summit	1,935	7.5%
TPR Overall	17,596	10.9%
Statewide Total	264,397	5.7%

Source: 2011 U.S. Census American Community Survey Five-Year Estimate, based on values for "Speak English – not at all, not well or well"

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 2-7 2011 Limited English Proficiency Population

Percentages based on the 2007-2011 American Community Survey Table B16004, and on values for "Speak English - not at all, not well, and well"


ntermountain

2.3.7 **Population of People with Disabilities**

Table 2-7 and **Figure 2-8** provide information about the percentage of the population that has a disability within the Intermountain region. The highest number of disabled persons live in Garfield County, and the lowest number in Lake County. The highest percentage of disabled persons as a percent of total population is located in Garfield County with 8.1 percent, and Summit County is the lowest with 3.7 percent. The percentage of disabled persons as a share of the total population for the entire State of Colorado is 9.8 percent, indicating that the Intermountain region has a relatively low disabled population.

Table 2-72012 Disabled Population

County	2012	% Disabled Population	
Eagle	2,128	4.1%	
Garfield	4,526	8.1%	
Lake	438	6.0%	
Pitkin	1,091	6.4%	
Summit	1,037	3.7%	
TPR Overall	9,220	5.8%	
Statewide Total	487,297	9.8%	

Source: 2012 U.S. Census American Community Survey Five-Year Estimate

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 2-8 2012 Disabled Population

Disability status data extracted from 2012 U.S. Census American Community Survey Table S1810 - Disability Characteristics



ntermountain

2.3.8 Veteran Population

Table 2-8 and **Figure 2-9** illustrate the veteran population within the Intermountain region. The highest number of veterans reside in Garfield County and the lowest number in Lake County. However, the highest percentage of veterans as a percent of total population is Lake County with 7.1 percent, and Eagle County is the lowest with 3.4 percent. The percentage of veterans as a percent of total population for the entire State of Colorado is 8.2 percent, indicating that the Intermountain region has a relatively low veteran population.

Table 2-82011 Veteran Population

County	2011	% Veteran Population		
Eagle	1,737	3.4%		
Garfield	3,629	6.5%		
Lake	497	7.1%		
Pitkin	1,041	6.2%		
Summit	1,408	5.1%		
TPR Overall	8,312	5.3%		
Statewide Total	405,303	8.2%		

Source: 2011 U.S. Census American Community Survey Five-Year Estimate

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 2-9 2011 Veteran Population

Veteran status data extracted from 2011 U.S. Census American Community Survey Table S2101 - Veteran Status



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

2.4 Employment and Job Characteristics

The major employment base in the Intermountain region is predominantly based on tourism and recreational activities. The region is home to 12 major ski resorts that draw visitors from across the globe in the winter and the region has developed a strong tourism draw in the summer months as well due to the attraction of National Forests, fishing, biking, and other outdoor recreational activities. Resort, lodging, retail, and food service industries associated with tourism and recreation activities in the region require a significant employment base. Many of these employees may have transit dependent characteristics. Additional robust employment industries in the TPR are health and wellness and the energy and natural resource sectors.

Figure 2-10 illustrates the job growth from a base year of 2000 out to 2040. As the figure shows, the most significant job growth in the region is projected to occur between 2010 and 2020, at greater than 25 percent. Job growth then levels out between 2020 and 2040 with the majority of counties in the region seeing job growth between 10 and 25 percent.

Figure 2-11 provides a snapshot of the commuting patterns in the region with each line indicating the number of commuter trips taken per day between counties (county-to-county trips with less than 100 commuters are not depicted). The most significant number of trips in the Intermountain region takes place from Eagle to Pitkin, from Garfield to Eagle, and from Mesa to Garfield counties. The commuter travel patterns identify that a large number of employees live a significant distance from their places of employment. In the Intermountain region, it is likely that the commuting trip distances are related to the high cost of living in this area.

2.5 Summary of Community Characteristics

As shown in **Figure 2-12**, Summit County is expected to see the highest population growth in the Intermountain region, while the highest increase in the number of adults aged 65+ is expected in Eagle County. With the overall above average growth in the elderly population, it is likely that the region will require more human service transportation options to meet the demand. Lake County has the highest population below the federal poverty level, as well as the highest minority population, while Eagle County has the largest population of persons with LEP. These transit indicators suggest that the need for employment transportation and information and marketing materials in multiple languages may be warranted. Based on the comparison of the transit need indicators for each county in the TPR to the TPR average and the statewide average, Garfield and Lake counties have the most significant number of transit indicators indicating a higher than average need for both public and human service transit options.

Job growth is expected to increase significantly in the Intermountain region until 2020 and then tapers off to 10 to 25 percent growth in all counties except Lake County until 2040. Due to the high cost of living in the Intermountain region, increased transit options will be needed to meet the demand of the workforce to get to and from jobs. These characteristics are all indicators of the need for transit service and provide insight into how to plan for transit services both now and in the future.

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 2-10 Job Growth





Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan





Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

Figure 2-12 Counties with Higher than Statewide and TPR Average Transit Needs Indicators



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

3.0 EXISTING TRANSIT PROVIDERS AND HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES

This Chapter describes existing public and private transit providers and the human service agencies in the region, as well as their current coordination activities. The information included in this Chapter was gathered through detailed surveys that were distributed to all transit providers and human service agencies in the Intermountain TPR and supplemented by telephone interviews and web research. **Figure 3-1** provides a snapshot of the primary public and private transit providers, resort transit providers, and human service agency transportation services available in the Intermountain region. While the map in **Figure 3-1** is not inclusive of every small agency, private taxi service, or mountain resort transportation provider, it does provide a useful summary of the available services, as well as an illustration of some gaps in service. **Appendix A** includes definitions of key terms used throughout this Chapter and the rest of the plan.



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Figure 3-1 Transit Provider System Map



ntermountain

3.1 Public Transit Providers

The Intermountain region has many public transit providers. Public transit services are funded by the local or regional agencies and are open to all members of the public. These differ from human service transportation services that are limited to clientele who qualify, such as people over the age of 65. The public transit providers in the TPR serve nearly 170,000 residents, millions of annual visitors, and a significant number of employees across the region. The Intermountain region has several key transit facilities that passengers can use to transfer to other services to connect with key activity centers in the region. Some of the most important connection points in the region are Avon, Eagle, Glenwood Springs, and Frisco. **Table 3-1** includes key information about each public transit provider in the region.

		Public Transit Pr	ovider Servi	ces Overv	iew		
Provider	Service Area	Service Type(s)	Span of Service	Days of Service	Fares	2012 Annual Ridership (includes all service types)	2012 Annual Operating & Admin Budget (includes all service types)
City of Aspen	City of Aspen	Fixed-RouteComplementary ADA	6:00 AM – 2:00 AM	S M T W Th F Sa	No Fare	1,100,000	\$4,700,000
City of Glenwood Springs – Ride Glenwood Springs	City of Glenwood Springs	Fixed-RouteComplementary ADA	7:00 AM – 8:00 PM	S M T W Th F Sa	\$1 per day	250,000	\$860,442
Eagle County Regional Transportation Authority (ECO Transit)	Eagle, Gypsum, Leadville/Lake County, Minturn, Red Cliff, Vail	 Fixed-Route Complementary ADA 	4:50 AM – 1:15 AM	S M T W Th F Sa	\$4 – \$7 per one way trip	731,827	\$7,145,460
Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA)	Aspen, Basalt, Carbondale, Eagle County (parts), El Jebel, Glenwood Springs, New Castle, Pitkin County, Snowmass Village, Regional Valley, and Rifle/Hogback, Woody Creek, Resorts	 Fixed-Route Complementary ADA Bus Rapid Transit (added in 2013) 	6:00 AM – 2:00 AM	S M T W Th F Sa	No Fare in Aspen City Limits, \$1 – \$10 per one- way fixed- route trip	3,951,487 (does not include Bus Rapid Transit trips)	\$31,265,550
Summit County – Lake County Link, Mountain Mobility, Summit Stage	Breckenridge, Dillon, Frisco, Leadville, Silverthorne, Lake County, Summit County	 Fixed-Route Complementary ADA 	6:00 AM – 2:00 AM	S M T W Th F Sa	No Fare Except for Lake County Link (\$5 one- way)	1,812,337	\$9,600,000

Table 3-1Public Transit Provider Services Overview

<mark>nt</mark>ermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

		Public Transit Pr	ovider Servi	ices Overvi	iew		
Provider	Service Area	Service Type(s)	Span of Service	Days of Service	Fares	2012 Annual Ridership (includes all service types)	2012 Annual Operating & Admin Budget (includes all service types)
Town of Avon Transit	Town of Avon, Beaver Creek Resort, Beaver Creek Mountain	 Fixed-Route Complementary Demand Response / ADA 	6:00 AM – 6:00 PM	S M T W Th F Sa	No Fare	253,633	\$1,002,715
Town of Breckenridge – Breckenridge Free Ride	Town of Breckenridge	Fixed-RouteComplementary ADA	6:15 AM – 11:45 PM	S M T W Th F Sa	No Fare	538,504	\$1,463,187
Town of Snowmass – Village Shuttle	Town of Snowmass Village	 Fixed-Route Deviated Fixed- Route Demand Response Complementary ADA 	6:45 AM – 12:45 AM	S M T W Th F Sa	No Fare	560,552	\$2,928,490
Vail Transit	Town of Vail	 Fixed-Route Complementary ADA 	5:45 AM – 2:15 AM	S M T W Th F Sa	No Fare	3,500,000*	*

Source: Transit Agency Provider Survey, 2013

* No survey information was received from Vail Transportation during the survey period. Ridership data for Vail Transportation as reported in the 2009 CASTA Transit Resource Directory.

3.2 Human Service Transportation Providers

Human service organizations often provide transportation for program clients to access their services and augment local public transportation services. **Table 3-2** describes human service organizations that fund or operate transportation service and participated in this coordinated planning process.

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Transportation Planning Region

Table 3-2Human Service Transportation Provider Overview

	Human Service	Transportation Provide		
Provider	Service Area	Passenger Eligibility	Service Type(s)	Days of Service
Eagle Healthy Aging	Eagle	Elderly (60+)Disabled	 Standing Schedule Demand Response - Door-to-Door 	T, Th Every other Monday and Medical trips by appointment
El Jebel Healthy Aging	El Jebel and Basalt	Elderly (60+)Disabled	 Standing Schedule Demand Response – Door-to-Door 	T, Th and Medical trips by appointment
Golden Eagle Senior Center	Eagle, with trips to Gypsum	Elderly (60+)Disabled	 Standing Schedule Demand Response – Door-to-Door 	W, F Every other Monday and Medical trips by appointment
Minturn Healthy Aging	Minturn	Elderly (60+)Disabled	 Standing Schedule Demand Response – Door-to-Door 	W, F Every other Monday and Medical trips by appointment
Mountain Valley Developmental Services (Community Centered Board)	Eagle, Garfield, Lake, and Pitkin counties	Disabled	 Fixed Route Demand Response – Door-through-Door 	S M T W Th F Sa
Pitkin County Senior Services	Pitkin County, Aspen area, Snowmass Village, Wood Creek area	Elderly (60+)Disabled	 Demand Response – Door-to-Door 	M W F
Summit County Community and Senior Center	Summit County, trips to Denver or Eagle County if needed	Elderly (50+)Disabled	 Demand Response – Door-through-Door 	M T W Th F
The Traveler	Service available to Garfield County residents. Service provided within a 5-mile radius off I-70 between Parachute and Glenwood Springs, and a 5-mile radius off Hwy 82 between Glenwood Springs and Carbondale	 Elderly (65+) Disabled 	 Demand Response – Door-to-Door 	S M T W Th F Sa
Vet Trans, Inc.	Garfield County, with trips to Grand Junction	 Veterans 	 Demand Response – Door-to-Door 	M W Th

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

3.3 Other Human Service Agencies/Programs

Many types of human service agencies in the region provide critical services and fund transportation programs but do not provide transportation for their clients. These agencies rely on public transit and human service transportation programs to get their clients where they need to go. The following types of human service agencies/programs need to be considered when determining transportation needs in the region:

- Area Agencies on Aging
- Community Centered Boards
- Departments of Human Services/Social Services (all counties)
- Departments of Public Health (all counties)
- Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (all counties)
- Healthcare Facilities
- Low-Income Housing
- Mental Health Facilities and Services
- Senior Services, Nursing Homes, Senior Centers
- Veteran's Services (all counties)
- Workforce Centers (all counties)
- Independent Living Centers
- Educational Institutions

3.4 Privately Operated Public Transportation Services

Table 3-3 provides an overview of the privately operated public transportation services that are available in the Intermountain region. These services are open to the public, but operated by private companies. This includes private resort bus and shuttle operators, taxi services, other shuttle services (e.g., airport), passenger rail service (Amtrak), and intercity bus services.

Table 3-3 Privately Oper	ted Public Transportation Services Overview
--------------------------	---

	Privately O	perated Public Transp	ortation Service	es Overview		
Provider	Service Area	Service Type(s)	Passenger Eligibility	Span of Service	Days of Service	Fares
Amtrak – California Zephyr	 Chicago –Omaha – Fort Morgan - Denver – Salt Lake City- Emeryville Station located in Glenwood Springs 	 Private long- distance passenger train service 	General Public	N/A	S M T W Th F Sa	Varies
Beaver Creek Village Transportation	Beaver Creek, Bachelor Gulch, and Arrowhead resort areas	 Fixed-Route Demand-Response Complementary ADA 	Resort Guests, Homeowners, Employees, General Public	5:00 AM – 3:00 AM	S M T W Th F Sa	No Fare
Colorado Mountain Express	 DIA/Denver to: Vail, Beaver Creek, Bachelor Gulch, Avon, Edwards Breckenridge, Keystone, Frisco, Dillon, Silverthorne, Copper Mountain Aspen, Snowmass 	 Private Shuttle Service (Door-to- Door shared-ride shuttle service and Point-to-Point service to set mountain locations for discounted rates) 	General Public, Lift- equipped vans are available by request	5:30 AM – 11:00 PM	S M T W Th F Sa	\$49 – \$118 Kids fare is half-price

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

	Privately O	perated Public Trans			Dava of	
Provider	Service Area	Service Type(s)	Passenger Eligibility	Span of Service	Days of Service	Fares
	Village, Eagle, Glenwood Springs Eagle County Airport Aspen/Pitkin County Airport Local Service in Aspen	 Private Charter Services throughout Colorado Local Shuttle Service 				
Copper Mountain Resort Shuttle	Copper Mountain Resort	 Resort Shuttle Service 	Resort Guests, Homeowners, Employees, General Public	6:00 AM – 11:00 PM (winter) 10:00 AM – 6:00 PM (Summer), No Service in May or October	S M T W Th F Sa	No Fare
Fresh Tracks	DIA to Frisco Transit Center Summit County	Resort Shuttle Service	General Public	5:00 AM – 10:00 PM	S M T W Th F Sa	\$45 – \$60
Greyhound	 Denver – Green River – Los Angeles Denver – Grand Junction Stations located in Frisco, Vail, Glenwood Springs 	 Intercity Bus Service 	General Public	Varies	S M T W Th F Sa	Varies
High Mountain Taxi	Aspen, Snowmass, Vail, Beaver Creek, Vail Airport, Eagle Airport	 Taxi Service 	General Public	24 hours per day	S M T W Th F Sa	Varies
MTN Shuttle	DIA to Breckenridge	 Private Door-to- Door Shared Ride Shuttle Service 	General Public	24 hours per day	S M T W Th F Sa	\$60 (rates reduced for 4+ passengers)
Peak One Express	DIA to Summit County, Breckenridge, Frisco	 Private Door-to- Door Shared Ride Shuttle Service to Summit County Point Drop Off in Breckenridge and Frisco 	General Public	5:00 AM – 11:15 PM	S M T W Th F Sa	\$44 – \$63 (rates reduced for 3+ passengers to Summit County)
Powderhound Transport	Breckenridge to Aspen, DIA, Steamboat, Vail	 Private Door-to- Door Shared Ride Shuttle Service 	General Public	24 hours per day	S M T W Th F Sa	\$36 – \$68
Ride Keystone	Keystone Resort	 Resort Shuttle Service 	Resort Guests, Homeowners, Employees, General Public	6:00 AM – 12:00 AM	S M T W Th F Sa (Winter season only)	No Fare
Summit Express	DIA to Breckenridge, Copper Mountain, Dillon, Frisco, Keystone	 Private Door-to- Door Shared Ride Shuttle Service Point Drop Off 	General Public	5:20 AM – 11:00 PM	S M T W Th F Sa	\$49 – \$64 (rates reduced for 3+

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Privately O	perated Public Trans	portation Service	es Overview		
		Passenger	Span of	Days of	
Service Area	Service Type(s)	Eligibility	Service	Service	Fares
					passengers)
Glenwood Springs and	= Taui Camiaa	Conorol Dublic	24 hours per	S M T W Th	Varias
the Roaring Fork Valley	Taxi Service	General Public	day	F Sa	Varies
	Service Area Glenwood Springs and	Service Area Service Type(s) Glenwood Springs and Taxi Service	Service Area Service Type(s) Passenger Eligibility Glenwood Springs and Taxi Service General Public	Service Area Service Type(s) Eligibility Service Glenwood Springs and Taxi Service General Public 24 hours per	Service Area Service Type(s) Passenger Eligibility Span of Service Days of Service Glenwood Springs and Taxi Service General Public 24 hours per S M T W Th

Source: Rates and schedules based on stakeholder input and internet information in Q1 2014.

