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## Corridor Profiles

## What are the Corridor Profiles?

As part of Colorado's Statewide Transportation Plan, Your Transportation Plan, extensive public engagement and data analysis helped to identify transportation needs across the state. The Corridor Profiles are a synthesis of the public feedback, stakeholder insight, and key data used to identify the transportation needs across the state. This synthesis culminated in the development of a comprehensive multimodal project list for each region to meet the corridor needs, as well as the 10 -Year Vision. Each interstate, US highway, and state highway corridor in all 10 of CDOT's rural Transportation Planning Regions (TPR) has a Corridor Profile.

Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) like the Denver Regional Council of Governments, Grand Valley MPO, North Front Range MPO, Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments, and Pueblo Area Council of Governments create their own regional plans that become part of the Statewide Transportation Plan. These plans help metropolitan regions set their own transportation priorities and goals. The MPOs are responsible for providing a vision for their corridors whereas these Corridor Profiles are the culmination of the statewide planning process for the rural regions of Colorado. For more information about transportation planning in Colorado's MPOs, visit the following websites:

| Denver Regional Council of Governments | $\underline{\text { drcog.org }}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Grand Valley MPO | gv2045rtp.com |
| North Front Range MPO | $\underline{\text { nfrmpo.org/rtp }}$ |
| Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments | www.ppacg.org |
| Pueblo Area Council of Governments | pacog.net |

## What's Included?

## Overview Page:

The overview page includes a map of the corridor, alongside details about the corridor, including the official name, descriptions, and a corridor vision. The map on the overview page shows the full extent of each corridor, which sometimes extends outside of the TPR boundary to a logical termini. State or federal designations are listed and may include:

- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor
- National Highway System
- Tier 1 Compressed Natural Gas, Electric Vehicle, and Hydrogen Corridor
- Scenic Byway


Appendix E-Corridor Profiles


Additionally, a public input synthesis labeled What We've Heard About the Corridor summarizes the public input specific to the corridor garnered through the extensive public engagement undertaken for this Plan including:

- Over 9,000 surveys
- Over 17,000 online map comments
- Over 15,000 website pageviews
- Over 16,000 telephone town hall participants
- 1.2 million + views on social media
- Discussions with over 3,500 people at community events


## Key Data Findings:

This page highlights the key findings of data analysis performed on each corridor. Data points include:

- Demographics
- Growth and congestion patterns
- Crash patterns
- Shoulder availability
- Drivability life
- Bicycle activity and safety
- Main Street designations
- Transit option



## Corridor Needs:

The key data findings and public input for each corridor were used to identify transportation-related needs for each corridor. This broad set of needs were then categorized into one of the following to help identify project solutions:



- Job concentrations
- Freight movement
- Recreational opportunities
- Airports
- Criticality
- Redundancy
- Natural disaster factors
- Hazardous materials (hazmat) route

- Freight
- Growth \& congestion
- Safety
- Lack of travel options
- Road condition \& maintenance


## Project List:

Corridor needs were addressed through project identification, gathering existing projects from CDOT Plans and project lists, and identifying new projects when necessary. This created a comprehensive multimodal project list for each corridor displayed on these Project List pages. To help visualize the project benefits and
 their relationship to statewide needs, each project was categorized based on primary project type (Table 1), additional project benefits (Table 2), and statewide plan goal areas (Table 3) represented as icons on the Corridor Profiles and the 10 Regional Transportation Plans (RTP).

The primary project type and additional project benefits were identified uniformly across projects and TPRs. More details on this identification method are provided in the tables below.

## Table 1: Primary Project Type

For most projects, one primary project type was selected. In some cases, two were needed to adequately represent the project (e.g., Bicycle and Pedestrian for streetscape improvements or Safety and Operations for intersection improvements).

## Icon Type Description

Trail projects, Main Street projects with a primary focus on improving pedestrian infrastructure including sidewalks, crosswalks, ADA ramps

Trail projects, bike lane projects, shoulder projects (only if this is a primary reason for the shoulders - otherwise bicycle as additional benefit)

Shoulder projects, wildlife crossing projects, pull-offs, intersection or interchange projects that specify safety improvements

Operations Intersection projects, interchange projects, ITS projects

Capacity Major widening projects, passing lane projects

Transit Any type of transit project - including capital, operating, or planning
Asset
Management
Reconstruction projects, resurfacing projects, bridge or culvert reconstruction

Freight Chain up stations, rest areas, specific freight-related projects

## Table 2: Additional Project Benefits

The additional project benefits describe the secondary benefits of the project. The benefits are generally different categories from the project type; however, there are a few exceptions. Bicycle and/or Pedestrian may be selected as a project benefit if the primary project type is something else - but the project includes bicycle and/or pedestrian improvements. Similarly, Asset Management may be selected as a project benefit if asset management treatments are being bundled with a capital project.
Type
Economic
Vitality

Public Health
Tourism
Mobility
Options
Resilience
Environmental

Quality of Life

Bicycle

Pedestrian

Freight

Transit

Asset
Management
Aviation

Safety

## Description

Project is located on a Colorado Freight Corridor; Main Street improvements to enhance downtown economic vitality

Project Type is Bike or Pedestrian; Transit service; If secondary bicycle benefit and High Demand Bicycle Corridor

Project would improve access to a tourist destination such as a National Park or State Park or is an improvement on scenic byways that impacts visitors

Project would expand biking, walking, or transit options
Project includes a specific component to address resiliency, (e.g., drainage improvements, rockfall mitigation, flooding, etc.)

Project includes a component that specifically enhances environmental resources (e.g., wildlife underpass, electric buses)

Project gives people the opportunity to access jobs, medical services, social activities, grocery stores, etc. (typically transit service projects)

Project includes bicycle improvements or would make bicycling safer/easier (e.g., shoulder widening); only included if NOT the primary project type

Project includes pedestrian improvements; only included if NOT the primary project type
Project would provide specific benefits for freight travel (Used only if not a primary freight project and if it's a Colorado Freight Corridor)
(e.g., interchange improvement with larger turning radius; bridge replacement that would allow heavier loads to use)
Project is not transit-focused but could benefit transit (e.g., capacity/ operations improvements on a state highway with fixed-route transit service, ADA sidewalk improvements proximate to transit stop)
Project includes an asset management component; bus maintenance or vehicle storage facility

Project would improve access to a commercial airport
Project would include pull-offs, passing lanes, if an asset replacement (e.g., bridge) likely also a safety benefit

## Project Based Strategies:

Your Transportation Plan uses three goal areas to address the transportation needs of the state; namely, Mobility, Safety, and Asset Management, identified as icons on the Project List pages. Many projects provide benefits of more than one goal area and may have had multiple goal areas identified. For the Project Based Strategies page, projects were placed into the


goal area that best aligned with the project type. Projects were then mapped using the goal area icons, by location, to visualize the projects along each corridor. More information on the goal areas can be found in Your Transportation Plan.

The SWP goal areas were identified uniformly across projects and TPRs. More details on this identification method are provided in Table 3.

## Table 3: SWP Goal Areas

SWP goal areas that are addressed with the project.

| Icon | Type | Description |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Safety |  |
| Mobility | Bike, Ped, Transit, Operations, Capacity projects, or an Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems (ITS) project |  |
| Asset <br> Management | Any component of asset management, including transit asset management <br> (e.g., fleet replacement), or geohazard (rockfall, avalanche mitigation) |  |

## Connection to the 10-Year Vision

The 10 -Year Vision reflects the highest priorities of the state and Regions. The $10-$ Year Vision's purpose is to create an implementation plan that best uses reasonably expected current and future funding to meet the needs identified by the state and the Regions. CDOT used what they heard from Coloradans and the Corridor Profiles' needs analysis, alongside the Priority Projects list from each TPR, to create five strategic focus categories for projects that align with the statewide needs for the 10-Year Vision:

- Improving Our Interstates
- Relieving Traffic
- Improving Rural Access Statewide
- Fixing Rural Roads
- Improving the Condition of our Roadway System

More details on project categories and how they align to corridor and regional needs can be found in Your Transportation Plan and in the 10-Year Vision (Appendix A).

## Table of Contents

| Central Front Range Transportation Planning Region | CFR 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Eastern Transportation Planning Region | EA 1 |
| Gunnison Valley Transportation Planning Region | GV 1 |
| Intermountain Transportation Planning Region | IM 1 |
| Northwest Transportation Planning Region | NW 1 |
| South Central Transportation Planning Region | SC 1 |
| Southeast Transportation Planning Region | SE 1 |
| San Luis Valley Transportation Planning Region | SLV 1 |
| Southest Transportation Planning Region | SW 1 |
| Upper Front Range Transportation Planning Region | UFR 1 |

## List of Acronyms

| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act |
| :--- | :--- |
| CFR | Central Front Range |
| CNG | Compressed Natural Gas |
| CR | County Road |
| DOLA | Department of Local Affairs |
| DRCOG | Denver Regional Council of Governments |
| EA | Eastern |
| EV | Electric Vehicle |
| GV | Gunnison Valley |
| GVMPO | Grand Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| HDBC | High Demand Bicycle Corridor |
| IM | Intermountain |
| ITS | Intelligent Transportation Systems |
| LCR | Larimer County Road |
| LOSS | Level of Safety Service |
| MP | Mile Post |
| MPO | Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| NECALG | Northeastern Colorado Association of Local Governments |
| NFRMPO | North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| NW | Northwest |
| PACOG | Pueblo Area Council of Governments |
| PPACG | Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments |
| RTP | Regional Transportation Plan |
| SCCOG | South Central Council of Governments |
| SC | South Central |
| SE | Southeast |
| SL | San Luis Valley |
| SW | Southwest |
| SWP | Statewide Plan |
| SH | State highway |
| TPR | Transportation Planning Region |
| UFR | Upper Front Range |
| WCR | Weld County Road |

## CDOT Region 2

## Counties:

## Custer, El Paso, Fremont, Park, Teller

## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Provide additional travel options
- Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
* Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback


## What We've Heard about the Central Front Range

- 759 public and stakeholder comments specifically about the Central Front Range
- 558 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the CFR TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" public survey respondents in the CFR TPR, combined with stakeholder input selected: Road Condition and Safety, Lack of Travel Options, and Growth and Congestion
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the Central Front Range (in order of frequency) included: Safety, Congestion, Road Condition, Roadway Capacity, Passing Lanes, Travel Time Reliability, Trucking/ Freight, Bus Service/ Transit, Bike Lanes

【I The vision for the Central Front Range TPR RTP is that the transportation system will accommodate the region's rapidly growing multimodal transportation needs through a combination of capacity improvements in congested corridors, safety and traffic management improvements elsewhere on the transportation system, and the provision of local and regional public transportation. Transportation development will accommodate and enhance the region's high quality of life, while preserving the environmental conditions that make this a great place to live, work, and visit. The transportation system supports economic development by providing mobility for people and goods, as well as


## Key Data Findings:

Demographics
Economics

| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 2.4 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 3.3 Million |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asset <br> Management | 73 Miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 297 Miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 117 Miles of highway with low drivability life |

State Highway 9A: US 50 North to US 24 (Hartsel) (PCF7001)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 9A: US 50 North to US 24

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 9 - US 50 north to US 24 (Hartsel) corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a regional facility providing both local access and connectivity of US 50 to the South Park area. The corridor serves as a detour during closures of US 50 and provides mobility for freight and commuter traffic.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for bicycle/ pedestrian improvements
- Desire for safety improvements
- Concerns about natural disasters




## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Address bridge in poor conditionImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate risk associated with natural disastersAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 9 Shoulder Widening | Widen SH 9 along selected location, estimated ~ $25 \%$ of corridor (Along SH 9 MP 0 to 47) | 1634 | (1) | 6 | \% ! | \$24.00 |
| SH 9 Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Wild Animal, Fixed Objects, Overturning | 2396 | (1) | (d) | * ! | \$0.08 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- SH 9 Shoulder Widening


State Highway 9B: US 24 (Hartsel) North to Breckenridge (PCF7002)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 9B: US 24 (Hartsel) North to Breckenridge

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 9 - US 24 (Hartsel) north to Breckenridge corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a north-south connection to areas outside of the region via Hoosier Pass. The corridor provides an important linkage to communities and towns along the corridor while also providing a direct connection to Summit County and I-70. SH 9 often serves as a reliever route due to congestion and/ or weather conditions on I-70. The corridor is important to commuters and tourists as it provides access to jobs and recreation in the region.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R2-1)
- Section of Scenic Byway (Golden Belt Tour)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 18 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for safety improvements (particularly at US 285 and SH 9)
- Desire for pedestrian improvements


Key Data Findings: State Highway 9B: US 24 (Hartsel) North to

## Key Data Findings:

Demographics Transit

Passes through census tract with high percentage of $65+\&$ low-income populations

Shoulders <2' between Fairplay \& Alma Dense wildlife collisions
Four segments with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)

| Resiliency | Medium bike activity on SH 9 <br> Two locations with bicycle crashes |
| :---: | :--- |
| Bicycling | Crosses and parallels 100-year flood plain |
| Economics | Concentration of hard rock mining locations <br> Concentration of jobs in Fairplay |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 9B: US 24 (Hartsel) North to

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate unsafe passing conditionsMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Improve bicycle accommodationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress increasing congestion to provide access to jobs and recreation

Breckenridge (PCF7002)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Inter-regional <br> Transit Service between <br> Summit County and <br> Colorado Springs | Inter-regional Transit Service From Summit County to Fairplay to Hartsel to Colorado Springs, 5 days per week, 4 trips per day | 1001 |  | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.70 |
| SH 9: Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Fairplay and Breckenridge | 1002 | (8) | (1) | (1) | \$19.00 |
| SH 9 Chain Up Station South of Hoosier Pass | Chain up station for CMV's heading north over Hoosier Pass | 1066 | (2) | (1) | (1) | \$4.50 |
| Hoosier Pass Northbound Climb Lane (MP 72.576.5) | Hoosier Pass Northbound Climb Lane (MP 72.5-76.5) | 1636 | -8) | (1) | (1) | \$9.00 |
| SH 9 Shoulder Widening | Widen shoulders for safety and accommodate bikes, estimated ~25\% of corridor (MP 47 to 64) and Breckenridge to Alma (MP 71-86), including other safety improvements | 1637 | $!$ | (4) 6 |  | \$28.00 |
| US 285/CO 9 Intersection Improvement with Bridge Widening | Upgrades the intersection with dual left turn lanes, protected pedestrian crossings, and new sidewalks. This project also includes a bridge widening and replacement along US 285. | 8 |  |  |  | \$15.00 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area

## 0 <br> Asset Management



## Corridor Name

US 24 A (i): Trout Creek Pass East to Lake George

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 24 - Trout Creek Pass east to Lake George corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides an important east-west connection between the Upper Arkansas River and South Park areas. Currently, the corridor has two distinct sets of operating characteristics:

- The western portion, Trout Creek Pass, has significant periodic congestion as well as on-going safety concerns on the winding, steep road.
- The South Park and Wilkerson Pass area currently shows little congestion, but will benefit from the construction of non-capacity improvements.
Additionally, the corridor serves as an alternative route from the Front Range to recreation in the central mountain area and serves as a reliever route for 1-70 due to congestion and weather related closures.


## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for transit options
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of 65+, low-income \& disabled populations | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Resiliency | Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Safety | Two segments with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Two segments with shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ Hazmat route | Economics | Provides access to recreational area |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one segment) Two bridges in poor condition |  |  |

Corridor Needs: US 24 A (i): Trout Creek Pass East to Lake George


## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate seasonal increases in tourism activity andEliminate unsafe passing conditions
associated congestion
$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Inter-regional Transit Service between Summit County and Colorado Springs | Inter-regional Transit Service From Summit County to Fairplay to Hartsel to Colorado Springs, 5 days per week, 4 trips per day | 1001 |  | (4) © | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.70 |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide <br> Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 24 and US 285; existing fiber on US 50 | Installation of fiber-optics and Intelligent Transportation Systems devices | 1003 | (8) | $!$ | (1) 5 | - |
| US 24 Shoulder Widening | Widen US 24 at selected locations, estimated ~ $25 \%$ of corridor (MP 225 to 284) | 1639 | (1) | 60 | (1) | \$30.00 |
| US 24 Passing lanes in South Park | Additional passing lanes in South Park | 1640 | D | (1) | (1) 5 | \$15.00 |
| Between Trout Creek Pass \& Hartsel | Rural road surface treatment | 2610 | 3 | (1) | 1. | \$7.14 |
| Hartsel to east of Wilkerson Pass | Rural road surface treatment | 2611 | 3 | ! | $8$ | \$9.83 |
| East of Wilkerson Pass to Lake George | Rural road surface treatment | 2612 | $(3$ | (1) | $8$ | \$3.29 |
| Between Lake George \& Divide | Rural road surface treatment | 2613 | $8$ | (1) | $8$ | \$5.13 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle


Capacity
Transit
Asset
Management
Pedestrian

Project Benefits
Environmenta

Economic Vitality
Public Health
Tourism
Environmental


Quality of Life
Bicycle


Pedestrian

Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit
SWP Goal Area

CFR 15


## (3) Asset <br> Management

- Between Trout Creek Pass \& Hartsel
- Hartsel to east of Wilkerson Pass
- East of Wilkerson Pass to Lake George
- Between Lake George \& Divide


## Mobility

- New Inter-regional Transit Service between Summit County and Colorado Springs
- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 24 and US 285; existing fiber on US 50
- US 24 Passing lanes in South Park


## ! Safety

- US 24 Shoulder Widening


## Corridor Name

US 24 A (ii): Lake George East to SH 67 (Woodland Park)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 24 - Lake George east to SH 67 (Woodland Park) corridor is primarily to increase mobility, improve safety and maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility (from Divide to Woodland Park), provides commuter access, and makes east-west connections within the mountainous region west of Colorado Springs. It is a primary connector to corridors serving the gaming community of Cripple Creek. The transportation system in the area serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor as well as destinations outside of the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System (Divide to Woodland Park)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 28 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for transit stop and park-n-ride improvements
- Improve bicycle accommodation
- Improve communication from CDOT about projects and closures
- Concerns about congestion
- Concerns about seasonal congestion


Key Data Findings: US 24 A (ii): Lake George East to SH 67 (Woodland


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high <br> percentage of $65+\&$ disabled populations |  | Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (eastern half the corridor) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Corridor Needs: US 24 A (ii): Lake George East to SH 67 (Woodland Park)


## Corridor Needs

Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs,Address pavement condition where drivability life is poortourist destinations, and recreation and minimizeEliminate shoulder deficiencies
growth impactsAccommodate seasonal increases in tourism activity and

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide <br> Strategic Fiber <br> Network; fiber on US 24 and US 285; existing fiber on US 50 | Installation of fiber-optics and Intelligent Transportation Systems devices | 1003 | (8) | (1) | (1) | - |
| Transit Transfer Facilities For Regional Services (Cripple Creek, Cañon City, Woodland Park) | Provide Transfer Facilities For Regional Services in Cripple Creek, Cañon City, and Woodland Park | 1004 | (-) | (ii) $x$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.39 |
| Between Lake George \& Divide | Rural road surface treatment | 2613 | $3$ | - | $9$ | \$5.13 |
| New Inter-regional Service between Cripple CreekWoodland ParkColorado Springs | Connecting Cripple Creek with Woodland Park and then Colorado Springs (via US 24). 5-7 days per week, 9 hours per day, estimated 2,300-3,230 hours per year | 1067 | (-) |  |  | \$1.78 |
| New Regional FixedRoute Transit Service in Teller County (including Lake George, Florissant, Evergreen Station, and others) | Establish twice daily fixed services throughout Teller County serving Lake George, Florissant, Evergreen Station, others; requires one cutaway vehicle; 3 days/week; twice daily | 1068 | (-) |  | $\theta$ | \$0.60 |

## Project Types



Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits
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Management
Freight
Transit
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety
(Woodland Park) (PCF7004)(Page 2l 2)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 24A Passing Lanes (Lake George to Florissant) | US 24A Passing Lanes (MP 266-268) | 1641 | (8) | (1) | (1) | \$6.00 |
| US 24 Shoulder Widening | Widen US 24 at selected location (US 24 MP 143 to 304) | 1642 | (1) | 68.3 |  | \$20.00 |
| US 24A Wilkerson Pass <br> Safety Improvements <br> (shoulder widening + rumble strips + geometry correction) | US 24A Wilkerson Pass Safety Improvements (shoulder widening + rumble strips + geometry correction) - MP 253-254.5 FY21 | 1643 | $!$ | 610 | (1) | \$3.00 |
| US 24 Ute Pass Median | US 24 Ute Pass Median - MP 278.18292.6 | 1644 | (8) | (1) | (1) | \$3.00 |
| US 24A Blind Curve Safety Improvements (near Florissant (curve re-align/flattening) | US 24A Blind Curve Safety Improvements (near Florissant (curve re-align/flattening) - MP 278.18-292.6 | 1645 |  | - | (1) | \$1.00 |
| Teller Senior Coalition Transit Stops, Facilities, and Wayfinding | Shelters, benches, signage for bus stops in Woodland Park | 2487 | (2) | (12) |  | \$0.03 |
| New Inter-regional <br> Transit Service between <br> Summit County and <br> Colorado Springs | Inter-regional Transit Service From Summit County to Fairplay to Hartsel to Colorado Springs, 5 days per week, 4 trips per day | 1001 | (9) | (x) 0 | $s$ | \$0.70 |

## Project Types



Freigh
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits
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- Between Lake George \& Divide US 24 Shoulder Widening


## $\Rightarrow$ Mobility

- Transit Transfer Facilities For Regional Services (Cripple Creek, Cañon City, Woodland Park)
- New Inter-regional Service between Cripple Creek Woodland Park-Colorado Springs
- New Regional Fixed-Route Transit Service in Teller County (including Lake George, Florissant, Evergreen Station, and others)
- Teller Senior Coalition Transit Stops, Facilities, and Wayfinding
- US 24A Passing Lanes (Lake George to Florissant) MP 266-268


## ! Safety

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 24 and US 285 ; existing fiber on US 50
- US 24A Wilkerson Pass Safety Improvements (shoulder widening + rumble strips + geometry correction
- US 24 Ute Pass Median (MP 278.18-292.6)
- US 24A Blind Curve Safety Improvements (near Florissant (curve re-align/flattening) - MP 278.18292.6


## Corridor Name

US 24 G: Elbert Road East to I-70 (Limon)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 24 - Peyton east to I-70 (Limon) corridor is to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections from the plains east of Colorado Springs. It is a link to the Ports to Plains Corridor on US 287 and to I-70 from Colorado Springs.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R2-4) - Pikes Peak TRP to Peyton