3.5 Existing Coordination Activities

The Intermountain region has been actively working on coordination efforts for a number of years. The main coordination categories completed and/or underway in the region include those listed below. Specific projects and coordination efforts are described in more detail below.

- Facility Sharing
- Joint Vehicle Procurement
- Local/Regional Coordinating Council
- Marketing and Information Campaigns
- Mobility Management
- Partnerships
- Vehicle Sharing

3.5.1 Facility Sharing

One of the most important ways to coordinate and streamline transit service is through joint use of facilities. Throughout the region, agencies are sharing bus stops and bus stations and are sharing maintenance facilities and services.

The following lists specific examples of such coordination activities in the Intermountain region:

- ECO Transit, Avon, Beaver Creek Transportation, Summit County, and the Town of Vail all share bus shelters.
- ECO Transit purchases fuel through and receives some vehicle maintenance from the Town of Avon.
- Town of Snowmass Village maintains regional bus stops and bus stations in Snowmass Village for RFTA.
- Town of Avon Transit will be sharing the new I-70 Regional Transportation Facility with ECO Transit and Beaver Creek Transportation, allowing parking of buses, vehicle wash, fluids, fuel, and maintenance.

3.5.2 Joint Vehicle Procurement

For many years, transit agencies in the Intermountain region have come together to procure vehicles to streamline the process, secure reduced unit costs, eliminate the duplication of preparing vehicle specifications, and ensure that the vehicles are in compliance with state and federal regulations. ECO Transit and RFTA have procured vehicles together in the past, and the Town of Snowmass Village would like to also join RFTA in future vehicle procurements. Several other agencies, including Town of Breckenridge, Summit County, and the City of Aspen, either are or are considering joint vehicle procurements as well.

3.5.3 Local/Regional Coordinating Council

A Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC) was developed for the region in 2010, whose mission is to "coordinate, manage, consolidate, educate, promote, enhance, and facilitate seamless access to

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

transportation services for the veteran, disabled, older, and low-income adult populations in the geographic region composed of Garfield, Pitkin, Eagle, Summit, Grand, Jackson, and Routt Counties." The RTCC for the region meets bimonthly to work on strategic coordination projects to assist the streamlining of transportation information and services to residents, employees, and visitors. The RTCC has been very project oriented this past year, as the Northwest Colorado Council of Governments (NWCCOG) was awarded Veterans Transportation and Community Living Initiative funding to create a centralized call center with information on all types of transportation providers and services in the region. The NWCCOG has contracted with RouteMatch for the software for a One-Call/One-Click Center and the call center began a soft opening in August 2014. Following the roll out of One-Call/One-Click Center, the RTCC will use funding that it has received to implement a marketing campaign to educate the public, transportation providers, and human service agencies about this new resource.

3.5.4 Marketing and Information Campaigns

Many agencies throughout the Intermountain region have recognized the value of cross marketing their transit information, especially in a region where so many of the resort and rural transportation services overlap. The following are some examples of the joint marketing efforts underway:

- ECO Transit's customer service representatives in Vail provide ticket sales and service information to Greyhound passengers as well as to Town of Vail patrons.
- A marketing campaign spearheaded by the RTCC will kick off in 2014 to educate the public and transit/human service agencies about the centralized call center.
- The Breckenridge Free Ride and the Breckenridge Ski Resort have a joint marketing arrangement and all services are advertised under the Free Ride brand. Additionally, these agencies have one phone number to provide transit information.
- The City of Aspen, Glenwood Springs, RFTA, and Snowmass Village partner together to market and promote transit services in their service areas and throughout the Roaring Fork Valley.

3.5.5 Mobility Management

In July 2012, the NWCCOG hired a mobility manager with a goal of streamlining coordination efforts in the region. The Mobility Manager works across parts of two Transportation Planning Regions, Northwest and Intermountain, including Garfield, Pitkin, Eagle, Summit, Grand, Jackson, and Routt Counties. Having a paid Mobility Manager ensures that staff resources are available and creates a community resource to energize coordination activities. The NWCCOG Mobility Manager leads the activities of the RTCC in the region and is working primarily on the development and implementation of a One-Call/One-Click Center, implementing a regional billing mechanism for Non-Emergent Medicaid Transportation, maintaining a regional transportation services inventory, including both human service agencies and transit providers, along with conducting a detailed gap analysis of the transit needs across the region to expand coordination of and access to existing and new resources.

3.5.6 Partnerships

The Intermountain TPR has extensive working relationships among its transit providers and human service agencies. The transit providers work together regularly and are able to come together as a region when decisions need to be made about distribution of funds, service coordination, and marketing.

3.5.7 Vehicle Sharing

The Breckenridge Free Ride and Summit County's Summit Stage have an agreement to supply emergency backup vehicles to each other.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

3.6 Summary of Existing Services

The Intermountain region is home to 10 large-scale rural public transit agencies that mainly provide service along the I-70 corridor, along SH 24, and from Glenwood Springs to Aspen along SH 82. In 2012, these 10 public transit agencies provided over 13,000,000 fixed-route trips, nearly 400,000 demand response trips, and approximately 12,000 paratransit trips. The region also has several human service agencies that provide trips to seniors and persons with disabilities throughout the region such as Eagle County Senior Transportation Services, Mountain Valley Development Services, and the Summit County Community and Senior Center. Given the number of resorts in the region, there are also a large number of private transportation operators. This includes small resort shuttle operators, several shuttle operators that provide service to visitors trying to get to mountain resorts from Denver, general public services such as Amtrak and Greyhound, and several taxi services that provide local transportation services.

The region's transit providers work very closely to provide connections between transit services in the TPR. RFTA provides its own rural service but also contracts with the City of Aspen, Snowmass Village, and Glenwood Springs to provide local services. All of these transit services connect with one another to provide service connections for passengers. Additionally, ECO Transit services connect with transit services provided by the Town of Avon, Beaver Creek Village, and with Summit Stage in Leadville.

There are still two major gaps in the regional service network. There is currently no regional bus service from Glenwood Springs to Eagle or direct service from Frisco to Vail. While Greyhound does provide intercity bus service between these points, there is no convenient service for local residents to access employment or to get to human services. The intercity service provided by Greyhound connects the region to Grand Junction to the west and Denver to the east. The Amtrak route that serves the region, the California Zephyr, originates in Chicago, connects through Denver, and heads west through the mountains with a stop in Glenwood Springs, and then goes on to Grand Junction with a final destination of Emeryville, California. The Amtrak station in Glenwood Springs is serviced by Ride Glenwood, which connects to the larger RFTA bus network within the TPR. Chapter 5 further discusses recommendations for these service gaps and other spatial, temporal, and financial needs and gaps.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

4.0 CURRENT AND POTENTIAL TRANSIT FUNDING

This Chapter presents a snapshot of current transit funding levels and potential sources of funds for the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region (TPR). Significant current and potential future funding programs are summarized and estimates of funds generated through future potential revenue mechanisms are provided.

Providing public transit and human service transportation in the Intermountain region is challenging. The substantial influx of seasonal residents, workers, and visitors during peak tourism months can strain providers, while excess capacity may be available during other parts of the year. Transit agencies must provide services within and connecting smaller rural communities, but with system ridership demands and infrastructure needs that are more characteristic of larger urban centers.

4.1 Current Transit Expenditures

Figure 4-1 illustrates the various levels of transit service provided in each of Colorado's rural TPRs as measured by operating cost per passenger trip. Each region varies considerably in the scale and type of operations, system utilization and ridership, full-time resident population, and population of seasonal visitors and other system users. In 2012, approximately \$6 per trip was expended to support critical transit services within the region. Overall transit operating costs in the Intermountain TPR are relatively high compared to other regions, due to the higher cost of living, labor, fuel, and general maintenance imposed by the region's geography and economy.

Figure 4-1 Operating Cost per Passenger Trip in Colorado Transportation Planning Regions



Source: 2012 Self-reported data from CDOT Transit Agency Provider Survey, 2013

4.2 Current Transit Revenue Sources

Transit service providers in the Intermountain region and across Colorado rely on a patchwork of funding sources to continue operations or fund improvements and system expansions. Transit providers often leverage funding from a wide variety of federal, state, and local or private sources. **Figure 4-2** displays information from the National Transit Database of rural providers for the nation and for Colorado. This information is compared to the aggregate regional financial information as reported to the Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) by providers in the region.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

Figure 4-2Comparison of National, State, and Regional Revenue Sources



Source: National Transit Database, 2012 | CDOT Transit Agency Provider Survey, 2013

At the national level, the majority of capital revenues are derived from federal sources, primarily Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grants. Over the past five years, federal capital spending increased substantially through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and some of those investments are still being awarded. In 2012, ARRA funding represented one-third of all federal transit-related capital funding nationally. However, in Colorado, relatively few ARRA investments and other large-scale transit capital projects are underway and the federal share of capital revenues is substantially less at the state level—at just 11 percent. The State of Colorado contributes more than twice the national average toward capital investments, primarily through the Funding Advancement for Surface Transportation & Economic Recovery (FASTER) program.

Local governments provide most financial support for major capital investment projects, including required local match funding for major new capacity projects in the Intermoutain region. Local funding for capital investment in the Intermountain region is substantial and has increased in recent years with the development of new capacity projects, such as the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority's (RFTA) bus rapid transit expansion. At the regional level in 2012, federal investments represent the largest share of capital funding (75 percent), however this is not typical and is a result of the Section 5309 funds received by RFTA. **Excluding the impact of recent FTA 5309 grants to the Intermountain region, local revenue sources would instead make up the majority of capital**

ntermountain

revenues and the regional average would appear more similar to the state average of 11 percent in federal funds.

The breakdown of funding sources that are used to fullfill operating needs in the state and region also emphasize the importance of local funding. At the national level, operating revenues are relatively diversified among federal, local, agency-derived, and state funding sources. Colorado on average is more dependent on local sources and less reliant on federal and state sources for operating funds. Within the Intermountain region, the local share of operating revenues is greater than the state average (64 percent compared to 55 percent). Local revenues include any General Fund transfers or dedicated revenues collected by authorities, counties, and cities in the region. The Intermountain region is notable for the three counties (Eagle, Summit, and Pitkin) that impose Mass Transit District sales taxes to support transit. The region is also home to RFTA, which provides dedicated sales tax revenue to support transit.

4.3 Regional Transit Revenue Trends

While federal operating support for rural transit is relatively stable and predictable, many other funding sources are highly variable, including federal or state competitive grant awards, one-time transfers from local governments, private or philanthropic donations, or local tax revenues that are subject to fluctuations in local economies. When these funding streams decline or remain stagnant, transit agencies are forced to respond by reducing service, raising fares, eliminating staff positions, delaying system expansions, or postponing maintenance activities.

Figure 4-3 illustrates trends in reported capital and operating revenues for the past three years. It should be noted that data for 2010 and 2011 are compiled from the National Transit Database and are not directly comparable to data derived from survey information reported by providers in the region in 2013 based on 2012 data.



Figure 4-3Recent Trends in Regional Transit Revenues

Source: 2012 Self-reported data from CDOT Transit Agency Provider Survey, 2013

Within the Intermountain region, providers have not substantially reduced services in recent years but instead have partnered to undertake major system expansions. The level of operating revenues reflects the regional and statewide need to continue to diversify revenue sources and secure new sources of funding to maintain existing services. Providers in the Intermountain TPR have strong local support and dedicated revenues; however, to realize the region's long-term vision for transit, additional funding sources and partnerships must be explored. The following sections detail a number of commonly used funding streams and provide estimates of potential new revenue sources in the region.

4.4 Current and Potential Transit and Transportation Funding Sources

Public funds are primarily used to support transit and transportation services in Colorado's rural areas. Support from federal agencies, state programs, and local governments provide the majority of funding to support capital

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

construction and acquisition. Operating and administration activities are most often supported by local governments, FTA grants, private or civic gifts and from agency-generated revenues such as contract services, service fares, and investments.

The following sections detail a number of commonly used funding streams and provide estimates of potential new revenue sources for the region.

4.4.1 Federal Grant Programs – U.S. Department of Transportation

Grant programs administered by the FTA provide the most significant source of ongoing funds to support transit services in rural areas. CDOT conducts a statewide competitive application process to determine awards of FTA grants and to ensure that it and the local grantees follow federal laws and regulations. CDOT contracts with the local grantees once it selects the funding recipients. FTA funds are complex and governed by varying requirements and provisions for use.

Only the 5311 grant programs are specifically intended to support transit in rural areas; however, under certain circumstances and with the discretion of the state, many other programs may be used to support rural services. The following list of major FTA and U.S. DOT programs cover grant assistance programs for rural areas. Providers in the Intermountain region may not be eligible for some of these programs. CDOT provides a clearinghouse of information on current grant programs and can provide limited technical assistance with grant applications.

FTA Section 5311 Formula Grants for Rural Areas program provides formula funding to states for the purpose of supporting public transportation in areas with populations of less than 50,000. Funds may be used to support administrative, capital, or operating costs, including planning, job access, and reverse commute programs, for local transportation providers when paired with local matching funds. States may distribute funding to public, private non-profit, or tribal organizations, including Local and Regional Coordinating Councils. Within this program, Section 5311(f) requires at least 15 percent of a state's funds under this program to be used to support intercity bus services, unless the governor has certified that such needs are already being met. The Rural Transit Assistance Program and the Tribal Transit Program are funded as a takedown from the Section 5311 program. The federal share of eligible capital and project administrative expenses may not exceed 80 percent of the net cost of the project. For operating, the federal share may not exceed 50 percent of the net operating cost of the project. For projects that meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Clean Air Act, or bicycle access projects, they may be funded at 90 percent federal match.

FTA Section (5311(b)(3)) Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP) provides a source of funding to assist in the design and implementation of training and technical assistance projects and other support services tailored to meet the needs of transit operators in rural areas. States may use RTAP funds to support non-urbanized transit activities in four categories: training, technical assistance, research, and related support services. Colorado receives a base allocation of \$65,000 annually in RTAP funds. There is no federal requirement for a local match. CDOT provides RTAP funding to the Colorado Association of Transit Agencies (CASTA).

FTA Section 5304 Statewide and Metropolitan Planning funds can be used for a wide variety of transit planning activities, including transit technical assistance, planning, research, demonstration projects, special studies, training, and other similar projects. These funds are not available for capital or operating expenses of public transit systems. First priority is given to statewide projects, which includes grant administration; the provision of planning, technical and management assistance to transit operators; and special planning or technical studies. The second priority is given to the updating of existing regional transit plans. Third priority is given to requests for new regional transit plans. Fourth priority is given to

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

requests to conduct local activities, such as: research, local transit operating plans, demonstration projects, training programs, strategic planning, or site development planning.

FTA Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities is a formula grant program intended to enhance mobility of seniors and persons with disabilities. It is used to fund programs that serve the special needs of transit-dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation services and ADA complementary paratransit services. Eligible recipients include states or local government authorities, private non-profit organizations, or operators of public transportation. At least 55 percent of program funds must be used on public transportation capital projects that are intended to meet the special needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities when public transportation is insufficient, inappropriate, or unavailable. The remaining 45 percent of program funds may be used for projects that exceed ADA requirements or that improve access to fixed-route service and decrease reliance by individuals with disabilities on paratransit services or that provide alternatives to public transportation for seniors and individuals with disabilities. The 5310 program funds certain capital and operating costs, with an 80 percent federal share for capital and 50 percent federal share for operating.

FTA Section 5312 Research, Development, Demonstration, and Deployment Projects supports research activities that improve the safety, reliability, efficiency, and sustainability of public transportation by investing in the development, testing, and deployment of innovative technologies, materials, and processes; carry out related endeavors; and support the demonstration and deployment of low-emission and no-emission vehicles to promote clean energy and improve air quality. Eligible recipients include state and local governments, public transportation providers, private or non-profit organizations, technical and community colleges, and institutions of higher education. Federal share is 80 percent with a required 20 percent non-federal share for all projects (non-federal share may be in-kind).

FTA Section 5322 Human Resources and Training program allows the FTA to make grants or enter into contracts for human resource and workforce development programs as they apply to public transportation activities. Such programs may include employment training, outreach programs to increase minority and female employment in public transportation activities, research on public transportation personnel and training needs, and training and assistance for minority business opportunities. Eligible recipients are not defined in legislation and are subject to FTA criteria. This program is initially authorized at \$5 million total through 2014. The federal share is 50 percent with a required 50 percent non-federal share for all projects.

FTA Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities program provides capital funding to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses, vans, and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities. This program replaces the previous 5309 program and provides funding to eligible recipients that operate or allocate funding to fixed-route bus operators. Eligible recipients include public agencies or private non-profit organizations engaged in public transportation, including those providing services open to a segment of the general public, as defined by age, disability, or low income. States may transfer funds within this program to supplement urban and rural formula grant programs, including 5307 and 5311 programs. Federal share is 80 percent with a required 20 percent local match.

FTA Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grants (New Starts) program is the primary funding source for major transit capital investments. The 5309 program provides grants for new and expanded rail and bus rapid transit systems that reflect local priorities to improve transportation options in key corridors. This program defines a new category of eligible projects, known as core capacity projects, which expand capacity by at least 10 percent in existing fixed-guideway transit corridors that are already at or above capacity today, or are expected to be at or above capacity within five years. This

ntermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

discretionary program requires project sponsors to undergo a multi-step, multi-year process to be eligible for funding. Projects must demonstrate strong local commitment, including local funding, to earn a portion of this limited federal capital funding source. Generally, the requirements of this program limit funding to major urban providers; however, some rural systems have been competitive and received funding in recent years, including RFTA for the new VelociRFTA BRT service along SH 82. Maximum federal share is 80 percent.

FHWA Surface Transportation Program (STP) provides flexible funding that state and local governments may use for a variety of highway-related projects and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, transit capital projects, including vehicles and facilities used to provide intercity bus service, transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, and transportation alternatives as defined by MAP-21 to include most transportation enhancement eligibilities. Funds may be flexed to FTA programs, local governments, and transit agencies to support transit-related projects.

FHWA Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including transit-related projects, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, and community improvement activities. The TAP replaced the funding from pre-MAP-21 programs, including the Transportation Enhancement Activities, Recreational Trails Program, and Safe Routes to School Program. Requirements and guidelines for this program, as related to transit, largely remain similar to the previous transportation enhancement program. TAP funds transferred to FTA are subject to the FTA program requirements, including a required 20 percent matching local funds.

FHWA National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) provides funding specifically to support the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS). While this is a highway-oriented program, NHPP funds can be used on a public transportation project that supports progress toward the achievement of national performance goals. Public transportation eligible projects include construction of publicly owned intracity or intercity bus terminals servicing the NHS, infrastructure-based intelligent transportation system capital improvements, and bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways.

Veterans Transportation and Community Living Initiative (VTCLI) is a competitive grant program to support activities that help veterans learn about and arrange for locally available transportation services to connect to jobs, education, health care, and other vital services. The initiative focuses on technology investments to build One-Call/One-Click Transportation Resource Centers. The VTCLI program is a joint effort of the Departments of Transportation, Defense, Health and Human Services, Labor, and Veterans Affairs but is managed and administered by the FTA. Funded in 2011 and 2012 only, future funding for the effort has not been announced.

4.4.2 Federal Grant Programs – Other

Other federal agencies, including the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Labor, Department of Education, and others provide grants or continuing financial assistance to support the needs of aging residents, military veterans, unemployed workers, and other populations. A 2011 Government Accountability Office report found that over 80 federal programs may be used for some type of transit and transportation assistance. For a complete inventory of other federal programs available, see recent reports from the National Resource Center for Human Service Transportation Coordination (<u>http://www.unitedweride.gov/NRC_FederalFundingUpdate_Appendix.pdf</u>). Most federal human services related funding assistances flow through state or regional organizations and may be used to cover a wide range of services, including, but not dedicated to, transit and transportation assistance. These other federal programs may provide for contracted transportation services, or offer reimbursement for transportation services provided

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

to covered individuals or may be used as "non-federal" matches for FTA grants or may support transportation assistance and coordination positions.

The following section briefly describes current and major federal grant programs that are most frequently used to support transit and transportation services, according to the National Resource Center for Human Service Transportation Coordination:

Medicaid is the only program outside the U.S. DOT that requires the provision of transportation. This federal-state partnership for health insurance and medical assistance is provided for low-income individuals. In Colorado, Non-Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT) is provided for medical appointments and services for clients with no other means of transportation. Medicaid in Colorado provides a significant source of funds for many transit service providers. However, these funds are provided on a reimbursement basis.

Older Americans Act (OAA), Title III provides funding to local providers for the transport of seniors and their caregivers. Eligible recipients include transportation services that facilitate access to supportive services or nutrition services, and services provided by an area agency on aging, in conjunction with local transportation service providers, public transportation agencies, and other local government agencies, that result in increased provision of such transportation services for older individuals. Under certain conditions, OAA funds can be used to meet the match requirements for programs administered by the FTA.

Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funds for **Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)** is a federal program that provides funding to states. State TANF agencies, including Colorado Works, may use TANF funds to provide support services including transportation. States have wide latitude on how this money can be spent, but the purchase of vehicles for the provision of transportation services for TANF-eligible individuals is included. For example, supporting and developing services such as connector services to mass transit, vanpools, sharing buses with elderly and youth programs, coordinating with existing human services transportation resources, employer provided transportation, or guaranteed ride home programs are all activities that may be covered under the TANF program.

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) are administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and cover funding for transportation. A portion of CDBG funds are spent on directly operated transit services, transit facilities or transit-related joint facilities, and services for persons with disabilities, low-income populations, youth and seniors. These grants have statutory authority to be used as the "non-federal" matching funds for FTA formula grants.

Community Services Block Grants (CSBG) are administered by the Department of Health and Human Services and cover funding for transportation. CSBG funds are primarily intended to alleviate the causes and conditions of poverty in communities. Eligible transportation activities include programs or projects to transport low-income persons to medical facilities, employment services, and education or healthcare activities.

Vocational Rehabilitation grants are from the Department of Education. Often, a portion of these grants are used to provide participating individuals with transportation reimbursements, vouchers, bus passes, or other purchased transportation service, often from FTA grantees and subrecipients. State vocational rehabilitation agencies are encouraged to cooperate with statewide workforce development activities under the WIA. In Colorado, these grants are administered through the Statewide Independent Living Council and State Rehabilitation Council.

4.4.3 State, Local, and Agency-Derived Revenue Sources

In Colorado, local revenue sources provide an important source of funding for transit agencies and service providers. Transfers and grants from local governments provide ongoing operating support and assistance with

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

one-time planning efforts or matching funds for major capital projects. The State of Colorado provides direct funding for capital equipment investments and for projects that support transit activities. Providers and agencies use a variety of other relatively small, but important funding sources to meet the needs of transit dependent populations in the state.

Funding Advancement for Surface Transportation & Economic Recovery (FASTER) is a state funding source that provides direct support for transit projects. FASTER funds provide \$15 million annually for statewide and local transit projects, such as new bus stops, bike parking, transit maintenance facilities, multimodal transportation centers, and other capital projects. FASTER transit funds are split between local transit grants (\$5 million per year) and statewide projects (\$10 million per year). CDOT DTR competitively awards the local transit grants and statewide funds. Local recipients are required to provide a minimum 20 percent local match. Among the types of projects that have been awarded are the purchase or replacement of transit vehicles, construction of multimodal stations, and acquisition of equipment for consolidated call centers.

In 2014, the Colorado Transportation Commission approved the use of these funds for operating costs as well as capital costs. As a result, \$3,000,000 of the FASTER transit funds are now allocated to cover the cost of the planned Interregional Express Bus service and another \$1,000,000 is available annually to cover the operating costs of other regional/interregional routes. From fiscal years 2010 to 2013, over \$52 million in FASTER funds have been invested in transit projects throughout the state. However, while total revenues collected under the overall FASTER program (\$252 million FY 2013) are projected to increase over time, the allocation for transit projects remains at a flat \$15 million per year.

The Colorado Veterans Trust Fund is administered by the Colorado Department of Military and Veteran Affairs to support organizations providing transit and transportation assistance to veterans. The state supports Veterans Service Offices in each county and grants are awarded to non-profit organizations providing transportation and other services to veterans. An estimated \$200,000 a year is directed to supporting the transportation needs of veterans.

Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF) is funded through revenues raised from statewide gas tax, vehicle registration fees, license fees, and user fees. These taxes are not indexed to inflation or motor fuel prices. As a result, revenues within this fund do not keep pace with actual construction or program costs over time. Funds are distributed based on a formula to CDOT, counties, and municipalities. Under Senate Bill 13-140, local governments (counties and municipalities) are authorized to flex HUTF dollars to transit-related projects. Transit and other multimodal projects allowed include, but are not limited to bus purchases, transit and rail station constructions, transfer facilities, maintenance facilities for transit, rolling stock, bus rapid transit lanes, bus stops and pull-outs along roadways, bicycle and pedestrian overpasses, lanes and bridges. Local governments may expend no more than 15 percent of HUTF allocations for transit-related operational purposes.

Local Governments including cities, counties, and special districts support or directly fund rural transit services. These services are typically funded through a city or county's general fund, although mass transit districts, metropolitan districts, and rural transportation authorities can levy and collect dedicated funding from sales and use taxes. Local funds flow to public or non-profit transit or transportation service agencies either on a contract basis or in the form of general operating support. Transit agencies also often seek direct local support to provide matching funds to federal grant awards. Local governments in Colorado are most commonly funded through general sales and use taxes or property taxes.

In 1990, Colorado provided the "authority of counties outside the Regional Transportation District to impose a sales tax for the purpose of funding a mass transportation system." Eagle, Summit, and Pitkin

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

counties currently employ this Mass Transit District mechanism to support transit services. Unlike a rural transportation authority, this option does not require a geographic boundary separate from the county and does not require the creation of a legal authority.

In 1997, Colorado enabled the "Rural Transportation Authority Law" to allow any single or coalition of several local governments to create rural transportation authorities. These authorities are empowered to develop and operate a transit system, construct and maintain roadways, and petition the citizens within the authority boundary to tax themselves for the purpose of funding the authority and the services provided. There are currently five Rural Transportation Authorities active in Colorado (Roaring Fork, Gunnison Valley, Pikes Peak, Baptist Road, and South Platte Valley).

Fares and other revenues (such as advertising) generated by transit agencies are used to offset operating expenses. Farebox recovery varies by agency, but rarely do passenger fares cover more than half of total operating and maintenance expenses. Because of this, transit agencies are dependent on the federal, state, and local revenue sources they receive to continue operating.

Service contracts are a way that local agencies fund operations for specific economic or employment centers, such as universities or the campuses of major employers. Examples around the country include CityBus in Lafayette, Indiana, which has a service contract with Purdue University and Ivy Tech State College; Kalamazoo Metro Transit in Michigan, which contracts with Western Michigan University; Corvallis Transit in Oregon, with a contract with Oregon State University. Service contracts can also be made with neighboring counties or municipalities. In addition to service contracts, another way to partner with local colleges or universities is through a College Pass Program. These programs often involve a student activity fee for transit services administered by the school. This can be paired with a discounted or free pass that students can use to ride the transit system.

Private support from major employers within a transit agency service area can be a source of funds. These employers may be willing to help support the cost of vehicles or the operating costs for employee transportation. Individual companies or business groups may also fully fund or subsidize new express routes, dedicated vehicles, or improved transit facilities that specifically serve their employees. Sponsorship opportunities can range from small-scale benefits programs to encourage ridership (such as commuter passes) to service subsidies (such as direct contract payments or on-vehicle advertising) to larger capital investments in new vehicles or facilities serving business centers.

Charitable contributions are a source of revenue for many rural transit or service providers. While contributions from individuals are uncommon, ongoing operating support or one-time grants for operating positions or even capital investments may be provided by community or private foundations.

4.5 Future Funding Options

The following section describes options that Colorado's local agencies can consider to fund transit service. These sources include revenue streams that are relatively common across the country or those that are not often implemented except in a small number of communities. Available options for any given community are dependent on state and local regulations, funding needs, and political considerations. Many of the examples listed in this section are drawn from TCRP Project J-11, Task 14: Alternative Local and Regional Funding Mechanisms.

Local Sales Taxes: Local sales and use taxes are one of the most common sources of revenue used to fund public transit by counties, cities, and special districts. Revenues derived from sales taxes may be dedicated to a transit agency or special district or may be collected by a local government and transferred to a local public provider for ongoing support. Dedicated assessments commonly range from 0.25 to 1 percent of total taxable sales. The use of these revenues is generally flexible, can provide

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

Human Services Plan

funding for specific capital projects, or provide dedicated operating revenue to an entire agency. In Colorado, formation of special districts and any tax policy change resulting in net revenue gains requires voter approval under the TABOR constitutional amendment.

Property Taxes: Another common source of funding for transit agencies is property taxes. Property tax assessments are usually levied as a percentage of assessed residential and commercial value within a transit agency's service area. Property tax assessments that are levied solely on mineral or natural resource property value are infrequently used, but do exist. As with sales tax assessments, local communities seeking to raise property tax mil rates must seek voter approval and must consider TABOR and Gallagher limits.

Motor Fuel Taxes: Motor fuel taxes are commonly levied by states for transportation and most state funding for transit comes from fuel tax revenues. At the local or regional level, state motor fuel taxes are generally dedicated to roadways, although some local governments can transfer fuel tax revenues to transit, including in Colorado. In addition to state-collected fuel taxes, at least 15 states allow for local-option motor fuel taxes to be administered and collected at the city or county level.

Those states that enable local-option fuel taxes that may be used to support transit services within a local area include Tennessee, California, Florida, Illinois, Hawaii, and Virginia.

Vehicle Fees: Fees tied to vehicle ownership most commonly include annual registration titling fees and other mechanisms such as vehicle titling or sales fees, rental or lease taxes, toll revenues, parking, or taxi company licensing fees. State collected vehicle-related fees are used to support transit, including the FASTER program in Colorado. Locally collected vehicle-related fees are not in widespread use to directly support transit, though there are a few examples around the country.

Triangle Transit in North Carolina and New York MTA both receive multiple types of vehicle fees that are collected at the local level. Allegheny County in Pennsylvania enacted a \$2 rental car fee to support transit services in the Pittsburgh region.

Parking Fees: Fees and fines for parking vehicles within certain city areas may be imposed to achieve local goals, including managing congestion and encouraging mode shifts to transit. Local transit agencies may receive funding for operations from parking fees and fines levied by local governments or they may receive parking related revenues generated at facilities (e.g., parking garages or park and ride lots actually owned by that transit provider).

The San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Agency (Muni) receives a significant amount of revenues for the provision of transit services through parking fees and fines. Eighty percent of city parking revenues are dedicated to Muni operations.

Employee or Payroll-Based Taxes: Payroll taxes are generally imposed on the gross payroll of businesses within a transit district or transit agency service area and are paid by the employer. An income-based tax is imposed on employee earnings and may be administered by a local government based on employees' place of work.

Transit agencies currently using payroll taxes include TriMet in Oregon, New York MTA, and CityBus in Lafayette, Indiana.

Value Capture: Value capture describes a range of revenue mechanisms related to residential or commercial development, including impact fees, tax increment financing (TIF), and special assessment districts. Impact fees are based on anticipated traffic and transit volumes of major new developments and are used to offset the costs of new transportation infrastructure. TIF mechanisms seek to capture some portion of the value of redevelopment or new development property value within a certain geographic area and usually administered by local business improvement or special districts.

<mark>Int</mark>ermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Tampa, Florida's Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority uses a combination of three value capture mechanisms. Impact fees provide matching funds for bus capital projects, TIF funds operations for the city's streetcar system, and a special assessment district funds the capital costs of the city's streetcar system.

Utility Taxes or Fees: Utility fees are annual flat assessments per household or housing unit that range from \$5 to \$15. These fees are widely used in Oregon for operations and maintenance expenditures for transit and capital improvements of transportation infrastructure, primarily local roads and streets. Local governments in other states such as Florida, Texas, and Washington have enacted utility fees for transportation, but their use is not widespread across the country.

In 2011, the Corvallis Transit System implemented a Transit Operations Fee that is a hybrid revenue mechanism but most closely associated with a utility fee. The fee is indexed to the average price of a gallon of gas and adjusted each year. In 2012, the fee was \$3.73 per month for single family residences and \$2.58 per unit per month for multifamily properties. Pullman Transit in Washington State levies a voter-approved 2 percent utility tax on natural gas, electricity, telephone, water, sewer, and garbage collection services within the city of Pullman. This tax brings in approximately \$1 million annually.

Room and Occupancy Taxes: Additional sales taxes for hotel and lodging purchases are common across the country and include flat service fees and percentage based sales taxes. This revenue source is popular in areas with high tourism demand to fund additional needs associated with visitors.

Savannah, Georgia uses room occupancy fees to fund free public transportation and Park City Transit in Utah relies on occupancy taxes to fund services.