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 16 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for safety improvements
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for roadway condition improvements
- Concerns about travel conditions from snowstorms



|  | Key Data FindingS: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety Hazmat route |  | Resiliency | High criticality (Peyton to Calhan) <br> Crosses 100-year flood plain |  |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (two segments) <br> One bridge in poor condition near Peyton |  | Freight <br> Economics | High percentage of truck traffic <br> High concentration of wind turbines |
| Bicycling | Medium to high bike activity (east of Peyton) |  |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor$\triangle$ Address bridge in poor conditionEliminate unsafe passing conditionsMitigate risk associated with natural disastersImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Limon to Colorado Springs (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Limon and Colorado Springs. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1006 | (5) |  |  | 1.97 |
| US 24: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS Intelligent Transportation Systems devices between Colorado Springs and Limon | 1007 | (8) |  | B! | \$11.00 |
| US 24 East: Elbert Road to El Paso County Line Turn and Passing Lanes | Addition of turn and passing lanes on US 24 from Elbert Rd. to El Paso County line. (MP 325.5-350.5) | 1069 | (8) | -2) |  | \$32.00 |
| US 24 Passing Lanes | US 24 East Passing Lanes (MP 326 to 329) | 1647 | D |  | $\Leftrightarrow!$ | \$6.00 |
| US 24 Calhan East Eastbound Passing Lane | US 24 Calhan east Passing Lanes (MP 341.3-342.58) | 1648 | D |  | $\Leftrightarrow!$ | \$4.00 |
| US 24G Bridge Replacement (widen bridge and install guardrail for bridge approaches) | Widen bridge and install guardrail for bridge approaches | 1649 | $3$ | - | $8$ | \$3.00 |
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- US 24G Bridge Replacement (widen bridge and install guardrail for bridge approaches)


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Limon to Colorado Springs (Proposed Outrider Service)
- US 24: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure


## (1) Safety

- US 24 East: Elbert Road to El Paso County Line Turn and Passing Lanes
- US 24 Passing Lanes
- US 24 Calhan East Eastbound Passing Lane (MP 341.3-342.58)


## Corridor Name

US 50 A (i): East of Salida East to SH 115 (Cañon City)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 50 - East of Salida east to SH 115 (Cañon City) corridor is primarily to improve safety and to maintain system quality, but includes mobility in terms of public transportation and pedestrian improvements.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an east-west multimodal National Highway System facility and serves as the major arterial in Cañon City. This corridor has become a southern alternative to l-70 for tourist and freight traffic, requiring interstate level mobility. The transportation system in the area serves towns, cities, and destinations such as the Arkansas River, one of the most scenic areas of the state with vast recreational opportunities.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Scenic Byway (Parkdale to Cañon City - Gold Belt Tour)
- Tier 2 EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 120 comments specifically about this corridor
- Improve bicycle accommodations
- Improve travel time reliability (Cañon City)
- Improve roadway condition
- Provide pedestrian crossings (Cañon City)
- Improve accel/ decel/ turn lanes



| Key Data Findings: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of 65+, minority, \& disabled populations | Transit | Black Hills Stage Lines operates on the corridor Bustang Outrider operates on the Corridor with stops in Cotopaxi and Cañon City |
| Freight Safety | Three segments with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Several segments with shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route | Bicycling | Medium bicycle activity (Parkdale to Cañon City) Medium-high stress for bicycling DOLA Main street through Cañon City |
|  |  | Resiliency | High criticality Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one large segment of the corridor) | Freight <br> Economics | High percentage of truck traffic High concentration of jobs in Cañon City |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate increasing congestion to improve accessMitigate risk associated with natural disastersEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demandImprove bicycle accommodationsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transit Transfer <br> Facilities For Regional <br> Services (Cripple <br> Creek, Cañon City, <br> Woodland Park) | Provide Transfer Facilities For Regional Services in Cripple Creek, Cañon City, and Woodland Park | 1004 |  |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.39 |
| US 50 Corridor Plan | Access/multimodal improvements along US 50 | 2461 | (3) | $\Rightarrow 60$ |  | \$0.20 |
| Essential Bus Service between Salida to Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Salida and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1008 | (-) | (12) 5 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.34 |
| Between Penrose \& Fremont/Pueblo County Line | Rural road surface treatment | 2607 |  | (1) |  | \$9.14 |
| US 50 Passing Lanes East of Salida | Addition of passing opportunities, mobility and safety improvements including shoulder widening, curve corrections, rock excavation and rockfall protection on US 50 east of Salida. | 1009 | (1) | (3) 3 |  | \$8.50 |
| New Golden Shuttle Fixed-Route Service in Fremont County (Cotopaxi and outlying areas) | Expand service to include weekend and evening service. Estimated 4,400 hrs./yr. Annual depreciated cost of one-half time body-on-chassis bus | 1070 |  | (n) $\Rightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$1.33 |
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expanded Local FixedRoute Service between Florence-PenroseCañon City | Expand Fixed Services in Fremont County serving Florence, Penrose and towns west along US50. Requires one cutaway vehicle | 1071 |  | (iil) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.76 |
| Expanded Starpoint <br> Demand Response <br> Transit Service | Expand Starpoint client-based service to include weekend and early morning service. Estimated 1,000 hrs./yr. Annual depreciated cost of one-half time body-on-chassis bus | 1072 | (9) | $\text { iin } \Leftrightarrow(n)$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.29 |
| US 50: Salida to Cañon City Passing Lanes | Addition of passing lanes between Salida and Cañon City. (MP 223-277) | 1073 | (1) | - 2 ! | (1) | \$25.00 |
| US 50A Texas Creek Overlay (Install new Guardrail) | US 50A Texas Creek Overlay (Install new Guardrail) - MP 243.94-244.06 | 1650 | $8$ | - |  | \$0.03 |
| US 50 West Cable Barrier Near Penrose (median cable barrier and slope flattening) | US 50 West Cable Barrier Near Penrose (median cable barrier and slope flattening) - MP 284.5291 | 1651 | (1) | - | $!$ | \$2.85 |
| US 50A at 8 Mile Canyon (passing lane fix and median barrier) | US 50A at 8 Mile Canyon (passing lane fix and median barrier) - MP 269-275 | 1652 | (1) | (8) 1 ! -2 | (1) | \$10.00 |
| US 508 Mile Canyon Super Elevation Corrections | US 508 Mile Canyon Super Elevation Corrections (MP 269275) | 1653 | (1) | - | 4 | \$2.50 |
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 50 and Dozier Intersection Improvements | Intersection improvements at US 50 and Dozier | 1654 | (1) 8 | (i) (-) | (1) | \$1.50 |
| US 50A at SH 120A/R <br> St Intersection Improvements | US 50A at SH 120A/R St Intersection Improvements (reconstruct intersection as a reduced conflict intersection or JTurn Intersection) | 1656 | (1) | (8) - | (1) | \$3.00 |
| US 50 Resurfacing (MP 241 to 251) | US 50 Resurfacing (MP 241 to 251) | 1657 | $(3)$ | (-) |  | \$7.00 |
| US 50 Shoulder Widening and Improvements (where feasible) | Shoulder widening along corridor, some locations in the canyon for example are not practical, estimated $\sim 25 \%$ of corridor (Locations within MP 225 to 277) | 1658 | (1) | $-60-1$ | * ! | \$26.00 |
| Expansion of Transit Services to Cotopaxi and Surrounding Areas | Expansion of transit services to the Cotopaxi \& Howard and surrounding areas. Adding a fixed route service to Cañon City, (will also retain Demand Services) | 2489 | (-) |  | $\theta$ | \$0.86 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 2 locations: Cañon City and Cotopaxi | 2496 | (-) | (x) 30 | $\theta$ | \$0.16 |
| US 50 Texas Creek east from MP 251 to MP 261 | Rural road surface treatment | 22 | $3$ | (1) | 5 | \$9.00 |
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## 3 <br> Asset Management

- Between Penrose \& Fremont/Pueblo County Line
- US 50A Texas Creek Overlay (Install new Guardrail) - MP 243.94-244.06
- US 50 Resurfacing (MP 241 to 251)
- US 50 Texas Creek east from MP 251 to MP 261


## Mobility

- Transit Transfer Facilities For Regional Services (Cripple Creek, Cañon City, Woodland Park)
- Essential Bus Service between Salida to Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Expanded Starpoint Demand Response Transit Service
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements


## ! Safety

- US 50 Corridor Plan
- US 50 Passing Lanes East of Salida
- US 50 West Cable Barrier Near Penrose (median cable barrier and slope flattening) - MP 284.5-291
- US 508 Mile Canyon Super Elevation Corrections (MP 269-275)

- See previous page


## $\Rightarrow$ Mobility

- Expanded Local Fixed-Route Service between Florence-Penrose- Cañon City
- US 50 and Dozier Intersection Improvements
- US 50 Shoulder Widening and Improvements (where feasible)
- Expansion of Transit Services to Cotopaxi and Surrounding Areas


## (1) Safety

- US 50: Salida to Cañon City Passing Lanes
- US 50A at 8 Mile Canyon (passing lane fix and median barrier) - MP 269-275
- US 50A at SH 120A/R St Intersection Improvements


## Corridor Name

US 50 A (ii): SH 115 east to I-25/ Pueblo

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 50 - SH 115 (Cañon City) east to I25 (Pueblo) corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This east-west corridor connects Cañon City to I-25 and Pueblo. The corridor is a multimodal National Highway System facility and serves as an alternative to I-70 for tourist and freight activity in the region. The corridor plays an important role in supporting the local economy by providing access to jobs and commercial activity, supporting manufacturing, and providing a linkage to the Department of Corrections facilities in the region. Maintaining the urban/ rural character and maximizing mobility are the desires for the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 48 comments specifically about this corridor
- Add turn lanes
- Desire for safety improvements
- Improve roadway condition



|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of 65+, disabled, and low-income populations | Transit | Black Hills Stage Lines operates on the corridor Bustang Outrider operates on the Corridor with stops in Cotopaxi and Cañon City |
| Freight Safety | Two segments with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Several segments with shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling Numerous bicycle crashes (in and around Cañon City) |
|  |  | Resiliency | High criticality Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Freight <br> Asset Management | Low drivability life (eastern segment of corridor) | Economics | High concentration of jobs in Cañon City. Concentration of jobs in Penrose |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor© Mitigate risk associated with natural disastersMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)
(
Address increasing congestion to improve access

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 50 Corridor Plan | Access/multimodal improvements along US 50 | 2461 | (8) | $\Leftrightarrow 6$ | (1) | \$0.20 |
| Essential Bus Service between Salida to Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Salida and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1008 |  | (-1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.34 |
| Between Penrose \& Fremont/Pueblo County Line | Rural road surface treatment | 2607 | 3 | - |  | \$9.14 |
| Carpool or Vanpool Service Connecting Cripple Creek to Pueblo | New carpool/vanpool service to connecting Cripple Creek, Woodland Park, Colorado Springs, Cañon City, and Pueblo. 5 days per week, 2 vans | 1074 | (-) | (a) $\Rightarrow$ | 3 | \$0.10 |
| US 50 Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Rear End, Wild Animals, Broadside | 2397 | (1) | (2) -2 | ! $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.15 |
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Project Based Strategies: US 50 A (ii): SH 115 East to I-25/ Pueblo