Lottery or Limited Gaming Taxes: Taxes are imposed on the sale of lottery tickets, most often by a state, while local municipalities may tax casino revenues or assess a fee per machine. In Colorado, state lottery taxes are devoted to fund costs associated with open space and recreation as well as the state and local library system. Those municipalities or tribal governments that allow for gaming may also transfer limited gaming fees to support local transit systems, including in Cripple Creek, Colorado.

The State of New Jersey diverts a portion of the state Casino Revenue Fund to support a Senior Citizens and Disabled Residents Transportation Assistance Program. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania dedicates a percentage of lottery revenues to a free transit program for persons over 65 years old traveling in off-peak hours.

Vehicle-Miles Traveled Fees: A number of states are increasingly researching alternatives to fuel taxes that would instead charge drivers a fee based on the amount of miles traveled rather than a tax on the amount of fuel used. Fees could also be variable to help manage congestion at peak times. Generally, those states examining VMT-based fees consider this system to be a revenue-neutral alternative to fuel taxes, rather than a source of additional new funding.

Corporate Sponsorship: Businesses across the country have practiced funding private employee shuttles or vanpool options for decades and subsidized or fully-funded transit passes are a common employee benefit. Individual companies or business groups may also fully fund or subsidize new express routes, dedicated vehicles, or improved transit facilities that specifically serve their employees. Sponsorship opportunities can range from small-scale benefits programs to encourage ridership (such as commuter passes) to service subsidies (such as direct contract payments or on-vehicle advertising) to larger capital investments in new vehicles or facilities serving business centers. Private sponsorship can be uncertain and unsustainable, but partnerships and contracts do provide alternative revenue streams and offer opportunities for increasing system ridership.

Public-Private Partnerships: Public-private partnerships or P3 arrangements generally refer to a range of project delivery and financing agreements (loans) between a public agency and private business to

Regional Coordinated Transit and

Human Services Plan

complete infrastructure projects. P3 arrangements are becoming increasingly common for major public works or infrastructure projects. However, according to the National Council of State Legislatures, P3s are used for less than 20 percent of transportation projects nationally and are not typically used for transit projects. In Denver, a recent agreement between the Regional Transportation District and Denver Transit Partners was the first full design-build-finance-operate-maintain transit P3 project in the United States.

States and communities across the country have enabled and enacted a wide variety of revenue mechanisms to directly or indirectly support transit services. Generally, those states with more robust local transit operations or with state policies that are more supportive of public transit allow for more innovative revenue options. In Colorado, the constitutional TABOR amendment restricts state and local governments from implementing new taxes without voter approval and from raising revenues collected under existing tax rates in excess of the rate of inflation and population growth, without voter approval. Additional constitutional restrictions in Colorado limit the ability of local governments to creatively finance transit services.

4.6 Potential Revenue Estimates

Transit providers in the Intermountain TPR benefit from relatively diversified revenue streams and the availability of dedicated funds through sales and use taxes. However, to meet future needs and continue to provide critical services in the region, alternative revenue sources should be considered. **Table 4-1** presents high-level estimates of the potential funds that could be generated by enabling additional or alternative revenue sources. These estimates are intended to provide an approximate gauge of the potential value of alternative revenue sources in closing future funding gaps. The exact amount of revenues that could become available is dependent on voter approval, implementation of the mechanism, and local limitations and tax policy.

Table 4-1 provides an approximate estimate of potential new revenues in the Intermountain TPR based on feasible and currently available revenue sources. This estimate is intended to portray the approximate value of these potential funding sources and does not constitute an endorsement or a recommendation. Values are based on currently published information for Eagle, Garfield, Lake, Pitkin, and Summit counties.

	Mechanism Revenue Source		2012 Revenue Base	Annual Funds Generated
1.	0.7% sales tax	Net Taxable Sales	\$4,150,944,000	\$29,056,608
2.	1.0 mill levy	Assessed Property Value	\$11,213,829,168	\$11,213,829
3.	\$15 annual fee	Total Housing Units	101,328	\$1,519,920
4.	2% equivalent fee	Local Tourism Tax Receipts	\$102,000,000	\$2,040,000
5.	10% flex transfer	Local Highway Users Tax Fund	\$8,030,611	\$803,061

Table 4-1	Estimates of Funds Generated Through Alternative Revenue Sources
	Lotimates of i anas denotated in ough internative nevenue bour ees

- Sales Tax Increase: If each county in the region were to enact an additional levy of 0.7 percent of net taxable sales in the region, annual revenues would vary but could have reached nearly \$30 million in 2012. An increase in sales taxes would require voter approval and would be collected either by a dedicated regional transportation authority or by local governments and then transferred to support transit services. Several counties and transportation authorities in the region currently levy dedicated mass transit sales taxes ranging from 0.4 percent to 0.8 percent, varying by city and county.
- 2. Property Tax Increase: If each county in the region were to increase property taxes the equivalent of 1.0 mill (or \$1 per \$1,000 of assessed value), the potential revenue generated in 2012 could have

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

reached over \$11 million. An increase in taxes would require voter approval and local cities and counties may be limited by existing TABOR revenue limits.

- **3.** Utility Fee Enactment: If each county in the region were to enact a \$15 per housing unit annual fee to provide transportation and transit services, potential revenue could have reached \$1.5 million in 2012. Housing units account for single and multi-family residences, including those for seasonal use or second-home ownership. Housing units do not account for nightly lodging or rental units.
- 4. Tourism Tax Enactment: Visitors to the region spent approximately \$2.2 billion in 2012 and generated over \$100 million in local tax receipts. If each county in the region were to enact a fee or daily tax on lodging equivalent to 2 percent of all local tourism-based tax receipts, approximately \$2 million in annual revenues could have been generated. New taxes require voter approval in Colorado.
- **5. Transfer of HUTF:** If each county in the region were to allocate 10 percent of HUTF receipts to transit, then approximately \$800,000 could have become available for transit-related investments. Some counties in the region do use these funds to support transit infrastructure.

4.7 CDOT Grants Process

CDOT's DTR is responsible for awarding and administering state and federal transit funds to public transit and human service transportation providers throughout Colorado. State transit funds are provided through FASTER passed by the state legislature in 2009. FASTER provides a fixed \$15 million per year for statewide, interregional, regional, and local transit projects.

On the federal side, the FTA provides funding for transit services through various grant programs. Several grant programs are provided directly by the FTA to Designated Recipients, primarily in urbanized areas. For rural areas, FTA transit funds are allocated by formula to the state and are administered by DTR through a competitive application process. These grant programs provide funding assistance for administrative, planning, capital, and operating needs. For more information on the various FTA grant programs, visit the FTA website at: http://www.fta.dot.gov/index.html.

To begin the grant application process, DTR issues a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) and a "call for projects" for FASTER and FTA funds annually or bi-annually. Capital and operating/administrative calls for projects are conducted separately and at different times during the year. Applications for FTA operating and administrative funds are solicited every two years. Applications for FTA and FASTER capital funds are solicited every year in a single application, and DTR determines the appropriate source of funds (FTA or FASTER).

From the date of the NOFA, grant applicants have a minimum of 45 days to submit an application. The application process will soon be available online using DTR's new CoTRAMS grant management program. Before submitting an application, each grant applicant must submit an agency profile and capital inventory. Applications will not be reviewed until this is complete. Applicants applying for funds for a construction project must complete and submit National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation with the application and demonstrate the readiness of the project to proceed.

Following the 45-day grant application period, applications for operating/administrative funds are then evaluated, scored, and ranked by both internal DTR staff and an Interagency Advisory Committee comprised of individuals outside of DTR (including the Colorado Department of Human Services and the Public Utilities Commission). Amounts awarded are often less than the amount requested. Applications for capital funds are evaluated primarily on performance metrics (age, mileage, and condition).

DTR announces the awards and obtains CDOT Transportation Commission approval for projects that are awarded FASTER transit funds. Transportation Commission approval is not necessary for FTA awarded funds. All awards require a local match; 50 percent local match for operating funds and 20 percent for administrative and

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

capital funds. All funds are awarded on a reimbursement basis—that is, grant recipients must first incur expenses before seeking reimbursement from CDOT.

Once funding awards are made, a scope of work for each awarded project is developed and negotiated between DTR and the grant applicant. Once the scope of work is complete, the project can be offered a contract. Once a contract is fully executed by both DTR and the grant applicant, CDOT issues a notice to proceed. For more information on the grant application process, visit the DTR Transit Grants website.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

5.0 TRANSIT NEEDS AND SERVICE GAPS

This Chapter provides an assessment of key quantitative factors that play a role in assessing and understanding transit needs and gaps in the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region (TPR). Additionally, an assessment of existing public transit and human service transportation services are reviewed with the needs and gaps expressed by a variety of sources and data collection efforts conducted as a part of this plan development. The sources used to prepare this subjective assessment of needs and gaps in the Intermountain TPR included, but were not limited to the Intermountain Transit Working Group (TWG), provider and human service agency survey results, geographic analysis of the locations/concentrations of the likely transit user populations (see Chapter 2), CDOT survey of older adults and adults with disabilities, and input received from two public meetings in the region.

5.1 Quantitative Assessment of Needs and Gaps

This section provides information relevant to general population growth, elderly population growth, and growth in resort/tourism dollars spent in the TPR. This data aids in the quantitative assessment of transit needs and gaps in the Intermountain region.

5.1.1 Population and Elderly Population Growth

Based on 2012 estimates from the Colorado State Demographer's Office (see Chapter 2), the general population in the Intermountain region is expected to see significant growth by 2040, increasing from 169,824 residents in 2013 to approximately 312,600 residents in 2040, an 84 percent increase. While the general population is likely to grow quite significantly in every county in the region, the highest growth rates are Summit, Garfield and Eagle counties. As these are large counties that are mountainous and rural in nature, travel over long distances to reach services and employment will continue to be a challenge for transit providers and passengers alike. Transit systems in the region are already heavily relied upon for employment and access to human services, so this growth will need to be considered to meet the growth projected in the long-term.

The overall growth in the elderly population for the region is anticipated to grow approximately 226.6 percent from 2013 to 2040. Eagle County will see the most significant growth in the 65+ population in the region with a 329.8 percent increase from 2013 to 2040, but Summit County and Garfield County also have very high growth projection at 242.9 percent and 221.5 percent, respectively. When comparing these numbers to the expected growth rate of 120.5 percent on a statewide level, the doubling in the Intermountain region is a concern and these forecasts must be considered when planning for both public transit and human service transportation in the future. The elderly population will likely produce an increased number of transit dependent individuals that will rely heavily on human service transportation to get to major activity centers, healthcare facilities, and meal sites.

5.1.2 **Resort/Tourism Demand Assessment**

Tourism and outdoor recreation are the predominant economic engines in the Intermountain region and by looking at tourism dollars spent in each county, reasonable assumptions can be made that the number of visitors will ebb and flow relative to increases and decreases in tourism dollars spent in each county and the region as a whole. In 2004 travel spending in the Intermountain region was \$2 billion and it inched up to \$2.3 billion in 2012. The average growth in travel spending between 2004 and 2012 was 1.7 percent. Of course, this dataset includes the time period of the great economic recession, and in 2009 the region was hardest hit by the decrease in travel spending. In 2009, all counties saw a decrease in travel spending growth, ranging from negative 11.9 percent in Summit County to negative 19.3 percent in Garfield County. However, the years of 2006 and 2010 saw the greatest overall annual increases in travel spending in the region at 8.7 percent and 10.7 percent, respectively.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

Based on the historical travel spending growth from 2004 to 2012 in the Intermountain region, it is reasonable to assume that there will be an average of 3.6 percent annual growth in travel spending in future years. In 2012 travel spending in the Intermountain region was nearly \$2.3 billion. Assuming a growth rate of approximately 3.6 percent in future years, travel spending could reasonably reach \$3 billion by 2020, \$4.3 billion by 2030, and just over \$6.1 billion by 2040. These projections indicate that transportation demand relative to tourism and recreation in the Intermountain TPR will continue to grow through the planning horizon of 2040.

5.2 Qualitative Assessment of Needs and Gaps

Various limitations impact transit service delivery to the general public and specialized populations. By reviewing these limitations within the Intermountain TPR, a baseline is established which then helps to identify the larger service needs and gaps. Identified service needs and gaps for the five-county TPR are reviewed below.

5.2.1 Spatial Limitations

Spatial limitations were observed in many parts of the Intermountain TPR. Spatial limitations make it challenging for some travelers to access education, medical, service, shopping and employment centers outside their home service area. The following highlights spatial imitations identified in the Intermountain TPR:

- There is currently no regional general public transit serving the I-70 corridor between Glenwood Springs and Eagle. This provides a significant barrier to passengers trying to traverse between Eagle and Garfield Counties to access recreation, human services, and employment especially given that it is sees some of the highest commute patterns in the region.
- There is a need for direct, regional transit service to/from Frisco and Vail to connect passengers between Summit and Eagle Counties serving the I-70 corridor. This service would aid in employment access, recreational access as well as access to human services for specialized populations.
- The need for high speed transit service connecting Denver and the Intermountain TPR was identified. This service would connect a high volume of day skiers/visitors as well as overnight visitors from Denver International Airport (DIA) to the Intermountain TPR's numerous recreational activities.
- Human service transportation services are especially limited in rural areas (e.g., Garfield County). Recognizing that serving rural areas with low population densities often results in low productivity and high per trip costs, there are likely needs that are not being met in the region.
- There is a need to connect Lake County residents to major employment centers for the growing populations that are limited in English proficiency and those living below the federal poverty level (SH 82 and US 24 corridors).
- Many human service transportation providers' services in the region are limited to the sponsoring jurisdictions' boundaries. This creates limitations for passengers trying to cross county lines/boundaries for services and requires additional work and resources from the providers to coordinate the transfer of passengers.
- Need for enhanced multimodal connections to allow passengers to travel using various modes. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian improvements at and near transit centers/stops were identified to improve connectivity to local, regional and intercity transit networks.

Additionally, supporting the needs identified through analysis of the region and from the TWG, the Colorado Statewide Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan indicates the following spatial gaps in the Intermountain TPR:

Need for Interregional express service along the I-70 corridor from Denver to Glenwood Springs with stops in Frisco, Vail, Gypsum/Eagle (one-round trip per day).

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

- Need for Regional service between Glenwood Springs and Gypsum/Eagle along the I-70 corridor that would integrate into ECO Transit and RFTA service schedules.
- Need for Essential regional service, typically operating as demand response, connecting Craig and Grand Junction with service through Rifle (SH 13 and I-70).

CDOT's survey of older adults and adults with disabilities in the Intermountain TPR also showed concurrence with many of the spatial needs, including:

- The majority (54 percent) of respondents in the Intermountain region rely on others for some or all of their transportation needs, with over half of respondents (54 percent) unable to get somewhere because they could not find transportation once or more in the last month.
- The majority of the elderly and disabled surveyed have difficulty finding transportation to medical appointments (44 percent) and for accessing activity centers for shopping and pharmacy trips (43 percent).
- General public transportation service and paratransit service is not available where 35 percent of the survey respondents live and/or where they want to go that indicated this was a "major problem".
- The distance to a bus stop showed to be a major problem for 36 percent of survey respondents and is a barrier to their use of transit.

5.2.2 Temporal Limitations

Temporal limitations were also observed in many parts of the Intermountain TPR. Similar to spatial limitations, temporal limitations create challenges for passengers trying to access education, medical, service, shopping and employment centers outside of their home service area at certain times during the week/day. The following are the temporal needs and gaps noted for the Intermountain TPR.

- A limitation on transit service frequency in the late evening and early morning hours was identified in the region. The lack of services during these times impacts the ability of service industry workers to access employment where jobs do not typically fall in the 8 AM to 5 PM timeframe.
- A need for additional and/or expanded weekend transit service was identified as a need by several human service agencies in the region. Again, weekend service allows specialized populations access to employment, recreation/social activities, and services.

CDOT's survey of older adults and adults with disabilities in the Intermountain TPR also indicated temporal needs of those surveyed, including:

- Twenty-four percent of respondents indicated that service not operating during needed times is a "major problem" and a barrier to their using transit.
- Fifty-eight percent of respondents indicated that it was difficult to find transportation on weekdays from 10 AM to 4 PM and 39 percent indicated this same challenge on weekdays from 4 PM to 7 PM. Lack of transportation services during the day on Saturday and Sunday also was a time that many survey respondents indicated needing transportation services, 33 percent and 32 percent, respectively.

5.2.3 Funding Limitations

Funding limitations in the region were identified by all general transit and humans service transportation providers. The following are the main issues identified.

• The need for additional operating and capital funds to maintain existing services was identified as a major issue by all providers. The lack of ongoing, consistent funding remains an issue in the State of Colorado and within the Intermountain TPR. While capital funds are needed, the lack of operating

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

funds was a major limitation noted by all providers. Additionally, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is now requiring all grantees to develop asset management plans. CDOT will work with its grant partners to meet this new requirement with a goal of having the asset management plans in place for all grantees by 2017.

- Exponential growth in the elderly population in the Intermountain region is going to put additional strain on general public and human service transportation agencies, which will likely require additional funds to expand services to meet demand.
- Projected tourism growth of 3.6 percent annually will likely result in a need for additional funds to expand service to meet demand. With the existing limitations on maintaining existing services, this is going to become a bigger issue as the region grows and tourism increases.

5.2.4 **Program Eligibility and Trip Purpose Limitations**

Program eligibility and trip purpose limitations also result in gaps and unmet needs in existing services. Examples in the Intermountain TPR include:

- Many human service transportation programs are often only available to their program clients with no comingling of various subsets of the population allowed. This is often due to the funding limitations, liability concerns, vehicle needs, and passenger behavior. The region specifically identified a need for comingling of passengers for medical trips to Denver to reduce the number of trips and to increase the number of clients served on each trip.
- Many quality of life trips (e.g., shopping, meals, and friends) are often not eligible trips through human service transportation providers. This becomes especially problematic as the elderly population grows and these older adults want to age in place.

5.2.5 Human Services Transportation Coordination Limitations

The Intermountain TPR has made significant progress in its coordination efforts since this plan was last updated in 2008. A Regional Transportation Coordinating Council (RTCC) was established and has been meeting for several years, the Northwest Colorado Council of Governments (NWCCOG) hired a mobility manager to lead the RTCC and to manage coordination projects and activities, and agencies have been working collaboratively in a variety of ways. The following are ways the region can continue to coordinate to help in meeting the needs of residents, businesses and visitors in the years to come.

- Development and maintenance of a regional services inventory (public, private and volunteer programs) is needed to make it easier to refer travelers to transit systems/agencies and bring awareness to the services available in the Intermountain TPR.
- Expand collaboration between regional partners on joint procurements of vehicles, joint training programs, sharing drivers and sharing of facilities and vehicles.
- Improvement of local transit services was identified as a need in both Garfield and Lake Counties so as to increase the travel options for specialized populations. The lack of local transit service increases the burden on specialized transportation providers and limits the independence of specialized populations as well.
- Establish a centralized regional Medicaid billing system for providers was identified to help ease the administrative burden billing places on providers.
- Assess the need for a more detailed gap analysis to aid in the expansion of coordination efforts, access to services, and create a more detailed understanding of needed resources after completion of this plan.
Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

6.0 FINANCIAL AND FUNDING OVERVIEW

This Chapter presents current and estimated future operating expenses and revenues available in the Intermountain region through 2040. These estimates are based on survey reported data from providers in the region. Through Transit Working Group meetings, every attempt was made to be inclusive of all providers and agencies operating in the region and to verify the accuracy of this data. These estimates reflect best available data and are intended solely to illustrate long-term trends in operating needs.

The 2040 revenue and operating expense projections presented here are intended to estimate the general range of future revenues available and the magnitude of future resource needs. While any forecast is subject to uncertainty, estimates may help guide regional actions and may indicate the need for future coordination, collaboration, and alternative revenue strategies.

6.1 Current and Future Operating Expenses

In recent years, operating expenses for major transit providers in the Intermountain TPR have grown faster than available revenues and population growth. For some of the Intermountain region's largest providers, operating expenses have grown at average annual rates ranging between 1.2 percent and 4.3 percent over the past five years. As shown in **Table 6-1**, operating expenses are estimated to grow at an average annual rate of 5.2 percent between 2013 and 2040, while operating revenues are projected to grow at an average annual rate of just 1.7 percent for the same time period.

Table 6-1	Existing and Projected Operating Expenses and Revenues to Maintain Existing
	Service Levels (2013 – 2040)

Intermountain TPR	Year 2013	Year 2020	Year 2030	Year 2040	Average Annual Growth (2013- 2040)
Operating Expenses	\$63.5 million	\$100 million	\$165 million	\$262 million	5.2%
Operating Revenues	\$63.5 million	\$75 million	\$91 million	\$104 million	1.7%
Potential Funding (Gap) / Surplus	\$0	(\$25 million)	(\$74 million)	(\$158 million)	-3.5%

Source: CDOT, Transit Agency Provider Survey, 2013. Dollars in year of expenditure value.

The region's full-time resident population is expected to grow 2.1 percent annually from 2013 and reach approximately 312,600 by 2040. Estimates of future growth in seasonal visitors and workers are not available. In 2013, approximately \$63.5 million, or \$374 per capita, was expended to support transit services within the region. Per capita measures account only for full-time resident populations and do not capture seasonal visitors, residents, and workers or reflect system ridership. To provide the same level of service in 2040 (as measured by current per capita expenditures) as today, the region will require approximately \$262 million in operating funds.

Table 6-2 provides an overview of several of the indicators often used to measure performance of transit systems. The operating cost indicators provide an additional perspective on the operational costs in the Intermountain TPR and the regional influences. Influences on operating cost measures include the rural nature of the area, long trip distances, tourism in the region, higher salaries, higher fuel costs, and the higher cost of living in a resort area.

itermountain

Table 6-2Intermountain TPR Average Transit Operating Cost

Performance Measure	Operating Cost
Cost per Capita	\$374*
Cost per Passenger Trip	\$6
Cost per Revenue Mile	\$7
Cost per Revenue Hour	\$104

Source: Transit Agency Provider Survey, 2013

* The approach to calculate the cost per capita does not take into account the dynamics and unique nature of the resort communities and their labor force and may not be a comparable measure for comparison.

6.2 Current and Future Operating Revenues

By 2040, the Intermountain TPR could expect transit revenues available for operating and administration purposes to reach an estimated \$104 million dollars. Projections of future revenues are based on historical trends in transit operating budgets, current estimates of federal revenue growth, and state and regional population and economic growth rates. (All operating expenses also include administrative expenses as reported by the transit operators and as collected from available NTD and survey reported data.) **Figure 6-1** illustrates potential future trends in major operating revenue sources currently utilized within the region.



Figure 6-1 Forecasted Operating Revenues in the Intermountain TPR

The following information summarizes each of the revenue categories identified in Figure 6-1:

• **Contract Revenues** include fees for services provided by a transit agency; for example, Glenwood Springs contracts with RFTA to provide local service in Glenwood Springs. These revenues are assumed to grow at a modest and steady rate over the long-term.

Regional Coordinated Transit and

Human Services Plan

- Fare Revenues are variable because many transit agencies in the region operate on a no-fare basis. Growth in fare revenues is linked to personal income growth, ridership growth, and policy changes. Based on historic trends of providers in this region, fare revenues are anticipated to grow steadily at 4.3 percent annually, though fare-recovery rates could slow over the long-term.
- Local Revenues contribute the vast majority of operating funds that support transit and transportation services in the Intermountain TPR. These funds include matching funds for grant awards, general fund transfers, or in-kind contributions. Local funds are highly variable and depend on the fiscal health of governments and the state of the economy in the region. Local sales and use taxes provide the most significant source of revenue for local governments in the region (more than half of all revenues in many cities and counties). Based on historical trends, local government contributions have grown at an annual average rate of 1.2 percent per year in the region. However, growth in sales tax revenue is expected to slow over the long-term as consumer spending shifts from durable goods to non-taxable services, such as healthcare, due to the overall aging of Colorado's population. The amount collected through dedicated sales taxes in the region will grow more slowly through 2040 and decline in value relative to overall economic activity in the region.
- Other Federal Revenues accounted for in this forecast include Title III of the Older Americans Act (OAA), and Medicaid Non-Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT). These federal revenues do not provide a significant source of funding for providers in the region. Federal discretionary programs are expected to decline in the future as the impacts of sequestration become evident and as spending within these programs shifts away from discretionary activities such as transportation assistance to more direct expenses such as healthcare. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families/Workforce Investment Act (TANF/WIA), Head Start, other smaller FTA operating grant programs, and agency-derived sources such as investments and fees are important but relatively small sources of revenues.
- FTA 5311 Grants provide primarily operating support to fund transit service in the region today. FTA grant programs are dependent on federal fuel tax revenues which are expected to grow slowly through 2025 and decline by 2040. Future FTA funding levels are estimated by CDOT per U.S. Congressional Budget Office forecasts.

Estimating future revenues is challenging, particularly for the diverse federal, state, and local funding mechanisms utilized to support transit services in rural areas. Federal legislation, such as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), Older Americans Act, Social Security Act, and Workforce Investment Act provide significant and ongoing funding for transit and transportation services, but is subject to periodic reauthorizations and annual budget appropriations. Individual programs funded through the Federal Transit Administration, Department of Veteran Affairs, and Department of Health and Human Services continue to evolve over time and changes in state funding formulas can significantly impact the monies available to providers in Colorado. Other federal grant awards are competitive, often one-time grants, and highly uncertain over the long-term. Revenues from local governments or regional transportation authorities are often not dedicated and are subject to variations in local tax revenues and local budget processes. Donations and awards from private, civic, or philanthropic sources are highly variable and not often recurring. Fare and contract revenues reflect demand for services, but may also vary substantially with local economic fluctuations or changes internal to the agency. Every effort has been made to reasonably estimate the overall level of revenues available to support operating expenses at the regional level.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

6.3 Status Quo Revenue and Expense Summary

Based on best available information and known trends, it is currently forecast that transit expenses in the Intermountain TPR will grow faster than transit revenues by 3.5 percent (average annual growth including inflation) between 2013 and 2040. As illustrated in **Table 6-1** these trends could result in a potential funding gap of approximately \$158 million in 2040. In terms of potential projects and strategies, this means the region will have to secure new funding sources to address funding gaps.

Future operating expense estimates represent only the resources necessary to maintain transit services at current levels on a per-capita basis. These estimates do not take into account any cost increases beyond inflation. For example the higher cost of labor, fuel, administration, and maintenance can significantly increase operating costs. As a result, actual operating expenses in future years may run higher than anticipated. Operators in the region have taken steps to convert fleet fuels to natural gas, which has had the result of lowering fuel costs in the short-term, though longer-term fuel costs remain uncertain.

Additionally, revenue forecasts are highly variable and actual future values may be higher or lower than expected. Sales and use tax collections are cyclical and depend entirely on economic conditions. The ability to repay major investment bonds secured with sales tax revenues is particularly vulnerable to changes in sales tax fluctuations. The impact of future tourism-related economic activity on sales and use taxes is particularly challenging to predict. Significant growth in retail tourism spending could benefit the region, however tourists tend to purchase more services than goods and most service transactions in Colorado are exempt from sales tax. Future increases in tourism activity are likely to indicate increased demand for transit services in the region.

Given the magnitude of potential future funding shortfalls in the region, alternative revenue sources, such as those described in Chapter 4, or growth in current revenue streams will more than likely be necessary to continue to fund improvements and to meet the growing needs of the general public, seasonal visitors, businesses, elderly, veterans, low-income, and transit dependent populations.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

7.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Transit is an important economic engine that helps drive the State of Colorado's economy. Transit helps connect employees, residents, and visitors to jobs and recreation and much more throughout the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region (TPR). The strategies identified in this Chapter highlight the importance of continuing to make meaningful investments in transit in the region.

Based on the financial scenarios and the projected growth in the Intermountain TPR, the highest priority strategies for the region have been identified including the associated costs, common funding sources, local champions and partners, and the ideal timeframe for implementation. Each strategy falls in line with the vision identified by the Intermountain TPR Transit Working Group (TWG), aligns with one or more of the region's supporting goals, and supports the statewide goals and performance measures (see Chapter 1) established by CDOT with input from the Statewide Steering Committee.

7.1 High Priority Strategies

The following strategies are to be used as an implementation plan to help prioritize and fund projects over the next 15 years between now and 2030. The implementation plan should be used as a guide for moving the Intermountain region's transit vision forward. The TWG identified these strategies based on input from the public, identified needs and gaps in service, and input from transit and human service providers in the region. The strategies are categorized by the regional goal that it supports and also includes information, as appropriate, on the performance measure categories the strategy supports. **Appendix D.5** includes a full list of regional transit projects identified by the Intermountain TWG.

It should be noted that the strategies identified in this Chapter complement and are congruent with the recommendations that have been identified in plans and studies completed in the region within the last five years. This includes the local plans identified in Chapter 1 as well as the Statewide Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan and the Advanced Guideway System (AGS) Feasibility Study. It is important to connect all planning efforts in an attempt to meet the overall combined vision and goals of various stakeholders and entities throughout the region.

Regional Goal 1: Support transit investments that attract tourists and contribute to the economic vitality of the region and state.

Strategy 1.1: Maintain operation of existing services to support the travel needs of residents, employees and tourists throughout the region.

- > 2030 Operating Cost: \$165 million (5.2% average annual growth)
- Timeframe: Present to 2030
- Champions/Partners: All existing agencies
- Performance Measure Categories: System Preservation and Expansion, Mobility/Accessibility, Environmental Stewardship, Economic Vitality, and Safety and Security
- Potential Funding Sources:

Operating - FTA 5310, FTA 5311, FTA 5337, Agency Revenues, Local and Regional Government, RTA, Local HUTF

Capital - FTA 5310, FTA 5311, FTA 5339, FASTER, Local HUTF, FHWA TAP/STP

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Strategy 1.2: Develop and implement asset management plans. Grant partners and CDOT will need to work together with the FTA to define expectations for asset management activities and to properly budget and plan for them.

- Annual Administrative Cost: TBD Note: It is anticipated that the cost of implementing and maintaining asset management plans will be offset by the savings accrued through the streamlining of maintenance and capital costs associated with managing assets more effectively.
- Timeframe: 1-6 years
- Champions/Partners: All existing agencies
- Performance Measure Categories: System Preservation and Expansion
- Potential Funding Sources: N/A

Strategy 1.3: Improve transit facilities and infrastructure (e.g., bus shelters/stations, park and rides, transfer centers/stations, operations/maintenance/administrative facilities) to make transit more attractive to tourists, employees and residents.

- Capital Cost: \$85,847,000
- Timeframe: 1-12 years
- Champions/Partners: All existing agencies
- Performance Measure Categories: System Preservation and Expansion, Mobility/Accessibility, Safety and Security
- Potential Funding Sources:

Operating - FTA 5310, FTA 5311, FTA 5337, Agency Revenues, Local and Regional Government, RTA, Local HUTF

Capital - FTA 5310, FTA 5311, FTA 5339, FASTER, Local HUTF, FHWA TAP/STP

Strategy 1.4: Invest in safety and security including staffing and new technology.

- Cost: Capital \$1,224,000
 Annual Operating Cost \$35,000
- Timeframe: 1-6 years
- Champions/Partners: Town of Avon, Town of Breckenridge, ECO Transit, RFTA
- Performance Measure Categories: Safety and Security
- Potential Funding Sources:

Operating - FTA 5310, FTA 5311, FTA 5337, Agency Revenues, Local and Regional Government, RTA, Local HUTF

Capital - FTA 5310, FTA 5311, FTA 5339, FASTER, Local HUTF, FHWA TAP/STP

Regional Goal 2: Enhance local and regional transit service to provide congestion relief.

- Strategy 2.1: Expand and/or enhance local and regional services, especially on congested commuter corridors such as I-70, SH 82, US 6, and SH 9. These services complement those identified in the Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan and provide consideration for the new Interregional Express Bus service slated to begin operating from Denver to Glenwood Springs in 2015.
 - Cost: Capital \$485,000
 Annual Operating Cost \$2,692,000
 - Timeframe: 1-6 years
 - Champions/Partners: All agencies

ntermountain

- Performance Measure Categories: System Preservation and Expansion, Mobility/Accessibility, Environmental Stewardship, Economic Vitality, and Safety and Security
- Potential Funding Sources: *Operating* - FTA 5311, Agency Revenues, Local and Regional Government, RTA, Local HUTF, Corporate Sponsorships/Contract Services *Capital* - FTA 5311, FTA 5339, FASTER, Local HUTF, FHWA TAP/STP, Public-Private Partnerships

Regional Goal 3: Ensure transit is a competitive transportation choice for all users, and support and plan for increasing shifts away from the single-occupant vehicle.

Strategy 3.1: Implement capital improvements and technology enhancements for end users of the system.

- Capital Cost: \$240,900
- Timeframe: 1-6 years
- Champions/Partners: Town of Breckenridge
- Performance Measure Categories: Mobility/Accessibility
- Potential Funding Sources: FTA 5311, FTA 5339, FASTER

Strategy 3.2: Create and maintain a regional services inventory/directory (public, private and volunteer programs) to increase access to and information on all types of public transportation services within the region. This strategy supports coordinated transportation within the region.

- Cost: N/A
- Timeframe: 1-6 years
- Champions/Partners: NWCCOG, Regional Transportation Coordinating Council, TPR, Agency Support
- Performance Measure Categories: Mobility/Accessibility, Transit System Development and Partnerships
 Potential Funding Sources:
 - Administrative CDOT, CSBG/CDBG, OAA Title III, Other Federal, Private/In-kind Contributions, Corporate Sponsorship, Agency support

Strategy 3.3: Develop and implement marketing and information campaigns to increase awareness of public transportation services.