- Between Penrose \& Fremont/Pueblo County Line

- Essential Bus Service between Salida and Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- US 50 Corridor Plan
- US 50 Safety Study


## ! Safety

- Carpool or Vanpool Service Connecting Cripple Creek to Pueblo


## Corridor Name

State Highway 67 A-B: Wetmore North to US 50

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 67 - Wetmore north to US 50 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor primarily serves as a local facility and makes north-south connections between the Arkansas River valley east of Cañon City and the Wet Mountain Valley and Sangre de Cristo Mountains. This route serves as a detour route for travelers affected by US 50 closures. The communities along the corridor depend on agriculture, energy, and ex-urban residential to support economic activity in the area.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (US 50 to Florence - Gold Belt Tour)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments specifically about this corridor
- Improve pavement conditions
- High volume of commuters
- Desire for safety improvements


Key Data Findings: State Highway 67 A-B: Wetmore North to US 50

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of <br> $65+$, minority, \& disabled populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight | Corridor has shoulders <' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Economics | High concentration of oil and gas |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove bicycle accommodations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 67 Passing Lanes | Passing Lanes and Slow Vehicle Pull-offs | 1010 | $D$ | (1) | 38 <br> (!) | \$10.50 |
| SH 67 Shoulder <br> Widening | Widen shoulders along SH 67 to accommodate bicycles (MP 0 to 15) | 1659 | $601$ | (1) $\because$ | 5! | \$30.00 |
| Between Florence \& US 50 | Rural road surface treatment | 2614 |  | (1) |  | \$2.00 |
| SH 67A from MP 0 to MP 11 between SH 96 and Florence | Rural road surface treatment | 27 | $(3)$ | (1) |  | \$5.80 |

## Project Types
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Project Based Strategies: State Highway 67 A-B: Wetmore North to US 50

## (1) Asset Management

- Between Florence \& US 50
- SH 67A from MP 0 to MP 11 between SH 96 and Florence



## Corridor Name

State Highway 67 C: Victor North to Divide

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 67 - Victor north to Divide corridor is primarily to improve safety and system quality as well as to increase mobility through safety and public transportation improvements.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility connecting Victor and Divide. The corridor provides access to I-25 and Colorado Springs via US 24. The corridor serves as a main street in Victor and in downtown Cripple Creek requiring consideration of all modes - autos, freight, bicyclists, pedestrians, and public transportation. Given congestion levels along the corridor, alternative modes should be considered as well as off-system parallel routes. The primary economic generators in the region include mining, gaming, and tourism.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Victor to Cripple Creek - Gold Belt Tour)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 14 comments specifically about this corridor
- Improve communication from CDOT about roadway projects and closures
- Educate the public about safe driving/ rules of the road
- Accommodate future growth and truck traffic
- Desire for safety improvements



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of <br> $65+$ and disabled populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Two segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Four segments with shoulders <2' |
| Transit | Cripple Creek transit operates on the corridor |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling <br> One location with a bicycle crash <br> (near Cripple Creek) <br> DOLA Main streets through Cripple Creek \& Victor |
| Economics | Concentration of hard rock mining locations <br> Concentration of jobs in Cripple Creek <br> Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patternsEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress increasing congestion to minimize growth impactsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transit Transfer Facilities For Regional Services (Cripple Creek, Cañon City, Woodland Park) | Provide Transfer Facilities For Regional Services in Cripple Creek, Cañon City, and Woodland Park | 1004 | (2) | (x) 5 (iil | 5 | \$0.39 |
| SH 67 Passing Lanes | Passing Lanes and Slow Vehicle Pull-offs | 1010 | (1) | 31 | 3 (!) | \$10.50 |
| SH 67: Victor to Divide \& North of Woodland Park | Shoulder widening and safety improvements. Victor to Divide (MP 45.5-69.7) and Woodland Park to Deckers (MP 77-100). | 1011 | (1) | (1) (4) (4) | 43 | \$25.00 |
| Cripple Creek <br>  <br> Operations Facility | Bus/admin facility with 9 bays; $60 \times 180 \mathrm{ft}$; training and admin offices; wash bay | 1075 | (-) |  | 51 | \$2.05 |
| Cripple Creek Historic Trolley Restoration | Restore two historic trolleys and approximately 3 miles of historic inter-urban electric trolley railway through the City of Cripple Creek. | 1076 | (-) |  | 5 | \$12.70 |
| Feasibility Study: <br> Cripple Creek Trolley | Conduct planning and feasibility study for the Cripple Creek Trolley system | 1077 | (-) | ( 5 ) 0 (in) | $\theta$ | \$0.10 |
| Cripple Creek Bus Operations and Storage Facility (Phase 1) | New, Phase I engineering and design for bus ops and storage facility | 1078 | (-) | $5$ | 48 | \$0.12 |
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[^1]Corridor Projects: State Highway 67 C: Victor North to Divide (PCF7009)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 67F SB Pull Out (South of Divide) (Slow vehicle pull out) | SH 67F SB Pull Out (S of Divide) Slow vehicle pull out (MP 56.557.6) | 1660 | (1) | (-) | (1) | \$0.50 |
| SH 67 Curve Correction | Curve correction of elevation (MP 90-92) - Project to be partnered with Project \#1660) | 2463 | $!$ | $(\square)$ | (1) 今 | \$3.50 |
| Multi-use path to High School and Pikes Peak Redesign in Florence | Multi-use path in Town of Florence | 2464 | ( 6 | (1) $n$ | (1) 3 | \$2.00 |
| Essential Bus Service between Salida to Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Salida and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1008 | (-) | $\text { (1) } \Leftrightarrow$ | 5 | \$2.34 |
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## Asset Management

- Transit Transfer Facilities For Regional Services (Cripple Creek, Cañon City, Woodland Park)
- Cripple Creek Historic Trolley Restoration
- Feasibility Study: Cripple Creek Trolley


## Mobility

- SH 67 Passing Lanes
- Cripple Creek Administration \& Operations Facility
- Cripple Creek Bus Operations and Storage Facility (Phase 1)
- Multi-use path to High School and Pikes Peak Redesign in Florence
- Cripple Creek Bus Operations and Storage Facility (Phase 1)


## (!) Safety

- SH 67: Victor to Divide \& North of Woodland Park
- SH 67F SB Pull Out (S of Divide) (Slow vehicle pull out)
- SH 67 Curve Correction



## Corridor Name

State Highway 67 D: Woodland Park North to Sedalia

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 67 - Woodland Park north to Sedalia corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides north-south connections between the upper Platte River Basin and the communities of Woodland Park and Sedalia. The corridor is seeing increased commuter traffic to connect to Colorado Springs via Woodland Park and the Front Range via Salida. Recreation is a major economic driver in the region, and as such it is important to maintain the mountain character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- HDBC R2-5


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments specifically about this corridor
- Consider impacts of future growth
- Desire for safety improvements


Key Data Findings: State Highway 67 D: Woodland Park North to Sedalia

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of <br> $65+$ population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Corridor has shoulders $<^{\prime}$ <br> Southern portion of corridor has dense wildlife <br> crashes |
| Bicycling | Bicycle stress varies from low to high along corridor |
| Resiliency | Parallels 100-year floodplain |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 67 D: Woodland Park North to Sedalia

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove bicycle accommodationAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

Corridor Projects: State Highway 67 D: Woodland Park North to Sedalia

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 67: North of Woodland Park | Shoulder widening and safety improvements. Woodland Park to Deckers (MP 77-100). | 1011 | (1) | (c) (i) (1) 0 | (1) 0 | \$25.00 |
| SH 67 Shoulder Widening and Improvements | Widen shoulders along SH 67 MP 76 to 100 where practical, estimated ~25\% of corridor (MP 76 to 100) | 1662 | (1) | (12) 60 | (1) 0 | \$12.00 |

## Project Types
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Project Based Strategies: State Highway 67 D: Woodland Park North to

## ( Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

(Te cied )


## Corridor Name

State Highway 69 A: Custer/ Huerfano County Line north to US 50 (Texas Creek)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 69 - Custer / Huerfano County Line north to US 50 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides north-south connections within the Wet Mountain Valley area. The transportation system in the area serves towns along the corridor and provides access to recreation areas. Given the local economy's dependence on tourism and agriculture, it is important to maintain mobility for both tourists and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 14 comments specifically about this corridor
- Accommodate local industry truck traffic
- Desire for safety improvements
- Desire for transit connectivity


Key Data Findings: State Highway 69 A: Custer/ Huerfano County Line

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of <br> $65+$ and disabled populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes (north of Westcliffe) |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (north of Westcliffe) |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling <br> One location with a bicycle crash (near Hillside) <br> Main street through Westcliffe (DOLA affiliated Main <br> Street) |
| Resiliency | Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs near Westcliffe and Silver <br> Cliff |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 69 A: Custer/ Huerfano County Line

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Westcliffe Vehicle Housing | Metal building to house vehicles | 1079 | (-) | 3 | 53 | \$0.46 |
| SH 69A from MP 58.7 to MP 71.5 between Westcliffe and Fremont County Line | Rural road surface treatment | 26 |  | (1) | $8$ | \$6.50 |
| SH 69 Improvements | Shoulder widening, safety improvements, and passing lanes on SH 69 (MP 42-59) | 2567 | (1) | 6 |  | \$10.00 |

## Project Types
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Project Based Strategies: State Highway 69 A: Custer/ Huerfano County
Line north to US 50 (Texas Creek) (PCF7011)

## $\square$ <br> Asset Management

- SH 69A from MP 58.7 to MP 71.5 between Westcliffe and Fremont County Line


State Highway 94 A: Ellicott East to US 40 (PCF7012)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 94 A: Ellicott East to US 40

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 94 - Ellicott east to US 40/ 287 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides east-west connections between Colorado Springs and the eastern plains. It is a key trucking link to the Ports to Plains Corridor on US 287 and also serves Schreiver Air Force Base and other military facilities. Providing for movement of commuters and freight through the corridor is important to support access to jobs and local and regional economies. Inclement weather is often an issue along the corridor, contributing to safety issues and delayed travel times.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for safety improvements (including shoulders)
- Concerns about weather related highway closures



|  | Key Data FindingS: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high <br> percentage disabled population |  | Resiliency |
| Safety | Dense wildlife crashes | Freight <br> Economics | High percent of truck traffic |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 94 A: Ellicott East to US 40 (PCF7012)


[^4]Corridor Projects: State Highway 94 A: Ellicott East to US 40 (PCF7012)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 94 Intersection Modification at Blaney (in PPACG) | Constructing jug handle intersection at Blaney (SH 94 and Blaney Rd) | 1664 | (1) 8 | - | (1) | \$4.00 |
| SH 94 Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Overturning, Fixed Objects, Broadside | 2398 | 4 | - | (1) 0 | \$0.10 |
| Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems (ITS) | CDOT has identified SH 94 as a Priority level 2 Fiber corridor | 2462 | (8) | (1) | (1) | \$20.00 |

## Project Types

 Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## (3) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- SH 94 Intersection Modification at Blaney (in PPACG)
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

- SH 94 Safety Study


## Corridor Name

State Highway 96 A: Westcliffe East to I-25 (Pueblo)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 96 - Westcliffe east to I-25 (Pueblo) corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides an east-west connection within the Wet Mountain Valley area and serves as a US 50 detour route. The corridor is part of the Frontier Scenic Byway and provides access to recreation, small towns, as well as the Pueblo area. The local economy depends on the corridor to support tourism and freight movement.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Frontier Pathways)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 13 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for reduced speeds
- Desire for shoulder improvements
- Concerns about roadway conditions
- Interest in bicycle and pedestrian accommodation
- Concerns about natural disasters




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high <br> percentage of 65+and disabled populations |  | High stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |  |  |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 96 A: Westcliffe East to I-25 (Pueblo)


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate risk associated with natural disastersCorridor Projects: State Highway 96 A: Westcliffe East to I-25 (Pueblo)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 96 Shoulder Widening | Widen SH 96 at select locations, estimated ~25\% of corridor (MP 0 to 59) | 1665 | (1) | 60 (1) 3 |  | \$30.00 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits


Mobility Options
Asset
Management A Aviation
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Project Based Strategies: State Highway 96 A: Westcliffe East to


- See project: SH 96 Shoulder Widening



## (1) Safety

- SH 96 Shoulder Widening


## Corridor Name

State Highway 115 A (i): US 50 in Cañon City East to US 50

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 115 - US 50 (Cañon City) east to US 50 corridor is primarily to increase mobility through safety and system quality improvements, as well as to enhance public transportation.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides east-west connectivity between Cañon City and Florence and serves as a Main Street in Florence. Multimodal mobility options are important for the corridor as the route is heavily used for intra-area travel by local residents. The corridor plays an important role in providing access to jobs in the region, including to Department of Corrections facilities. Maintaining the small urban/ suburban character of the corridor is important while providing commuter mobility and access to services in the region.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Cañon City to Florence - Gold Belt Tour)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 44 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for bicycle and pedestrian improvements
- Interest in transit improvements
- Desire for shoulder improvements
- Concern about roadway conditions
- Desire for safety improvements (including turn lanes)
- Concerns about congestion



|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of 65+ population | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling <br> One location with a bicycle crash <br> Main street through Florence (DOLA affiliated <br> Main Street) |
| Growth | Moderate congestion between US 50 and E Main Street $(2030,2045)$ |  |  |
|  |  | Resiliency | Parallels 100-year flood plain |
| Freight Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ Dense wildlife crashes | Freight Economics | High concentration of jobs in Cañon City Concentration of jobs in Florence Agricultural corridor |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one segment) |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 115 A (i): US 50 in Cañon City East to


## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate wildlife crashesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations( Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobsEliminate unsafe passing/turning conditions

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 115 Widening and Passing Lanes, Shoulder and Intersection Improvements between Cañon City and Florence | Addition of passing lanes, shoulders, and improved bicycle and pedestrian safety per PEL (MP 0-8) | 1080 |  | 68 <br> (8) |  | \$10.50 |
| SH 115 Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Fixed Objects, Rear Ends, Wild Animal | 2399 | (1) | (1) | $\geqslant!$ | \$0.15 |
| Between Canon City \& US 50 | Rural road surface treatment | 2608 | (3) | (1) | 3 | \$8.01 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
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Project Benefits
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- Between Canon City \& US 50

- SH 115 Safety Study



## Corridor Name

State Highway 115 A (ii): US 50 North to Colorado Springs Limit

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 115 - US 50 north to Colorado Springs city limit corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides commuter access and makes northsouth connections within the southern foothills between Florence/ Penrose/ Cañon City and the Colorado Springs areas. The transportation system in the area primarily serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor High levels of mobility are critical to the communities in the corridor and desire to preserve the rural character of the corridor while supporting movement of commuters, freight, and tourists.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 78 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire to accommodate bicyclists
- Concerns about roadway and safety impacts of heavy truck traffic
- Interest in roadway expansion to accommodate growth/ congestion
- Desire for expanded travel options
- Concerns about roadway condition



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of <br> $65+\&$ minority populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | High congestion (2030, 2045) |
| Safety | Two segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (two segments) |
| Bicycling | Medium-high stress for bicycling <br> One location with a bicycle crash |
| Resiliency | High criticality <br> Crosses 100-year flood plain |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 115 A (ii): US 50 North to Colorado

## Corridor Needs

Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobsAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate wildlife crashesMitigate risk associated with natural disastersAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove bicycle accommodation

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Inter-regional Transit Service between Cañon City-Florence-Colorado Springs | Connecting Cañon City and Florence with Colorado Springs. 5-7 days per week, 8 hours per day, estimated 2,080-2,912 annual hours; one van | 1081 |  | (r) (iin | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.84 |
| SH 115 - Safety and Paving improvements | Replaces the current bridge at Rock Creek on SH 115 with a wider bridge to accommodate passing lanes from MP 37 to 39 and resurfaces the existing pavement. Also constructs a paved shoulder for a mobile weight scale or freight. Paving will be included as budget allows. | 18 | (1) 3 | -1) |  | \$42.00 |
| SH 115 @ US 50A EB Ramp Roundabout (roundabout) - MP 13.695-14.108 | SH 115 @ US 50A EB Ramp Roundabout (roundabout) - MP 13.695-14.108 | 1667 | (8) | (1) | (1) | \$1.08 |
| SH 115 Shoulder <br> Widening | Widen SH 115 at select locations, estimated $\sim 25 \%$ of corridor (MP 0 to 47) | 1668 | (1) | 610 | (1) | \$24.00 |
| SH 115 Wildlife Fence Project | SH 115 Wildlife Fence Project (MP 23-40) | 2400 | (1) | (2) | (1) | \$1.00 |

## Project Types
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## Corridor Name

State Highway 120 A: SH 115 East to US 50

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 120 - SH 115 east to US 50 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality and improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides east-west connections between Florence and Portland within the Arkansas River Valley area. Maintaining the rural character of the area is important while also providing truck movement and supporting local access and connectivity.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Resiliency | Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census track with higher |  |  |
|  | percentage of 65+and low-income populations | Freight Economics | High percentage of truck traffic |
| Freight Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ One segment with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) Dense wildlife crashes |  |  |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsCorridor Projects: State Highway 120 A: SH 115 East to US 50 (PCF7016)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Widen Shoulders | Widen Shoulders (MP 0 to 7.2) | 1669 | (1) | 6 | $\Leftrightarrow$ ¢ | \$15.00 |
| SH 120 Safety Study | - | 2401 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.05 |
| SH 165 Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Wild Animal, Fixed Objects, Overturning | 2402 | (1) | (1) | $\Leftrightarrow!$ | \$0.03 |
| East of Florence to US $50$ | Rural road surface treatment | 2615 | 3 | (1) | 9 | \$2.90 |

## Project Types

SafetyFreight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits
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(3) Asset

Management

- East of Florence to US 50

- SH 120 Safety Study
- SH 165 Safety Study


## Corridor Name

State Highway 165 A: SH 96 in Custer County East to I25/ Pueblo

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 165-SH 96 (Custer County) east to I-25 (Pueblo) corridor is primarily to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides local access and makes north-south connections within the Wet Mountain area. The transportation system in the area primarily serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor, but also provides a critical connection to l-25 and Pueblo. The corridor also serves as a recreational gateway to the Sangre de Cristo Mountains and is part of the Frontier Scenic Byway.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Frontier Pathways)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 comment specifically to this corridor
- Consider logging operations and fire mitigation in the area


Key Data Findings: State Highway 165 A: SH 96 in Custer County East to

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census track with higher percentage of <br> $65+$ and disabled populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Majority of corridor has shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 165 A: SH 96 in Custer County East to

## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patternsEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Widen Shoulders | Widen Shoulders at select locations, estimated $\sim 25 \%$ of corridor. (MP 0 to 18) | 1670 | (1) | (1) 6io | * | \$9.00 |

Project Types


Project Benefits


Mobility Options
Asset
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Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## Corridor Name

US 285 D (i): US 24 (Antero J unction) North to SH 9 (Fairplay)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 285 - US 24 (Antero J unction) north to SH 9 (Fairplay) corridor is primarily to increase mobility, especially for truck freight, as well as to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides north-south connectivity within Park County and is a part of the National Highway System. The corridor serves as a major truck route connecting New Mexico with Front Range communities. Increasing mobility to support movement of freight and tourism is important for the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 20 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for turn lanes and passing lanes
- Improve travel time reliability
- Expand roadway capacity
- Improve roadway to serve as alternative route for I-70/ congestion management
- Desire for safety improvements



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census track with higher percentage <br> of 65+ and low-income populations <br> Safety |
| :--- | :--- |
| Four segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |  |
| Asset <br> Management | One bridge in poor condition |
| Transit | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor with stops in <br> Fairplay \& Conifer. <br> Black Hills Stage Lines operates on corridor |
| Bicycling | Medium-high stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Address unsafe passing conditionsAddress bridge in poor conditionImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Reduce travel delays and improve travel time reliabilityAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 24 and US 285 ; existing fiber on US 50 | Installation of fiber-optics and Intelligent Transportation Systems devices | 1003 | (2) | (1) | (1) | - |
| I-70 Closures | Dynamic Route Assignment | 1085 | (8) | - | $\theta$ | - |
| US 285: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure (Fairplay to Monte Vista) | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Fairplay and Monte Vista | 1012 | (8) | (1) | (1) 0 | \$45.00 |
| US 285 Passing lanes and shoulder widening North of Fairplay | Passing lanes north of Fairplay (3 locations, SB MP 184 to 185, NB MP 189 to 190 , SB MP 200 to 201); shoulder widening Fairplay to Richmond Hill (MP 183-234) | 1672 | (1) |  |  | \$35.00 |
| US 285/CO 9 Intersection Improvement with Bridge Widening | Upgrades the intersection with dual left turn lanes, protected pedestrian crossings, and new sidewalks. This project also includes a bridge widening and replacement along US 285. | 8 |  |  |  | \$15.00 |

## Project Types
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## ( Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- US 285 Passing lanes and shoulder widening North of Fairplay
- I-70 Closures



## Corridor Name

US 285 (ii): Bailey North to Conifer

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 285 - Bailey north to Conifer corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor, a part of the National Highway System, makes north-south connections within the northeast Park County area and largely serves local residents, tourists, and freight movement. The corridor experiences significant safety, capacity and congestion impacts due to commuter travel and impacts from I-70 congestion and closures. Maintain the mountain character of the corridor and minimizing environmental impacts are important for this corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 40 comments specifically about this corridor
- Interest in roadway expansion
- Desire for turn lanes and passing lanes
- Improve travel time reliability (eliminate signals)
- Concerns about congestion
- Desire for safety improvements




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Passes through census track with higher percentage of 65+and low-income populations | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Resiliency | High criticality Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Freight Safety | Four segments with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) Dense wildlife crashes Hazmat route | Economics | High concentration of jobs near Bailey |
| Transit | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor with stops in Fairplay \& Conifer Black Hills Stage Lines operates on corridor |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress unsafe passing conditions$\leftrightarrow$ Provide additional travel optionsAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 24 and US 285 ; existing fiber on US 50 | Installation of fiber-optics and Intelligent Transportation Systems devices | 1003 | (8) | $!$ | (1) | - |
| I-70 Closures | Dynamic Route Assignment | 1085 | (8) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| US 285: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure (Tiny Town to Fairplay) | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Tiny Town and Fairplay | 1014 | (8) | (1) -3 | (1) | \$40.00 |
| South of Bailey to Park/Jefferson County Line | Rural road surface treatment | 2609 |  | (1) |  | \$6.85 |
| New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver | Essential bus service between Durango, Bayfield, Pagosa Springs, South Fork, Monte Vista, Center, Saguache, Villa Grove, Salida, Buena Vista, Fairplay, Denver (Potential Bustang Outrider). Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. ( 350 miles, 700 roundtrip) | 2535 | (-) | (i) ( $\because \Rightarrow)^{3}$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$11.55 |