- Cost: N/A
- Timeframe: Ongoing
- Champions/Partners: All agencies
- Performance Measure Categories: Mobility/Accessibility, Transit System Development and Partnerships
- Potential Funding Sources:
 - *Administrative* CDOT, CSBG/CDBG, OAA Title III, Other Federal, Private/In-kind Contributions, Corporate Sponsorship, Agency support

Regional Goal 4: Ensure transportation/mobility options are available for transit dependent populations.

Strategy 4.1: Expand and/or enhance existing human service transportation programs (e.g., additional capacity for disabled and elderly service in Garfield County and a connection between Glenwood Springs and Eagle). This strategy complements the findings of the Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan and services identified in local planning documents.

- Cost: N/A
- Timeframe: Ongoing

ntermountain

- Champions/Partners: Human Service Agencies/Human Service Agency Providers
- Performance Measure Categories: System Preservation and Enhancement, Mobility/Accessibility, Economic Vitality
- Potential Funding Sources:

Operating - FTA 5310, FTA 5311, Agency Revenues, Local and Regional Government, RTA, Local HUTF, Corporate Sponsorship/ Contract Services, Medicaid, TANF, CSBG/CDBG, OAA Title III *Capital* - FTA 5310, FTA 5311, FTA 5339, FASTER, Local HUTF, FHWA TAP/STP, Public-Private Partnership, TANF, CSBG/CDBG, OAA Title III

Strategy 4.2: Establish a centralized regional Medicaid billing system for providers.

- Cost: N/A
- Timeframe: 1-6 years
- Champions/Partners: NWCCOG and Agency Partners
- Performance Measure Categories: Mobility/Accessibility
- Potential Funding Sources:

Operating - Private/In-kind Contributions, Corporate Sponsorship *Administrative* - CDOT, CSBG/CDBG, OAA Title III, Other Federal, Agency Support

Regional Goal 5: Coordinate land use and multimodal transportation planning to enhance connectivity and attractiveness of transit.

Strategy 5.1: Construct bike and pedestrian capital improvements (pedestrian crossings, bike lanes, trip planners).

This strategy supports CDOT's performance measure to increase passenger miles traveled on fixed-route transit by enhancing last mile connections.

- Capital Cost: \$20,617,000
- Timeframe: 1-6 years
- Champions/Partners: Town of Avon, Town of Basalt, Town of Breckenridge, Town of Carbondale, City of Glenwood Springs, Pitkin County, RFTA
- Performance Measure Categories: Mobility/Accessibility
- Potential Funding Sources: CDBG/CSBG, FASTER, FHWA Funds (TAP/STP)

Strategy 5.2: RFTA to conduct a region-wide bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access planning study for the Roaring Fork Valley and Colorado River Valleys from roughly Aspen to Glenwood Springs and Glenwood Springs to Parachute.

- Administrative Cost: \$75,000
- Timeframe: 1-6 years
- Champions/Partners: RFTA
- Performance Measure Categories: Mobility/Accessibility
- Potential Funding Sources: FTA 5304

Regional Goal 6: Improve connectivity and coordination between regional transit and transportation systems to better provide access to jobs, recreation, education, health and human services, and medical facilities.

Strategy 6.1: Implement coordination activities among agencies, including vehicle sharing, new and improved connections between services, medical trips to Denver and other areas throughout the region.

- Administrative Cost: N/A
- Timeframe: 1-6 years
- Champions/Partners: All agencies
- Performance Measure Categories: Transit System Development and Partnerships
- Potential Funding Sources: FTA 5304, FASTER, Local and Regional Government

Strategy 6.2: Implement new general public service from Eagle County to Summit County (Frisco to Vail) operating seven days per week with four round trips per day. This service supports the recommendations in the Statewide Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan and local planning studies.

- Annual Operating Cost: \$369,000
- Timeframe: 1-12 years
- Champions/Partners: ECO Transit and Summit County
- Performance Measure Categories: System Preservation and Enhancement, Mobility/Accessibility, Economic Vitality
- Potential Funding Sources:

Operating - FTA 5311, Agency Revenues, Local and Regional Government, RTA, Local HUTF, Corporate Sponsorship/Contract Services

Capital - FTA 5311, FTA 5339, FASTER, Local HUTF, FHWA TAP/STP, Public-Private Partnership

Strategy 6.3: Implement new general public service from Garfield County to Eagle County (Glenwood Springs to Eagle) operating seven days per week with eight round trips per day. This service supports the recommendations in the Statewide Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan and local planning studies.

- Annual Operating Cost: \$923,000
- Timeframe: 1-12 years
- Champions/Partners: RFTA, ECO Transit, City of Glenwood Springs
- Performance Measure Categories: System Preservation and Enhancement, Mobility/Accessibility, Economic Vitality
- Potential Funding Sources:

Operating - FTA 5311, Agency Revenues, Local and Regional Government, RTA, Local HUTF, Corporate Sponsorship/Contract Services *Capital* - FTA 5311, FTA 5339, FASTER, Local HUTF, FHWA TAP/STP, Public-Private Partnership

Strategy 6.4: Conduct planning studies to analyze operations, capital, and maintenance needs, the redesign of transit services to improve connectivity with VelociRFTA, and to maximize transit system efficiencies.

- Administrative Cost: \$795,000
- Timeframe: 1-12 years



- Champions/Partners: RFTA, City of Glenwood Springs
- Performance Measure Categories: TBD
- Potential Funding Sources: FTA 5304, FASTER, Local and Regional Government

7.2 Implementation Plan Financial Summary

Table 7-1 provides an overview of estimated costs over the next 15 years associated with maintaining the existing system compared to implementing the high-priority strategies as identified in Section 7.1.

To maintain existing service levels in 2030, the region would require operating funds in the amount of approximately \$165 million. Overall inflation rates in Colorado over the last decade have averaged at 2 percent per year. Price inflation for goods and services has averaged 3 percent and motor fuel price inflation has averaged over 10 percent over the last decade. Inflation erodes the purchasing power of current revenue streams.

To implement the "growth" scenario, which implements the high priority strategies, an additional \$8 million in operating and administrative dollars would be required in 2030, increasing the annual shortfall to approximately \$82 million. Capital costs associated with the high-priority strategies will require an additional \$108 million between 2014 and 2030 in 2013 dollars to implement. This cost jumps to \$173 million when looking at the inflated 2030 capital costs.

As shown, to maintain existing services and implement high priority strategies identified in the region, the Intermountain TPR will need to secure new funding to ensure growth and expansion of transit and human services transportation in the region.

2030 Projected Annual Operating/Administrative Costs				
\$165 million				
\$8 million				
\$173 million				
\$91 million				
(\$82 million)				

Table 7-1Financial Summary

Values in 2030 dollars

2014-2030 Projected Capital Costs						
Growth – Implement High Priority Strategies	\$108 million in 2013 dollars \$173 million in 2030 dollars					

ntermountain

As discussed in Chapter 6, it is currently forecast that transit expenses in the Intermountain region will outstrip the growth in transit revenues by 3.5 percent, resulting in a potential funding gap of approximately \$158 million to maintain existing service levels in 2040. In terms of potential projects and strategies, this means the region will have to secure new funding sources to address funding gaps.

Future operating expense estimates represent only the resources necessary to maintain transit services at current levels on a per-capita basis. These estimates do not take into account any cost increases beyond inflation. For example, higher costs of labor, fuel, administration, and maintenance can significantly increase operating costs. As a result, actual operating expenses in future years may run higher than anticipated.

To provide the same level of service (as measured by per capita expenditures) in 2040 as today, the region could require approximately \$262 million in operating funds.



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

APPENDIX A GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Regional Coordinated Transit and

Human Services Plan

ACCESSIBLE VEHICLE (OR WHEELCHAIR-ACCESSIBLE VEHICLE OR ADA ACCESSIBLE VEHICLE) - Public transportation revenue vehicles, which do not restrict access, are usable, and provide allocated space and/or priority seating for individuals who use wheelchairs, and which are accessible using ramps or lifts.

ADVANCED GUIDEWAY SYSTEM (AGS) – A fully automated, driverless, grade-separated transit system in which vehicles are automatically guided along a guideway. The guideway provides both physical support as well as guidance. The system may be elevated or at-grade. Examples include maglev systems, people mover systems and monorail.

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009 (ARRA) – Legislation passed in 2009 as an economic stimulus program to fund projects such as improving education, building roads, public transportation, criminal justice, health care and others. The intent of the act is that it would result in jobs and other associated economic benefits.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) – Federal civil rights legislation for disabled persons passed in 1990. It mandates that public transit systems make their services more fully accessible to the disabled. If persons with disabilities are not capable of accessing general public transit service, the law requires agencies to fund and provide for delivery of paratransit services which are capable of accommodating these individuals.

AREA AGENCY ON AGING (AAA) A state-approved county or regional body responsible for administering Title III funds within a particular geographical area. There are 16 AAAs in Colorado.

ASSET MANAGEMENT – A systematic and strategic process of operating, maintaining, upgrading and expanding physical assets effectively through their life cycles.

BROKERAGE - A method of providing transportation where riders are matched with appropriate transportation providers through a central trip-request and administrative facility. The transportation broker may centralize vehicle dispatch, record keeping, vehicle maintenance and other functions under contractual arrangements with agencies, municipalities and other organizations. Actual trips are provided by a number of different vendors.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) – BRT combines the quality of rail transit with the flexibility of buses. It can operate on exclusive transitways, HOV lanes, expressways, or ordinary streets. A BRT system combines Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology, priority for transit, lower emissions, quieter vehicles, rapid and convenient fare collection, and integration with land use policy.

CAPITAL COSTS – Refers to the costs of long-term assets of a public transit system such as property, buildings, equipment and vehicles. Can include bus overhauls, preventive maintenance, mobility management and even a share of transit providers' ADA paratransit expenses.

CARPOOL – Arrangement made between a group of people that ride together to a designated place.

CAR SHARE – Companies that own cars that can be rented by members for the hour or day and are conveniently located at designated locations (transit stations, downtown, etc.).

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CDOT) - CDOT is primarily responsible for the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of Colorado Highway System, including the Interstate Highway System within the state's boundaries. Within CDOT, the Division of Aeronautics supports aviation interests statewide, the Division of Transit and Rail provides assistance to numerous transit systems around the state, and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program supports improvements to non-motorized facilities, such as bike paths, trails and routes, and pedestrian walkways and trails. <u>www.coloradodot.info</u>

COLORADO TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION – The state's transportation system is managed by the Colorado Department of Transportation under the direction of the Transportation Commission. The commission is comprised of 11 commissioners who represent specific districts. Each commissioner is appointed by the

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Governor, confirmed by the Senate, and serves a four-year term. The Transportation Commission is responsible for formulating general policy with respect to the management, construction, and maintenance of the state's transportation system; advising and making recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly relative to transportation policy; and promulgating and adopting CDOT's budgets and programs, including construction priorities and approval of extensions of abandonments of the state highway system. www.coloradodot.info/about/transportation-commission

COMMUTER RAIL – A transit mode that is an electric or diesel propelled railway for urban passenger train service consisting of local short distance travel operating between a central city and adjacent suburbs. Service is operated on a regular basis by or under contract with a transit operator for the purpose of transporting passengers within urbanized areas, or between urbanized areas and outlying areas.

COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (COG) – A voluntary association of local governments that operates as a planning body, collects and disseminates information, reviews applications for funding, and provides services common to its member agencies.

COMMUNITY CENTERED BOARDS (CCBS) – Private non-profit agencies that provide services to the developmentally disabled population. CCBs provide a variety of services, including transportation.

COORDINATION – A cooperative arrangement among public and private transportation agencies and human service organizations that provide transportation services. Coordination models can range in scope from shared use of facilities, training or maintenance to integrated brokerages of consolidated transportation service providers. Coordination also means the cooperative development of plans, programs and schedules among responsible agencies and entities to achieve general consistency, as appropriate.

COORDINATED PUBLIC TRANSIT-HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION PLAN (COORDINATED PLAN) – a locally or regionally developed, coordinated plan that identifies the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes, provides strategies for meeting those needs, and prioritizes transportation services for funding and implementation. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires that a project be included in a Coordinated Plan to be eligible for certain federal transit funds.

CURB-TO-CURB – A form of paratransit or demand-response service that picks up passengers at the curbside.

DEADHEAD – The time/distance that a transit vehicle does NOT spend in revenue service or moving passengers, as in the movement from the garage to the beginning of a route.

DEMAND-RESPONSE SERVICE – Personalized, direct transit service where individual passengers request transportation from a specific location to another specific location at a certain time. Transit vehicles providing demand-response service do not follow a fixed schedule or a fixed route, but travel throughout the community transporting passengers according to their specific requests. Can also be called "dial-a-ride," "paratransit" or "specialized service" to refer to any non-fixed route service. These services usually, but not always, require advance reservations and are often provided for elderly and disabled persons.

DEVIATED FIXED ROUTE – Provides service along a fixed route with deviations to pick up special riders (e.g., elderly and disabled persons) without significantly detracting from its schedule.

DISABLED – Any person who by reason of illness, injury, age, congenital malfunction or other permanent or temporary incapacity or disability, is unable, without special facilities, to use local transit facilities and services as effectively as people who are not so affected.

DIVISION OF TRANSIT AND RAIL (DTR) – A division within the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) responsible for transit and rail policy, planning, funding and oversight. DTR was created in 2009 to promote, plan, design, build, finance, operate, maintain and contract for transit services, including, but not limited to bus, passenger rail and advanced guideway systems. The Division is also responsible for administering and expending

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

state and federal transit funds, integrating transit and rail into the statewide transportation system, and developing a statewide transit and passenger rail plan as part of the multimodal statewide transportation plan.

DOOR-TO-DOOR SERVICE – A form of paratransit or demand –response service that includes passenger assistance between the vehicle and the door of the passengers' home or other destination. A higher level of service than curb-to-curb, yet not as specialized as "door-through-door" service.

DOOR-THROUGH-DOOR SERVICE – A form of paratransit or demand-response service that includes passenger assistance between the vehicle and within the home or destination. A higher level of service than curb-to-curb and door-to-door service.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (EJ) – Refers to the fair treatment of all people, regardless of race, color, national origin or income in terms of the distribution of benefits and costs of federal programs, policies and activities. Executive Order 12898, signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994, requires procedures be established to protect against the disproportionate allocation of adverse environmental and health burdens on a community's minority and low-income populations.

FARE BOX RECOVERY – The amount of revenue generated through fares by paying customers as a fraction of the total operating expenses.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (FHWA) – The agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation that provides funding for the construction, maintenance and preservation of the nation's highways, bridges and tunnels. <u>www.fhwa.dot.gov</u>

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) – The agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation that administers federal funding to support a variety of locally planned, constructed, and operated public transportation systems throughout the U.S., including buses, subways, light rail, commuter rail, streetcars, monorail, passenger ferry boats, inclined railways, and people movers. FTA provides financial assistance for capital, operating, administration and planning costs of these public transportation systems. <u>www.fta.dot.gov</u>

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION (FRA) – The federal agency within the U.S. Department of Transportation that oversees certain aspects of rail services, especially safety issues. The FRA promulgates and enforces rail safety regulations, administers railroad assistance programs, conducts research and development in support of improved railroad safety and national rail transportation policy, among other things. <u>www.fra.dot.gov</u>

FIXED ROUTE – Transit services where vehicles run on regular, scheduled routes with fixed stops and no deviation. Typically, fixed-route service is characterized by printed schedules or timetables, designated bus stops where passengers board and alight and the use of larger transit vehicles.

FUNDING AGENCY - Any organization, agency, or municipality that funds transportation services by contracting with another organization, agency, or municipality to provide the service. This does not include organizations that provide travel vouchers, subsidies, stipends, reimbursements, or other travel assistance directly to their clients for travel on public transit, paratransit, taxi services, other agency-sponsored transportation, or in private vehicles.

FUNDING ADVANCEMENT FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND ECONOMIC RECOVERY (FASTER) ACT –

Signed into law in 2009, FASTER provides state funds from an increase in vehicle registration fees to improve roadways, repair unsafe bridges, and support and expand transit. FASTER generates approximately \$200 million every year for transportation projects across Colorado. Of this, \$15 million annually goes to fund public transportation/transit projects statewide. Additional money is provided for city roads (approx. \$27 million annually) and county roads (approx. \$33 million annually). http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/fasternew

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

HEAD START – A federal program that provides support to children, birth to age five, that come from low income families by improving their physical, social and emotional development. Head Start programs are typically managed by local nonprofit organizations and are in almost every county in the country.

HEADWAY – The time interval between the passing of successive transit buses or trains moving along the same route in the same direction, usually expressed in minutes. It may also be referred to as service frequency.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND (HTF) – is a federal transportation fund, established in 1956 to finance the Interstate Highway System. In 1982, the Mass Transit Fund was created and a portion of the HTF also funds transit projects. Revenue for the HTF is generated by the federal fuel tax (18.4 cents per gallon on gasoline and 24.4 cents per gallon of diesel fuel), which has not increased since 1993.