Project Types
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## 3 <br> Asset Management

- South of Bailey to Park/Jefferson County Line

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 24 and US 285; existing fiber on US 50
- I-70 Closures
- New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver


## ! Safety

- US 285: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure (Tiny Town to Fairplay)


## Corridor Name

US 285 (iii): SH 9 (Fairplay) North to Bailey

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 285 - SH 9 (Fairplay) north to Bailey corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor, a part of the National Highway System, provides a north-south interregional connection between Fairplay and Bailey. The corridor largely serves local residents, tourists and freight movement. The corridor experiences safety, capacity and congestion impacts due to congestion and closures of I-70. Maintaining the corridors mountain character and minimizing environmental impacts are important for this corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 71 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for shoulder improvements
- Expand roadway capacity
- Desire for bicycle accommodation
- Improve travel options
- Desire for safety improvements




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census track with higher <br> percentage of 65+\& low-income populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Several segments with elevated crash <br> patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| Transit | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor with <br> stops in Fairplay \& Conifer <br> Black Hills Stage Lines operates on corridor |


| Bicycling | Medium-low to high stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- |
| Resiliency | Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |

Bustang Outrider operates on corridor with Black Hills Stage Lines operates on corridor


[^5]| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 24 and US 285; existing fiber on US 50 | Installation of fiber-optics and Intelligent Transportation Systems devices | 1003 | (8) | $!$ | 48 | - |
| I-70 Closures | Dynamic Route Assignment | 1085 | (8) | - | 5 | - |
| US 285: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure (Tiny Town to Fairplay) | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Tiny Town and Fairplay | 1014 | (8) | (1) -3) | (1) | \$40.00 |
| Design and Construction of Fairplay Park-n-Ride | Design and construction of new Park-n-Ride facility to connect Outrider routes (Gunnison-Denver and Fairplay-Breckenridge) along US 285. | 1084 | (-) |  |  | \$4.00 |
| North Kenosha Pass Chain Up Station | Chain up station for CMV's heading south over Kenosha Pass | 1086 | (-) | (1) | (1) | \$5.00 |
| US 285 Platte Canyon Northbound Passing Lane | US 285 Platte Canyon Northbound Passing Lane | 1673 |  |  | (1) | \$5.00 |
| Design and Construction Phases of SH 9 and US 285 Intersection \& Corridor Improvements | Design and Construction Phases - SH <br>  <br> Corridor Improvements (Mod Signal <br> + Minor Widening + Bridge <br> Replacement + Lane <br> Reconfiguration) | 1674 | (1) |  | (1) | \$3.12 |

## Project Types
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Asset Management
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 285 \& Reinecker Ridge Curve Realignment (MP 189.4-189.7) | US 285 \& Reinecker Ridge Curve Realignment (realign curve geometry) - MP 189.4-189.7 | 1675 | (1) | (5) - | (1) 0 | \$3.75 |
| US 285 Wildlife Fence | - | 1676 | (1) | (1) | 4 | \$1.80 |
| US 285 Raised Pavement Markings | - | 1677 | 4 | (1) -3 | 1 | \$2.00 |
| New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver | Essential bus service between Durango, Bayfield, Pagosa Springs, South Fork, Monte Vista, Center, Saguache, Villa Grove, Salida, Buena Vista, Fairplay, Denver (Potential Bustang Outrider). Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. ( 350 miles, 700 roundtrip) | 2535 |  | $A(\pi) \Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$11.55 |

## Project Types
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## (3) Asset Management

- Design and Construction of Fairplay Park-n-Ride
- US 285 \& Reinecker Ridge Curve Realignment (MP 189.4-189.7)


## Mobility

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 24 and US 285; existing fiber on US 50
- I-70 Closures
- US 285 Platte Canyon Northbound Passing Lane
- New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver


## (1) Safety

- US 285: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure (Tiny Town to Fairplay)
- North Kenosha Pass Chain Up Station
- Design and Construction Phases of SH 9 and US 285 Intersection \& Corridor Improvements
- US 285 Wildlife Fence
- US 285 Raised Pavement Markings

Corridor Projects: Non-Corridor Specific

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additiona <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South Powers Boulevard (SH 21) Corridor Study | Corridor Study from Mesa Ridge Parkway (SH 16) to I-25 | 2741 | (1) 8 | - | (1) | \$1.00 |

Project Types


Project Benefits


SWP Goal Area


## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- See corridor projects


## (1) Safety

- South Powers Boulevard (SH 21) Corridor Study



## CDOT Region 4

## Counties:

Cheyenne, Elbert, Kit Carson, Lincoln, Logan, Phillips, Sedgwick, Washington, and Yuma

## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Provide additional travel options
- Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
- Provide additional rest stops/ truck parking locations
* Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback


## What We've Heard about the Eastern TPR

- 1458 public and stakeholder comments specifically about the Eastern TPR
- 393 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the Eastern TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" respondents in the Eastern TPR, combined with stakeholder input, selected: Road Condition and Safety, Freight, Lack of Travel Options
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the Eastern TPR (in order of frequency) include: Road condition, Safety, Trucking/Freight, Shoulders, Economic Vitality
© 6 The vision of the Eastern TPR is to enhance the unique character and quality of life found in northeast and east central Colorado by providing an efficient, safe and accessible transportation network. This is essential to support dynamic local and regional economies based on agriculture, oil and gas production, domestic and international trade, recreation, and tourism.



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics | 2015 Population: 80, 353 <br> 2045 Forecasted Population: 93, 265 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | 2015 J obs: 39,130 <br> 2045 Forecasted J obs: 36,560 |
| Economics | Top Industries: Food and Agriculture, Manufacturing and <br> Processing, Financial Services, Transportation and Logistics, <br> Health and Wellness, Energy and Natural Resources |


| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 3.4 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 5.1 Million |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asset <br> Management | 293 Miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 719 Miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 402 Miles of highway with low drivability life | Processing, Financial Services, Transportation and Logistics, Health and Wellness, Energy and Natural Resources

State Highway 86 (Rural Section): Town of Kiowa East to I-70 (PEA7001)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 86 (Rural Section): Town of Kiowa East to I-70

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 86 Rural Section corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to improve system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections east to I-70 in Eastern Colorado. Travel modes now and in the future include passenger vehicle, truck freight, and local public transit. The transportation system in the area primarily serves destinations outside of the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System (from I-25 to Franktown)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 24 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Frustration with congestion


Key Data Findings: State Highway 86 (Rural Section): Town of Kiowa


| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher |  |  |
|  | percentage of 65+population and minority population | Pedestrian Economics | Main Street through Kiowa Agriculture |
| Safety | Entire corridor has shoulder less than $2^{\prime}$ | Resiliency | Low redundancy Crosses 100-year floodplain |
| AssetManagement | Low drivability life (one segment) |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Address unsafe passing conditionsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies$\Leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand
(downtown areas)Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (ln millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 86: I-25 Castle Rock East to I-70 | Surface treatment and intersection improvements. | 1015 | (3) | (1) | (1) 2 | \$35.00 |
| Essential Bus Service between Limon and Denver | Bus service between Limon and Denver. Assumes 2 days per week purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1016 | (\%) | (12) (in | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.08 |
| SH 86 Corridor Improvements | Pavement, safety, and operations from I-25 to I70 | 2413 | (1) | $(3)$ |  | \$3.00 |
| SH 86 Sidewalk in Kiowa | Add sidewalk on south side of SH 86 (Comanche Street) in Kiowa | 2414 | (1) | (1) 3 (ii) | (1) 0 | - |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits




Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Project Based Strategies: State Highway 86 (Rural Section):Town of

(1) Asset Management

- SH 86: I-25 Castle Rock East to I-70


- SH 86 Corridor Improvements
- SH 86 Sidewalk in Kiowa


## Corridor Name

State Highway 86 (Urban Section): I-25 in Castle Rock to Kiowa

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 86 Urban Section corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, connects to places outside the region, serves as a Main Street and makes east-west connections within the South Metro Denver area. This portion of the corridor is transitioning from a rural to urban land use pattern.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 42 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for roadway expansion
- Concerns with growth and congestion
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Desire for regional transit




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage minority population |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Heavy congestion (2030 and 2045) | Pedestrian <br> Economics | DOLA designated Main Street through Elizabeth |  |
| Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than 2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes | Economics | Low redundancy <br> Crosses 100-year floodplain |  |
| Asset- <br> Management | Low drivability life (two segments) |  |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorProvide additional travel optionsAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demandMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (downtown areas)
(including wildlife crashes)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 86 (Urban Section):I-25 in Castle
Rock to Kiowa (PEA7002)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project <br> Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 86: I-25 Castle Rock East to I-70 | Surface treatment and intersection improvements. | 1015 | (3) | (1) | $1 \Rightarrow$ | \$35.00 |
| Essential Bus Service between Limon and Denver | Bus service between Limon and Denver. Assumes 2 days per week purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1016 | (\%) | (1) $\Rightarrow$ ii | $\theta$ | \$1.08 |
| SH 86 Corridor Improvements | Pavement, safety, and operations from I-25 to I70 | 2413 | (1) | $3$ | (1) | \$3.00 |
| SH 86 Pedestrian <br> Enhancements in Elizabeth | Install pedestrian crossing improvements on SH 86 (Kiowa Avenue) in Elizabeth | 2415 | ( | (1) 0 | (1) 5 | - |

Project Types


Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Freignt
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Project Based Strategies: State Highway 86 (Urban Section):I-25 in


- SH 86: I-25 Castle Rock East to I-70

- Essential Bus Service between Limon and Denver


## (1) Safety

- SH 86 Corridor Improvements
- SH 86 Pedestrian Enhancements in Elizabeth


## Corridor Name

State Highway 71 (Southern Section): US 50 at Rocky Ford to I-70 in Limon

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 71 Southern Section corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes northsouth connections within the Arkansas Valley area.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 19 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Concerns about safety
- Frustration with lack of maintenance

Key Data Findings: State Highway 71 (Southern Section): US 50 at Rocky
Ford to I-70 in Limon (PEA7003)


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ and disabled populations and minority <br> population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than 2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset- <br> Management | Low drivability life |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Inner-city bus station in Limon <br> Local transit services in Limon |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Limon |
| Economics | Concentration of wind turbines north and south of <br> Limon <br> Freight |
| Concentration of oil and gas wells |  |
| Agriculture |  |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)(including wildlife crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)


Corridor Projects: State Highway 71 (Southern Section): US 50 at
Rocky Ford to I-70 in Limon (PEA7003)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Passing Lanes (La Junta to Limon) | Passing Lanes - SH 71 (top priority from study yet to be finalized) | 1534 | (1) | (-) 1 | (1) | \$2.75 |
| Increase Truck Parking. | Most likely through private investment in Limon, Last Chance and Brush! | 1535 | $6$ | - |  | \$1.18 |
| SH 71 Corridor Study | Study operational, mobility and safety of the SH71 corridor in R4 | 2406 | (1) | $\theta$ |  | - |
| SH 71 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2505 | $!$ |  | $0 \rightarrow$ | - |

Project Types


Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
2) Freight
2) $T$

Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management

Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


State Highway 63: Anton (US 36) North to Atwood (US 6) (PEA7004)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 63: Anton (US 36) North to Atwood (US 6)

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 63 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and provide mobility options.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility and makes north-south connections within the central Washington and southeastern Logan counties area

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 32 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvement for freight and truck movement
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Concerns for safety due to wildlife management


Key Data Findings: State Highway 63: Anton (US 36) North to Atwood

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$, disabled, and minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Segments with shoulders less than 2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Freight <br> Asset- <br> Management | Two segments of low drivability life |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling north of Akron |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Crosses 100-year floodplain in Merino and Atwood |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Atwood |
| Freight <br> Economics | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor <br> Agriculture |
| Freight <br> Economics | High truck traffic near Anton |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)(including wildlife crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 63 Operations \& Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Wild Animal, Fixed Objects, Overturning | 2407 | (1) | (t) | (1) | - |
| SH 63 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2507 | $4$ | 6 | (1) | - |

Project Types


Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- See project: SH 63 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)


## ! Safety

- SH 63 Operations \& Safety Study
- SH 63 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)



## Corridor Name

State Highway 61: From Otis (US 34) north to Sterling (I-76)

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 61 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and provide mobility options.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, connects to places within the region, and makes northsouth connections within the northeastern Washington and southeastern Logan counties area. There is a desire to extend the state highway designation from US 34 south to US 36.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 31 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Frustration with lack of maintenance


Key Data Findings: State Highway 61: From Otis (US 34) north to Sterling

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population, disabled population, and minority <br> population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Segments with shoulders less than 2' |
| Freight <br> Asset- <br> Management | Low drivability life (two segments) |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Inner-city bus station in Sterling <br> Local transit services in Sterling |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Crosses 100-year floodplain in Sterling |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Sterling |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor <br> Agriculture |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 61: From Otis (US 34) north to Sterling

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclistsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 61 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2508 | (1) | 60 | (1) | - |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management
........................................

## Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- See project: SH 61 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)



## Corridor Name

US Highway 6 (Eastern Plains): I-76 in Brush to Sterling, East to Nebraska

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 6 Plains corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, connects to places outside the region, serves as a Main Street, and makes east-west connections within the Northeast Colorado to Nebraska area.

## Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor: R4-19


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 48 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvement for freight and truck movement
- Concerns about safety
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Economics Pedestrian | Main Street through Haxtun and Holyoke |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+ population, disabled populations, and minority population |  |  |
| Freight Safety | Segments with shoulders less than 2' Dense wildlife crashes | Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy Crosses 100-year floodplain |
|  |  | Economics | Concentration of jobs in Sterling |
| Freight AssetManagement | Low drivability life (one segment) | Freight <br> Economics | Agricultural corridor Agriculture |
| Bicycling | Medium to high stress for bicycling | Freight | High truck traffic |

Corridor Needs: US Highway 6 (Eastern Plains): I-76 in Brush to Sterling,

[^6]

## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress pavement condition where drivability is poorEliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclistsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)
(including wildlife crashes)
$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)

Corridor Projects: US Highway 6 (Eastern Plains): I-76 in Brush to
Sterling, East to Nebraska (PEA7006)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 6 Rumble Strips | Sterling to NE | 1537 | (1) | (-2) | (1) | \$0.04 |
| Truck, mobility, operational and Safety Project | Sterling S-curve (SH 14, US 6, US 138) | 1543 | (1) | (8) -2 | (1) | \$25.00 |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2442 | $6$ | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| US 6 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2500 | (1) | 68 (-2) | (1) | - |
| Merino to Atwood from MP 391 to MP 398 | Rural road surface treatment | 64 |  | (1) |  | \$6.10 |

Project Types


Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
2. Freight

Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management


- Merino to Atwood from MP 391 to MP 398


## (1) Safety

- US 6 Rumble Strips
- Truck, mobility, operational and Safety Project
- US 6 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)

Sedgwick (PEA7007)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 59: From US 40 in Kit Carson to Cope then to SH 138 in Sedgwick

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 59 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and provide mobility options.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, acts as a Main Street, and makes north south connections within central Cheyenne County to western Sedgwick County area. There is a desire to extend the state highway designation from SH 138 north to I-80 in Nebraska.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 44 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvement for freight and truck movement
- Desire for multi-modal design
- Desire for roadway expansion
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Desire for regional transit
- Concerns about safety



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+ population, disabled population, and minority population |
| :---: | :---: |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Freight Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than $2^{1}$ Dense wildlife crashes near Cope |
| Freight AssetManagement | Low drivability life One bridge in poor condition in Seibert |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Yuma |
| Economics Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells Agricultural corridor Agriculture |
| Freight | High truck traffic |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress bridge in poor conditionEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Provide additional travel options

Corridor Projects: State Highway 59: From US 40 in Kit Carson to Cope
then to SH 138 in Sedgwick (PEA7007)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 59 Safety Improvements \& Assets | Shoulders \& Safety Study and Implementation | 2498 |  |  | ! \% | \$50.00 |
| Sandy Creek Bridge | Bridge Replacement B-26-F | 2674 | (1) | (1) | $3$ | \$5.42 |
| SH59 Bridges | Bridge BMPS- A-25-AU B-26-D | 2675 | (1) | (1) | $5$ | \$1.29 |
| Six Mile Creek | Timber Replacement B-26-E | 2676 |  | (1) | $8$ | \$0.38 |
| SH59: Siebert to Cope | Bridge Surface Treatment G-25-F G-25-C G-25-G G-25-H | 2677 |  | $1$ |  | \$1.18 |
| South of Cope to I-70 from MP 41.071 to MP 67.14 | Rural road surface treatment | 60 |  | (1) |  | \$17.10 |

Project Types


Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


- Sandy Creek Bridge
- SH59 Bridges
- Six Mile Creek
- SH59: Siebert to Cope
- South of Cope to I-70 from MP 41.071 to MP 67.14


## Mobility

- See project: SH 59 Safety Improvements \& Assets
- SH 59 Safety Improvements \& Assets



## Corridor Name

US Highway 40: Town of Kit Carson East to Kansas

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 40 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the area from Kit Carson to Kansas.
The corridor also serves wide-load truck traffic.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System (From Kit Carson to Cheyenne Wells)
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor: R4-21


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 10 comments specifically about this corridor
- Questions/ concerns about funding
- Desired improvement for freight and truck movement
- Desire for rest stops/ truck parking
- Concerns about safety




## Key Data Findings:



Corridor Needs: US Highway 40: Town of Kit Carson East to Kansas


## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles,Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsrest stops/ truck parkingMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)Eliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclists (including wildlife crashes)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Continuation of Passing Lanes on US 40/US 287, an international freight route to improve safety | This project will strategically add new passing lanes or extend existing passing lanes at critical locations. This project will address the safety, mobility, and economic vitality of the corridor. It is the goal of the region to provide a minimum of 8 miles of passing lanes for every 20 mile stretch along our freight corridors. | 1017 | (1) |  | (1) * | \$20.00 |
| Region 4 Rest Area Study | Assess the feasibility of new or relocated rest areas | 2422 | $!$ | - | $!$ | - |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2442 | $\theta$ | - |  | - |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle


Capacity
Asset
Management
Pedestrian

## Project Benefits




Quality of L
Bicycle
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## (3) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

- Region 4 Truck Parking Study
- Continuation of Passing Lanes on US 40/US 287, an international freight route to improve safety

- Region 4 Rest Area Study

Nebraska Border and US 40 from Kit Carson to Cheyenne Wells (PEA7009)

## Corridor Name

US Highway 385 (High Plains Highway): Granada North to the Nebraska Border and US 40 from Kit Carson to Cheyenne Wells

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 385 High Plains Highway, except for the segment from Grenada to Cheyenne Wells, is primarily system preservation and safety. The primary investment category for the segment from Granada to Cheyenne Wells is safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal regional facility, connects to places outside the region, serves as both the Main Street and state-designated hazardous waste route, and makes north-south connections within the eastern plains of Colorado from Oklahoma to Nebraska.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 128 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desired improvement for freight and truck movement
- Desire for roadway expansion
- Desire for turn lanes
- Desire for multi-modal design
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Concerns about safety



# Key Data Findings: US Highway 385 (High Plains Highway): Granada North to the 

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+disabled populations and minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than 2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes (near Vernon) <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Aset- <br> Management | Multiple segments of low drivability life |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Local transit station in Burlington <br> Inter-city bus station in J ulesburg |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Economics <br> Pedestrian | Main Street through Burlington and Holyoke |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Wray to Holyoke |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Cheyenne Wells, Burlington, <br> Wray, and Holyoke |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of wind turbines <br> Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor <br> Agriculture |
| Freight | High truck traffic |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingEliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress roadway conditionMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)(including wildlife crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)


| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary <br> Project Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 385 Do Not Pass Warning (DNPW) | DNPW on 2-lane truck route | 1090 | $0$ | (2) | 1 | - |
| US 385 Corridor Study Improvements | Implement US 385 Corridor Study priorities operations, passing lanes, safety | 2416 | (1) ! | $\Leftrightarrow-31$ | ! \% | \$200.00 |
| 287/40/94 | Bridge BMPs | 2673 |  | - |  | \$1.68 |
| US385: Burlington | Bridge BMPs | 2678 |  | (1) | $(8)$ | \$0.17 |
| US385: Idalia North | Bridge BMPs | 2679 |  | (1) | $8$ | \$0.01 |
| US385: Sand Creek to Near CR 29 | Major Pavement Rehabilitation | 2685 |  | (1) | $5$ | \$14.69 |
| US385: South of Cheyenne Wells | Minor or Major Pavement Rehab | 2686 |  | (1) | $3$ | \$12.32 |
| US385: Julesburg South | Minor Pavement Rehabilitation | 2687 | (8) | (1) | $8$ | \$11.55 |
| Near Smoky Hill River to near County Road GG from MP 157 to MP 170 | Rural road surface treatment | 62 |  | (1) |  | \$14.80 |
| Phillips/Yuma CL south from MP 263.06 to MP 269.35 | Rural road surface treatment | 63 |  | (1) | $5$ | \$7.10 |

## Project Types




Project Benefits



Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## A Asset Management

- 287 / $40 / 94$
- US385: Burlington
- US385: Idalia North
- US385: Sand Creek to Near CR 29
- US385: South of Cheyenne Wells
- US385: Julesburg South
- Near Smoky Hill River to near County Road GG from MP 157 to MP 170
- Phillips/Yuma CL south from MP 263.06 to MP 269.35



## (1) Safety

- US 385 Do Not Pass Warning (DNPW)



## Corridor Name

US Highway 287 (Ports to Plains): Oklahoma North to US 40 in Kit Carson, Kit Carson to 1 - 70 in Limon

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 287 Port to Plains corridor is primarily to increase mobility, as well as to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This entire corridor is a portion of the National Ports to Plains Corridor connecting Denver and Laredo, Texas and is part of CDOT's Strategic Investment Program (7th Pot). This crucial rural freight corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes north-south connections south into Oklahoma.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 1 CNG Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 38 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Concerns about safety
- Long term desire for 4-Iane expansion compatible with neighboring states
- Frustration with lack of maintenance




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+and disabled populations <br> and minority populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Regional bus route operates along corridor <br> Inter-city bus station in Limon <br> Local transit services in Limon |


| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Kit Carson |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Limon <br> Agriculture |
| Freight | High truck traffic |