HIGHWAY USERS TAX FUND (HUTF) – A state transportation fund, primarily funded by a motor fuel tax of 22 cents per gallon. Colorado's gas tax has been 22 cents since 1991. Funds are distributed based on a formula to CDOT, counties, and municipalities. Counties are authorized to flex HUTF dollars to transit, multimodal, bicycle, and pedestrian projects.

HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION - Transportation for clients of a specific human or social service agency that is usually limited to a specific trip purpose (e.g., Medicaid, Title III, etc.). Human service agency trips are often provided under contract to a human service agency and may be provided exclusively or rideshared with other human service agencies or general public service.

INTERCITY TRANSPORTATION - Long distance service provided between at least two urban areas or that connects rural areas to an urbanized area, usually on a fixed route, and often as part of a large network of intercity bus operators. Both express and local bus service may be provided. The Greyhound and Trailways systems are examples national intercity bus networks. Under the Federal Transit Administration's Section 5311(f) program, intercity transportation service must receive no less than 15 percent of each state's total Section 5311 funding, unless a state's governor certifies that these needs are already being met.

ITS (INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS) – Technical innovations that apply communications and information processing to improve the efficiency and safety of ground transportation systems.

LAST MILE CONNECTION – Refers to the challenge of getting people from transit centers/stations to their final destination. Last mile connections can be made by walking, biking, shuttles, local bus routes, etc.

LIGHT RAIL – A transit mode that typically is an electric railway with a light volume traffic capacity characterized by vehicles operating on fixed rails in shared or exclusive right-of-way. Vehicle power is drawn from an overhead electric line (catenary).

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) PERSONS - Refers to persons for whom English is not their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English. It includes people who reported to the U.S. Census that they speak English less than very well, not well, or not at all.

LOW-INCOME PERSON – A person whose median household income is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines.

LOW-INCOME POPULATION –Refers to any readily identifiable group of low-income persons who live in geographic proximity, and, if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient person who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy or activity.

MAGLEV (Magnetic Levitation) – A high-speed form of transit that moves along a fixed guideway by means of magnetic forces that vertically lift the vehicle from the guideway to propel it forward.

Regional Coordinated Transit and

ntermountain

Human Services Plan

MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21st CENTURY ACT (MAP-21) – A two-year funding and authorization bill to govern the United States federal surface transportation spending passed by Congress June 29, 2012 and signed into law by President Obama on July 6, 2012.

MATCH - State or local funds required by various federal or state programs to complement funds provided by a state or federal agency for a project. A match may also be required by states in funding projects that are joint state/local efforts. Some funding sources allow services, such as the work of volunteers, to be counted as an in-kind funding match. Federal programs normally require that match funds come from other than federal sources.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) – The agency designated by law as responsible for carrying out the transportation planning process and developing transportation plans and programs within an urbanized area. MPOs are established by agreement between the Governor and the local governments. There are five MPOs in Colorado.

MINORITY PERSONS - includes the following:

(1) American Indian and Alaska Native, which refers to people having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintain tribal affiliation or community attachment.

(2) Asian, which refers to people having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent, including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

(3) Black or African American, which refers to people having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa.

(4) Hispanic or Latino, which includes persons of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

(5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, which refers to people having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

MODE/INTERMODAL/MULTIMODAL - *Mode* refers to a form of transportation, such as automobile, transit, bicycle, and walking. *Intermodal* refers to the connections between modes, and *multimodal* refers to the availability of transportation options within a system or corridor.

MODE SHARE – Indicates the share of a transportation mode utilized by people for their transportation trips as compared to other modes and all of a region's transportation trips as a whole.

MONORAIL – Guided transit vehicles operating on or suspended from a single rail, beam or tube.

NATIONAL TRANSIT DATABASE (NTD): Annual reports (formerly known as "Section 15" reports) that provide financial and operating data that are required of almost all recipients of transportation funds under Section 5307. www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/

NON-EMERGENCY MEDICAL TRANSPORTATION (NEMT) - A form of medical transportation that is provided in non-emergency situations to people who require special medical attention. Often a form of human service transportation and a resource of Departments of Health and Human Services.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT (OAA) – An act passed in 1965 to addresses the needs of older adults and provide comprehensive services to those at risk of losing their self dependence. The act focuses on boosting the income, housing, health, employment, retirement and community services for older adults.

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

ntermountain

OPERATING EXPENSES/COSTS – The sum or all recurring expenses (e.g., labor, materials, supplies, fuel and equipment) associated with the operation and maintenance of the transit system including maintain equipment and buildings, operate vehicles, and to rent equipment and facilities.

OPERATING REVENUES – All funds generated from the operation of a transit system, including passenger fares, donations, advertising fees, etc.

PARATRANSIT SERVICE - The ADA requires public transit agencies that provide fixed-route service to provide "complementary paratransit" services to people with disabilities who cannot use the fixed-route bus or rail service because of a disability. The ADA regulations specifically define a population of customers who are entitled to this service as a civil right. The regulations also define minimum service characteristics that must be met for this service to be considered equivalent to the fixed-route service it is intended to complement. In general, ADA complementary paratransit service must be provided within 3/4 of a mile of a bus route or rail station, at the same hours and days, for no more than twice the regular fixed route fare.

PARK-AND-RIDE – A parking garage or lot used for parking passengers' automobiles while they use transit agency facilities. Generally established as collector sites for rail or bus service, but may also serve as collector sites for vanpools and carpools, and as transit centers. Can be either free or fee-based.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES – Specific measures developed to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of public transit.

PUBLIC (MASS) TRANSPORTATION – Transportation by bus, rail, or other conveyance, either publicly or privately owned, provided to the general public or special service on a regular and continuing basis. Does not include school bus, charter, or sightseeing service.

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION (RPC) – The planning body responsible for transportation planning within a MPO or rural area.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) – A multimodal transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon that is developed, adopted, and updated by the MPO or RPC through the transportation planning process.

REVENUE SERVICE MILES – The time when a vehicle is available to the general public, including running time and layover/recovery time.

RIDESHARING – A form of transportation in which two or more people shares the use of a vehicle, such as a van or a car. Also known as carpool or vanpool.

SERVICE AREA - A measure of access to transit service in terms of population served and area coverage (square miles). For fixed-route service, service areas are typically arranged in corridors. Complementary ADA paratransit services are required by ADA law to extend ¾ mile beyond the fixed-route corridors. As demand response serves a broad area and does not operate over a fixed route, the "service area" encompasses the origin to destination points wherever people can be picked up and dropped off.

SERVICE SPAN – The hours at which service begins and ends during a typical day.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT (SSA) – Federal legislation enacted in 1935 to provide elderly citizens (age 60 and older) with a monthly stipend, which is funded by payroll taxes on working citizens. The Act has been amended several times and now also provides stipends to dependents and those with disabilities.

STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (STAC) – Committee that provides advice to the Colorado Department of Transportation and the Transportation Commission on the needs of the transportation system in Colorado and review and comment on all regional transportation plans submitted by the transportation planning regions and/or CDOT.

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) – A statewide prioritized listing/program of transportation projects covering a period of four years that is consistent with the long-range statewide transportation plan, regional transportation plans, and TIPs, and required for projects to be eligible for funding.

STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – The long-range, fiscally constrained, comprehensive, multimodal statewide transportation plan covering a period of no less than 20 years from the time of adoption, developed through the statewide transportation planning process, and adopted by the Colorado Transportation Commission.

TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF) – A federal assistance program created in 1997. It is a social security program that provides financial assistance to indigent American families with dependent children through the Department of Health and Human Services.

TITLE VI – A federal regulation that prohibits discrimination by recipients of federal financial assistance on the basis of race, color, and national origin, including denial of meaningful access for limited English proficient persons.

TRANSIT AND RAIL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TRAC) – An advisory committee created specifically to advise the CDOT Executive Director, the Colorado Transportation Commission and the Division of Transit and Rail on transit and rail related activities.

TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD) – A type of development that links land use and transit facilities to support the transit system and help reduce sprawl, traffic congestion and air pollution. It calls for locating housing, along with complementary public uses (jobs, retail and services) at strategic points along a transit line.

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM) – Low-cost ways to reduce demand by automobiles on the transportation system, such as programs to promote telecommuting, flextime and ridesharing.

TRANSPORTATION DISADVANTAGED: A term used to describe those people who have little or no access to meaningful jobs, services, and recreation because a transportation system does not meet their needs. Often refers to those individuals who cannot drive a private automobile because of age, disability, or lack of resources.

TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES - Expenses for transportation services including vehicle operation, scheduling, dispatching, vehicle maintenance, fuel, supervision, fare collection (including ticket or scrip printing and sales), and other expenses for the purpose of carrying passengers, whether provided in-house, through contracts, or via taxicab.

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) – A prioritized listing/program of transportation projects covering a period of four years that is developed and formally adopted by an MPO as part of the transportation planning process, consistent with the regional transportation plan, and required for projects to be eligible for funding. The TIP is included in the STIP without modification.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REGION (TPR) – A geographically designated area of the state within which a regional transportation plan is developed. The term is inclusive of non-MPO TPRs, MPO TPRs and areas with both. There are 15 TPRs in Colorado; 5 are MPOs and 10 are in rural areas of the state.

TRANSPORTATION PROVIDER - Any organization, agency, or municipality that operates its own vehicles with agency staff and schedules trips for passengers or clients. This does not include organizations that provide travel vouchers, subsidies, stipends, reimbursements, or other travel assistance directly to their clients for travel on public transit, paratransit, taxi services, other agency-sponsored transportation, or in private vehicles.

URBANIZED AREA - An area defined by the U.S. Census Bureau that includes one or more incorporated cities, villages, and towns (central place), and the adjacent densely settled surrounding territory (urban fringe) that together have a minimum of 50,000 persons. The urban fringe generally consists of contiguous territory having a

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

density of at least 1,000 persons per square mile. Urbanized areas do not conform to congressional districts or any other political boundaries.

U.S. DOT (UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION) – The federal cabinet-level agency with responsibility for highways, mass transit, aviation and ports headed by the secretary of transportation. The DOT includes the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Transit Administration, among others. <u>www.dot.gov</u>

VANPOOL – An arrangement in which a group of passengers share the use and costs of a van in traveling to and from pre-arranged destinations together.

WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACT (WIA) – A federal law enacted in 1998 to provide workforce investment activities, through statewide and local workforce investment systems with a goal of increasing the employment, retention, and earnings of participants and to increase occupational skill attainment.



Transportation Planning Region

APPENDIX B TRANSIT WORKING GROUP



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

B.1 – Transit Working Group Meeting #1



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

B.2 - Transit Working Group Meeting #2



Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

B.3 - Transit Working Group Meeting #3

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Transportation Planning Region

APPENDIX C PUBLIC OUTREACH MATERIALS AND ATTENDANCE

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Transportation Planning Region

APPENDIX D PROVIDER AND HUMAN SERVICE AGENCY SURVEYS





D.1 – Provider Survey Questionnaire

D.2 - List of Provider Survey Respondents

- Beaver Creek Village Transportation City of Aspen
- City of Glenwood Springs
- Copper Mountain
- Eagle County Regional Transportation Authority
- Eagle County Schools
- Roaring Fork Transportation Authority
- Summit County Government
- Town of Avon Transit
- Town of Breckenridge
- Town of Snowmass Village





D.3 – Human Service Agency Questionnaire

ntermountain

D.4 – List of Human Service Agency Respondents

- Arkansas Headwaters Recreation Area
- Eagle County Economic Services
- Eagle County Human Services
- Eagle County Public Health
- **Eagle County Schools**
- Mountain Valley Developmental Services
- Northwest Colorado Council of Governments
- Pitkin County Human Services
- Summit County Community and Senior Center
- Summit County Social Services





D.5 – Regional Project List



Intermountain Transit Projects

Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Annual Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
City of Aspen*	Rubey Park transit facility renovation	\$4,600,000		Short	Facilities
City of Aspen	Entrance to Aspen Design	\$9,000,000		Short	Facilities
City of Aspen	Long-term vehicle replacements	\$500,000		Long	Vehicles
City of Aspen	Mid-term vehicle replacements	\$3,500,000		Mid	Vehicles
City of Aspen	Purchase of four (4) body on chassis vehicles in 2015	\$300,000		Short	Vehicles
City of Aspen	Purchase of four (4) replacement hybrid diesel buses (2018)	\$2,400,000		Short	Vehicles
City of Aspen	Purchase of one (1) replacement bus (2015)	\$400,000		Short	Vehicles
City of Glenwood Springs	Evaluate/update existing human services demand- response system and its funding source equity (labor)	\$1,000		Short	Access to Human Services
City of Glenwood Springs*	27th Street pedestrian crossing	\$5,000,000		Short	Facilities
City of Glenwood Springs	Purchase one (1) cutaway-type bus	\$50,000		Mid	Vehicles
City of Glenwood Springs	Replace two (2) large buses with CNG buses	\$900,000		Short	Vehicles
City of Glenwood Springs	Print new service schedules (estimated cost includes labor/materials)	\$2,500		Short	Marketing Strategies
City of Glenwood Springs	Reinstate service to the southern end of city limits		\$30,000	Short	Mobility of the General Public
City of Glenwood Springs	TDM (per Corridor Optimization Study)		\$200,000	Short	Operating



Transportation Planning Region

Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Annual Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
	Adjust transit service to meet city's Long-Range Transportation Plan; evaluate/study new bus stop				
City of Glenwood Springs	locations/park-n-rides/mass transit corridor	\$50,000		Long	Planning
City of Glenwood Springs	Evaluate local regional transit authority's rail R.O.W. infrastructure needs on city property			Long	Planning
Eagle County Human Services	Need for early morning service (before 9 AM)				Access to Human Services
Eagle County Human Services	Need for vanpool services				Coordination Strategies
Eagle County Public Health	Need for increased paratransit service in Eagle County (Roaring Fork Valley)				Access to Human Services
Eagle County Public Health	Need for regional service from Eagle to Garfield, Eagle to Summit, Eagle to Grand Junction, and Eagle to Denver				Access to Human Services
Eagle County Public Health	LEP appropriate maps and information/general transit navigation education				Coordination Strategies
ECO Transit*	Purchase of van to provide medical transport	\$35,000		Short	Access to Human Services
ECO Transit*	Provide medical transport from both local housing areas and from existing bus routes, 9.5 hours per day, 5 days a week, 20 minute headways		\$273,000	Short	Access to Human Services
ECO Transit	Refurbish all bus shelters in system, wood treatment, replace glass, roof repair for 34 shelters.	\$85,000		Long	Facilities
ECO Transit	Construct transportation facility at park and ride lot in Edwards with indoor facilities	\$800,000		Mid	Facilities



Transportation Planning Region

			Annual		
Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
ECO Transit*	Hire safety and security officer for organization		\$35,000	Short	Maintaining Service
ECO Transit*	Create new year round feeder and circulator service from the western half of the region to the work force centers in the eastern half, 1 hour headways, year round service (2 new cutaways)	\$250,000	\$500,000	Short	Mobility of the General Public
ECO Transit*	Reinstate half hourly service on Highway 6 route during mid-day hours, 12 hours per day 365 days per year		\$486,000	Short	Mobility of the General Public
ECO Transit*	Reinstate late night bus service (after midnight) from work force center year round, 5.75 hours per day 365 days per year		\$233,000	Short	Mobility of the General Public
ECO Transit	Create commuter service from neighboring counties to our work force centers, 16 hours per day 365 days per year		\$648,000	Mid	Regional Connectivity
ECO Transit	Purchase of 4 new commuter buses for service	\$2,000,000		Mid	Vehicles
ECO Transit	Reinstate third commuter bus from Leadville, 4 hours per day 365 days a year		\$162,000	Mid	Regional Connectivity
ECO Transit and RFTA*	New general public service from Garfield County to Eagle County (Glenwood Springs to Eagle) operating seven days per week with eight round trips per day		\$923,000	Short	Regional Connectivity
ECO Transit and Summit County*	New general public service from Eagle County to Summit County (Frisco to Vail) operating seven days per week with four round trips per day		\$369,000	Short	Regional Connectivity
Garfield County	Catherine Store park and ride renovation/expansion	\$600,000		Short	Facilities
Mountain Valley Developmental Services	Need for later evening service (after 6 PM)				Access to Human



Transportation Planning Region

			Annual		
Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
Agency	Filgett	Capital Cost	Admin Cost	Flaine	Services
					Services
					Access to
Mountain Valley					Human
Developmental Services	Need for local service in Lake and Garfield Counties				Services
Mountain Valley	Need for regional service between Eagle and Garfield				Access to Human
Developmental Services	Counties				Services
					Access to
Northwest Colorado Council					Human
of Governments	Need for additional weekend service				Services
Northwest Colorado Council	Establish a centralized regional Medicaid billing system				Coordination
of Governments*	for providers			Short	Strategies
Northwest Colorado Council	Maintain a regional services inventory (public, private				Coordination
of Governments*	and volunteer)			Short	Strategies
Northwest Colorado Council					Coordination
of Governments	Administer One-Call/One-Click Service			Short	Strategies
Northwest Colorado Council	Continued funding and support of NWCOG mobility				Coordination
of Governments	manager			Short	Strategies
Pitkin County*	Buttermilk pedestrian crossing	\$5,000,000		Short	Facilities
Pitkin County*	BC/SH82 intersection corrections	\$3,000,000		Short	Facilities
Pitkin County	Airport to Aspen Fixed Guideway			Long	Facilities
	Transit Guideway - Aspen to Snowmass, via Owl Creek				
Pitkin County	Road or other corridor			Long	Facilities
Pitkin County	Brush Creek intercept lot transit joint development	\$9,000,000		Mid	Facilities
Pitkin County	Terminal connection to BRT	\$4,000,000		Mid	Facilities
Pitkin County	Old Snowmass bus stop improvements	\$350,000		Short	Facilities



Transportation Planning Region

Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Annual Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category	
Pitkin County	Two Rivers Road park and ride renovation/expansion	\$300,000		Short	Facilities	
Pitkin County*	Aspen Maintenance Facility Phase IV Upgrades - CNG fueling	\$5,000,000		Short	Facilities	
RFTA*	West Glenwood Springs park and ride sidewalk/regional trail connection	\$435,000		Short	Facilities	
RFTA*	Structured park and ride reconstruction (Basalt, Carbondale, Brush Creek)	\$20,000,000		Mid	Facilities	
RFTA*	Glenwood maintenance facility expansion	\$20,000,000		Short	Facilities	
RFTA*	New Castle park and ride construction	\$600,000		Short	Facilities	
RFTA*	Administrative, Operations and Maintenance Needs Analysis to assess the long-term (20-year) space needs, locations, phasing and costs to design and construct (or rehabilitate) RFTA's administrative and operational facilities		\$20,000	Short	Facilities	
RFTA*	Housing Needs Analysis to assess RFTA's 20-year employee housing needs, locations, options, and phasing		\$20,000	Short	Facilities	
RFTA	Construction of BRT or similar high-quality, high capacity transit on I-70 to the East, connecting to Eagle County			Long	Facilities	
RFTA	Construction of BRT or similar high-quality, high-capacity transit on I-70, with a seamless connection over the Colorado river to SH82 BRT			Long	Facilities	
RFTA	I-70 corridor transportation preferred alternative design and construction (scope and cost TBD)			Mid	Facilities	
RFTA	I-70 / SH82 transit connection alternatives analysis / design	\$50,000,000		Mid	Facilities	



Transportation Planning Region

Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Annual Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
	Carbondale administrative and maintenance facility	•			
RFTA	renovation and expansion	\$25,000,000		Mid	Facilities
RFTA	Regional bus stop improvements	\$6,000,000		Mid	Facilities
RFTA	Housing rehabilitation and expansion (locations, scope, phasing, cost TBD)	\$2,000,000		Short	Facilities
RFTA	CMC park and ride renovation/expansion	\$400,000		Short	Facilities
RFTA*	Bus cameras	\$600,000		Short	Maintaining Service
RFTA*	Security upgrades at major bus stops and at facilities	\$500,000		Short	Maintaining Service
RFTA	Fleet replacement/modernization of thirty-five (35) buses	\$17,000,000		Mid	Maintaining Service
RFTA	Bus fleet replacement/modernization of thirty-five (35) buses	\$21,000,000		Short	Maintaining Service
RFTA	Comprehensive Asset Management Inventory - will be the foundation for RFTA's nascent asset management system, which will monitor the condition and maintenance schedule for all of RFTA's assets		\$25,000	Short	Maintaining Service
RFTA	Paratransit software	\$130,000		Short	Maintaining Service
RFTA	Regional travel model operations/maintenance		\$100,000	Short	Maintaining Service
RFTA	Re-power 18 MCI 57-passenger coaches	\$900,000		Short	Maintaining Service



Transportation Planning Region

			Annual		
Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
RFTA*	Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. This will address vision and goals for bicycle and pedestrian programs and projects, will develop a prioritized, short-term and long- term list based on systematic criteria, and will develop a funding plan		\$100,000	Short	Planning
RFTA*	Rio Grande ROW Comprehensive Plan. A requirement of RFTA's grants and agreements, this will update RFTA's 2005 comprehensive plan and will address encroachments, crossing policies, long-term maintenance and operation priorities, costs and funding.		\$750,000	Short	Planning
RFTA	As more people take transit, particularly with the advent of BRT, walking and bicycling programs and projects will become an important part of the transportation and mobility picture, and will need to compete for transportation funding, alongside transit and road funding.			Long	Planning
RFTA	Transit-oriented land use will become increasingly important. Land in the Roaring Fork Valley is scarce and valuable; by necessity, compact, transit-oriented land development will need to become the norm, and RFTA and its partners will need to gain expertise in land development as much as transportation.			Long	Planning
RFTA	I-70 corridor transit alternatives analysis		\$5,000,000	Mid	Planning
RFTA	Regional travel model development		\$250,000	Short	Planning
RFTA	Vehicle Replacements - fifty (50)	\$25,000,000		Long	5



Transportation Planning Region

Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Annual Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
Summit County	Facility improvements including expansion of bus bays and addition of a training and conference room.			Short	Facilities
Summit County	Replacement of aging buses in order to maintain safe, reliable and cost-effective service	\$5,000,000		Long	Vehicles
Summit County	Replacement of aging buses in order to maintain safe, reliable and cost-effective service	\$5,000,000		Mid	Vehicles
Summit County	Replacement of aging buses in order to maintain safe, reliable and cost-effective service	\$5,000,000		Short	Vehicles
Summit County Community and Senior Center	Increased weekend transit service				Access to Human Services
Summit County Community and Senior Center	Need for regional service between Denver and Summit County				Access to Human Services
Summit County Social Services	Need for later evening service (after 6 PM)				Access to Human Services
Summit County Social Services	Need for local service to Heeny and Blue River				Access to Human Services
Summit County Social Services	Need for regional service from Summit to Park and Summit to Lake				Access to Human Services
Town of Avon*	Bike lanes throughout core area of the Town of Avon	\$150,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Avon*	Bus shelter replacement throughout Town for conformity nine (9) shelters estimated at \$3,000 per shelter	\$27,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Avon*	Parking structure to access the Westin Gondola and Main Street	\$8,000,000		Short	Facilities



Transportation Planning Region

Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Annual Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
Agency	Floject	Capital Cost	Admin Cost	Frame	Maintaining
Town of Avon	Replacement of two (2) vehicles	\$800,000		Short	Service
		\$000,000		511011	Mobility of
					the General
Town of Avon*	Reinstate fixed-route service to the Village at Avon		\$350,000	Short	Public
			,,		Mobility of
	Trolley service on main street - operating \$150,000 &				the General
Town of Avon*	capital costs \$200,000	\$200,000	\$150,000	Short	Public
Town of Avon*	Security system upgrade on vehicles	\$100,000		Short	
Town of Basalt*	Basalt Avenue pedestrian crossing	\$5,000,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Basalt*	Sagewood bus stop reconstruction	\$400,000		Short	Facilities
					Mobility of
		\$200,000			the General
Town of Basalt	Local transit system in Basalt	annually		Mid	Public
					Mobility of
					the General
Town of Basalt	Bus service improvements between east and west Basalt	\$300,000		Short	Public
					Maintaining
Town of Beaver Creek Village	Need to fund annual vehicle replacement costs	\$500,000		Long	Service
		4=00.000			Maintaining
Town of Beaver Creek Village	Need to fund annual vehicle replacement costs	\$500,000		Mid	Service
	Nord to find enough which we do not so the	6500.000		Chaut	Maintaining
Town of Beaver Creek Village	Need to fund annual vehicle replacement costs	\$500,000		Short	Service
Town of Breckenridge*	Mixed-use parking structure at Tiger Dredge lot	\$8,000,000		Short	Facilities
	Retrofit garage doors on existing bus barn to				
Town of Breckenridge*	accommodate 102" wide buses	\$270,000		Short	Facilities
	Horizontal People Mover Phase IV - from McCain Parking				
Town of Breckenridge	to Farmer's Corner (AGS stop someday)			Long	Facilities



Transportation Planning Region

			Annual		
Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
Town of Breckenridge	Horizontal People Mover Phase I - from Gondola Town Base south to Village			Long	Facilities
Town of Breckenridge	Horizontal People Mover Phase II - from Village to Ice Rink			Long	Facilities
Town of Breckenridge	Horizontal People Mover Phase III - from Gondola Town Base north to McCain Parking			Long	Facilities
Town of Breckenridge	Mixed-use parking structure/transit station at McCain property	\$11,000,000		Mid	Facilities
Town of Breckenridge	Mixed-use parking structure/transit station at Gondola lots	\$21,000,000		Mid	Facilities
Town of Breckenridge	Merge with ski area will require a new bus storage facility	\$5,500,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Breckenridge	Summit Stage needs to promote building a mixed use parking structure/transit station in Blue River and expanding their service to Blue River before 2023.				Facilities
Town of Breckenridge	Electric Signage			Long	Maintaining Service
Town of Breckenridge	On-Board camera system upgrade			Long	Maintaining Service
Town of Breckenridge	Rolling stock mid-life refurbishments			Long	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Rolling stock replacements			Long	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Midlife refurbishment of (3) buses (2023)	\$465,000		Mid	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Replace Bus 9224 (2025)	\$610,000		Mid	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Replace three (3) cutaway buses with similar low floor cutaways (2027)	\$562,500		Mid	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Replace two (2) 2008 35' Diesel/Electric Hybrid buses (2024)	\$1,375,000		Mid	Vehicles



Transportation Planning Region

			Annual		
Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
Town of Breckenridge	Replace two (2) buses (2028)	\$1,300,000	Admin Cost	Mid	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Replace two (2) buses (2027)	\$1,260,000		Mid	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Three (3) expansion buses and expansion of service to McCain, The Shores, & Golf Course	\$2,700,000		Mid	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	\$5,250,000 for diesel buses, or \$11,000,000 for electric buses & infrastructure, or \$32,000,000 for CNG buses, infrastructure, fire protection upgrades	\$11,000,000		Short	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Merge operations with ski area and replace (10) buses			Short	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Mid-life refurbishment of bus 9224 (2019)	\$138,000		Short	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Mid-life refurbishment of two (2) 2008 diesel/electric hybrid buses to include battery packs (2016)	\$450,000		Short	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Midlife refurbishment of two (2) buses	\$300,000		Short	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Midlife refurbishment of two (2) buses	\$290,000		Short	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Replace Buses 9211, 9212, 9213 with (3) 29-32' diesel buses (2016)	\$1,440,000		Short	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge	Replace cutaway buses 9221, 9222, 9223 with similar low floor cutaways (2020)	\$465,000		Short	Vehicles
Town of Breckenridge*	Development of an ODP trip planner to include bike, ped, & trail	\$32,000		Short	Marketing Strategies
Town of Breckenridge*	Transit Wayfinding Project - upgrade existing signage & poles	\$180,000		Short	Marketing Strategies
Town of Breckenridge*	Where's My Bus - Phase II - outdoor monitors & pub/private partnership screens	\$60,905		Short	Marketing Strategies
Town of Breckenridge*	Yield to Bus - retrofit existing fleet with Yield to Bus equipment, install MUTCD signage, public education campaign	\$24,000		Short	Marketing Strategies



Transportation Planning Region

			Annual		
Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
Town of Carbondale*	SH 133 pedestrian bridge (along the Rio Grande Trail)	\$5,000,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Carbondale*	Local circulator bus infrastructure in Carbondale	\$2,000,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Carbondale*	Park and ride expansion	\$2,000,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Carbondale	Restroom at Carbondale BRT Station	\$100,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Carbondale*	Local circulator bus in Carbondale		\$200,000	Short	Mobility of the General Public
Town of Glenwood Springs*	Redesign entire bus service to better complement regional transit authority's new BRT service into and out of city limits		\$5,000	Short	Maintaining Service
Town of New Castle*	SH 6 Streetscape	\$8,000,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Parachute*	SH 6 and 24 Main Street Streetscape Improvements	\$900,000		Mid	Facilities
Town of Rifle*	Park and ride relocation	\$750,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Silt*	Park and ride expansion	\$2,000,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Snowmass Village*	Bus stop reconstruction (2) - Meadow Ranch and Snowmass Chapel	\$300,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Snowmass Village	Snowmass Mall Transit Plaza/Regional Transit Terminus Redevelopment	TBD		Mid	Facilities
Town of Snowmass Village	Build multimodal regional and local bus station	\$40,000,000		Mid	Facilities
Town of Snowmass Village	Snowmass bus storage facility	\$9,000,000		Mid	Facilities
Town of Snowmass Village	Wood Road roundabout bus stop reconstruction	\$2,000,000		Short	Facilities
Town of Snowmass Village	Owl Creek Road roundabout bus stops	\$1,500,000		Short	Facilities



Transportation Planning Region

Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Annual Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
		-			Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	Annual capital investments and maintenance of facilities	\$55,000		Long	Service
	Continue regional bus service to connect to RFTA BRT			0	Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	service (\$121,000 annual operating subsidy)	\$121,000		Long	Service
ŭ				0	Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace seventeen (17) standard body on chassis vehicles	\$2,074,000		Long	Service
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace three (3) service vehicles	\$120,000		Long	Vehicles
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace twenty (20) large body on chassis vehicles	\$12,300,000		Long	Vehicles
					Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace various pieces of maintenance equipment	\$122,000		Long	Service
	Continue regional bus service to connect to RFTA BRT				Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	service (\$110,000 annual operating subsidy)		\$110,000	Mid	Service
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace nine (9) large body on chassis vehicles	\$4,230,000		Mid	Vehicles
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace one (1) service vehicle	\$37,000		Mid	Vehicles
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace seven (7) standard body on chassis vehicles	\$686,000		Mid	Vehicles
					Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace various pieces of maintenance equipment	\$20,500		Mid	Service
	Add three (3) large body on chassis vehicles to fleet (if				
Town of Snowmass Village	necessary)	\$1,140,000		Short	Vehicles
	Annual capital improvements and maintenance of				Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	facilities	\$43,000		Short	Service
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace ten (10) large body on chassis vehicles	\$3,800,000		Short	Vehicles
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace ten (10) standard body on chassis vehicles	\$860,000		Short	Vehicles
Town of Snowmass Village	Replace one (1) service vehicle	\$28,000		Short	Vehicles
	Replace various pieces of maintenance equipment at cost				Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	of \$51,000.	\$51,000		Short	Service



Transportation Planning Region

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

Agency	Project	Capital Cost	Annual Operating/ Admin Cost	Time Frame	Category
Agency	Filipett	Capital Cost	Admin Cost	Traffic	
		¢50.000			Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	Annual capital investments and maintenance of facilities	\$50,000			Service
			ć100.000		Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	Annual fuel or alternative fuel subsidy		\$100,000		Service
	Annual funding for a dispatcher position 18 hours/day				Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	and 7 days/week.		\$150,000		Service
	Biannual consultant services to update policies and plans				Maintaining
Town of Snowmass Village	for federal grant guidelines		\$10,000		Service
	Marketing and promotion of transit service options,				Marketing
Town of Snowmass Village	seasonal changes, and special event services (annually)		\$25,000		Strategies
¥					Marketing
Town of Snowmass Village	Investment in transit information web site	\$35,000			Strategies
	Uishan franzisa hat was CUO2 and the Town of				Deviewal
Town of Coownards Village*	Higher-frequency service between SH82 and the Town of		¢500.000	Chout	Regional
Town of Snowmass Village*	Snowmass, to coincide with increased headways of BRT		\$500,000	Short	Connectivity Coordination
Transit Working Group #1*	Coordination of modical trins to Donvor			Short	
	Coordination of medical trips to Denver			SHULL	Strategies
	Coordination of regional transportation services,				Coordination
Transit Working Group #1*	including specialized transit services (HHS, veterans, etc.)			Mid	Strategies
	Increase vehicle sharing and multiple types of riders on				Coordination
Transit Working Group #1*	same vehicles			Mid	Strategies
	Develop and implement marketing and information				
	campaigns throughout the region to increase awareness				Coordination
Transit Working Group #1*	of public transportation services			Short	Strategies
					Coordination
Transit Working Group #1	Access to services in Garfield County from El Jebel				Strategies

*High priority strategy as identified in the Implementation Plan (Chapter 7).

Intermountain

Regional Coordinated Transit and Human Services Plan

APPENDIX E CDOT STATEWIDE SURVEY OF OLDER ADULTS AND ADULTS WITH DISABILITIES – INTERMOUNTAIN REPORT