## Corridor Needs

Address unsafe passing conditions$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles
$\leftrightarrow$ Provide additional travel optionsAddress roadway conditionMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)
$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)
(including wildlife crashes)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Continuation of Passing Lanes on US 40/US 287, an international freight route to improve safety | This project will strategically add new passing lanes or extend existing passing lanes at critical locations. This project will address the safety, mobility, and economic vitality of the corridor. It is the goal of the region to provide a minimum of 8 miles of passing lanes for every 20 mile stretch along our freight corridors. | 1017 | (1) |  | (1) | \$20.00 |
| US 287 Do Not Pass Warning (DNPW) | DNPW on 2-lane truck route | 1091 | $1$ | (-2) | $(1)$ | - |
| US 287 Road Weather Information Systems (RWIS) | RWIS on 2-lane truck route | 1092 | $1$ | (-2) | (1) | - |
| Increase Truck Parking | Implement outcomes of study. Hugo rest area, Kit Carson Community Truck parking and other opportunities | 1549 | $6$ | (8) 1 | (1) | \$0.87 |
| US 287 Sidewalk in Limon | Install a sidewalk on the north side of US 287 (Main Street) between N Street and R Street in Limon | 2417 | ( | (x) 3 | (1) | - |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2442 | (6) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| US40 Wild Horse | Bridge BMPs | 2672 | $(3)$ | (1) | $6$ | \$0.82 |
| 287/40/94 | Bridge BMPs | 2673 | (3) | (1) | ( | \$1.68 |

## Project Types



Safety
 Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits




## SWP Goal Area



## (3) Asset Management

- US40 Wild Horse
- 287 / 40/94


## Mobility

- Increase Truck Parking
- Region 4 Truck Parking Study
- Continuation of Passing Lanes on US 40/US 287, an international freight route to improve safety


## (1) Safety

- US 287 Do Not Pass Warning (DNPW)
- US 287 Road Weather Information Systems (RWIS)
- US 287 Sidewalk in Limon


## Corridor Name

US Highway 24 (Elbert County Line to Limon): Elbert County Line Northeast to l-70 in Limon

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 24, Colorado Springs to Limon corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor is on the National Highway System and serves as a multi-modal regional facility, provides commuter access, acts as a Main Street and makes eastwest connections within the northeast El Paso, southeast Elbert, and Lincoln Counties. The western portion of the corridor is transitioning from a rural to urban land use pattern. Significant facilities located in the Colorado Springs area affect transportation in the corridor, including the Colorado Springs Airport, the various military installations and numerous tourist attractions.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor: R4-21


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 12 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for turn lanes
- Desire for multi-modal design
- Desire for roadway expansion




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+and disabled populations <br> and minority population |  | Economics <br> Pedestrian |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route | Freight <br> Resiliency | Main Street through Simla |



[^7]Corridor Projects: US Highway 24 (Elbert County Line to Limon):
Elbert County Line Northeast to I-70 in Limon (PEA7011)
.............................................................................

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Limon to Colorado Springs (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Limon and Colorado Springs. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1006 | \%) | (i) * (iv | $\theta$ | \$1.97 |
| US 24: Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS Intelligent Transportation Systems devices between Colorado Springs and Limon | 1007 | (8) | (1) | (1) 5 | \$11.00 |
| US 24 and 9th Street intersection improvements | Intersection improvements to address off-set alignment at US 24 and 9th Street in Limon | 2418 | (1) (3) | (5) -2 | (1) | - |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2442 | (2) | - | 0 | - |
| US 24 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2509 | (1) | 680 | (1) 0 | - |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Capacity
Transit
Asset
Management
Pedestrian

## Project Benefits




Mobility Options Asset Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management


## (9) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

- Essential Bus Service between Limon to Colorado Springs (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Region 4 Truck Parking Study


## ! Safety

- US 24: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure
- US 24 and 9th Street intersection improvements
- US 24 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)


## Corridor Name

US Highway 24 (Seibert to Kansas State Line): I-70 in Seibert East to Burlington

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 24, Siebert to Burlington corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility including local bicycle traffic, acts as Main Street, serves as a parallel facility to the interstate facility for local traffic and makes east-west connections within the central Kit Carson County area.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 9 comments specifically about this corridor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance

...................


|  | Key Data FindingS: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+population and higher <br> percentage of disabled population and <br> minority population |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than 2' <br> Hazmat route |  | Economics <br> Pedestrian | Main Street through Burlington |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles
$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (busEliminate shoulder deficiencies

Corridor Projects: US Highway 24 (Seibert to Kansas State Line):I-70
in Seibert East to Burlington (PEA7012)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 24 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2504 | 4 | 680 | (1) | - |

Project Types


## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management Aviation
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## P Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routin


- US 24 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)


## Interstate 76 (Northeast Colorado): US 85 in Commerce City

Northeast to Nebraska (PEA7013)

## Corridor Name

Interstate 76 (Northeast Colorado): US 85 in Commerce City Northeast to Nebraska

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the l-76, Northeast Colorado corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor is on the National Highway System and National Freight Network and serves as a multi-modal Interstate facility, connects to places outside the region, serves as an important freight connection to Chicago and areas east, and makes east-west connections within the northeast Colorado area. I-76 from Denver to Brush is part of the Heartland Express designation in Colorado. The South Platte River Trail Scenic Byway runs along a portion of this corridor. The western portion of the corridor is transitioning from a rural to urban land use pattern.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 1 CNG, EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 31 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for rest stops/ truck parking
- Pavement condition is poor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Questions about technology/ data
- Concerns about safety


Commerce City Northeast to Nebraska (PEA7013)


| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ and disabled populations and minority population | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
|  |  | Freight Resiliency Economics | High criticality from Merino to Crook Low redundancy Crosses 100-year floodplain |
| Safety | Elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) near Atwood and Sterling |  |  |
| Freight | Majority of corridor has shoulder less than $2^{\prime}$ | Economics | Concentration of jobs in Sterling |
| Safety | Dense wildlife crashes Hazmat route | Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells Agricultural corridor Agriculture |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Black Hills Stage Line operates along corridor Burlington Trailways operates along corridor Amtrak operates along corridor Local transit services in Sterling and Julesburg | Freight | Agriculture |

Corridor Needs: Interstate 76 (Northeast Colorado): US 85 in Commerce


## Corridor Needs

Address roadway conditionImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)(including wildlife crashes)
$\triangle$ Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)
$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
$\rightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Sterling and Fort Morgan and Greeley (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Sterling-Fort Morgan-Greeley. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1019 | ( | (-1) 3 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.24 |
| I-76 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS Intelligent Transportation Systems devices between Hudson and State Line | 1021 | ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | (-2) | (1) | \$40.00 |
| I-76: Morgan/Washington County Line to Nebraska State Line | Pavement preservation, safety, operational and ITS Intelligent Transportation Systems improvements | 1022 | (1) | (8) -2 | 13 | \$200.00 |
| Increase Truck Parking. | Either increase space at the Julesburg Welcome Center or private investment for new rest area. | 1553 | (6) | (-) 1 | (1) | \$0.63 |
| Region 4 Rest Area Study | Assess the feasibility of new or relocated rest areas | 2422 | 4 | - | $!$ | - |
| Essential Bus Service between Sterling and Denver (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Denver and Sterling. Assumes one roundtrip 5 days per week 52 weeks per year. Purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 2465 | (\%) | (i) $\Rightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$3.62 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at Sterling | 2491 | (\%) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.08 |
| 176-Atwood | Bridge BMPs B-23-BA B-23-BB B-24-AI B-24-AD B-24-AU B-24-AV B-24-AX B-24-AW B-24-AZ B-24AY B-24-AT B-24-AS | 2671 |  | (1) |  | \$0.27 |
| 176: Sterling East Part 2 Slabs and Diamond Grind | Slab replacements and diamond grind | 2683 | (3) | (1) | $8$ | \$8.25 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
(1) Asset Management

Mobility
Safety

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sterling east from MP 124.7 to MP 128.2 | Rural road surface treatment | 72 |  | (1) | $8$ | \$8.20 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobil
Asset
Management
Freight
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
(F) Asset Management

M Mobility
1
Safety


## (3) Asset Management

- I-76: Morgan/Washington County Line to Nebraska State Line
- 176-Atwood
- I76: Sterling East Part 2 Slabs and Diamond Grind
- Sterling east from MP 124.7 to MP 128.2


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Sterling and Fort Morgan and Greeley (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Essential Bus Service between Sterling and Denver (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements


## ! Safety

- I-76 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure
- Increase Truck Parking.
- Region 4 Rest Area Study


## Corridor Name

State Highway 94: East side Colorado Springs to US 40/ US 287

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 94 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes eastwest connections within the urban edge of the Colorado Springs area. The western portion of the corridor is transitioning from a rural to urban land use pattern. Significant facilities located in the Colorado Springs area affect transportation in the corridor, including the Colorado Springs Airport, the various military installations and numerous tourist attractions.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Transit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ population and higher percentage of disabled population |  | Regional bus route operates along corridor |
|  |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than $2^{\prime \prime}$ | Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy |
|  |  | Freight | High truck traffic east of SH 71 |
| Freight AssetManagement | Low drivability life | Economics | Agriculture |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 94: East side Colorado Springs to US 40/ US


## Corridor Needs

(i) Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles
$\rightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 94 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2511 | $1$ | 6 | (1) | - |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management


## (3) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

- SH 94 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)
(!) Safety


## Corridor Name

State Highway 71 (Heartland Expressway): I-70 in Limon North to the Nebraska State Line

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 71 Heartland Expressway corridor is primarily to improve mobility, as well as to maintain system quality and safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, provides local access, and makes northsouth connections to the Ports to Plains Corridor. SH 71 from Limon to the Nebraska State Line has been designated a "high priority corridor" as part of the Heartland Expressway route in Colorado.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 36 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvement for freight and truck movement
- Desire for multi-modal design
- Desire for regional transit
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Pavement condition is poor
- Long term desire for 4-lane expansion compatible with neighboring states



## Key Data Findings: State Highway 71 (Heartland Expressway): I-70 in

Limon North to the Nebraska State Line (PEA7015)

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ and disabled populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulder less than 2' <br> Hazmat route |
| Mobility Hub <br> Transit | Inter-city bus station in Limon |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Limon |
| Economics | Concentration of wind turbines <br> Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor <br> Agriculture |
| Freight | High truck traffic |

ADAMS MORGAN

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsProvide additional travel optionsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 71 Super 2 | Reconstruction of corridor, safety, operational and Intelligent Transportation Systems components to Super 2 configuration from Limon to Nebraska state line. | 1023 | 13 |  | $4 \%$ | \$200.00 |
| SH 71 Do Not Pass Warning (DNPW) | DNPW on 2-lane truck route | 1093 | (1) | (-2) | $!$ | - |
| SH 71 Corridor Study Improvements | Construct improvements identified through the SH 71 Corridor Study (top priority from study yet to be finalized) | 2419 | (1) | (6) |  | - |
| SH71: Limon Structures | Bridge BMPs G-22-BB E-22-J E-22-A C-22-AR | 2680 | (8) | (1) |  | \$0.62 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits




Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilience
Pedestrian


Mobs Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


I-70 in Limon North to the Nebraska State Line (PEA7015)

## Asset Management

- SH 71 Super 2
- SH71:Limon Structures



## Corridor Name

State Highway 113: SH 138 near Sterling to I-80 in Sidney, Nebraska

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 113 corridor is to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes northsouth connections within the Northeast Colorado Plains and connections to Nebraska.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for passing lanes
- Frustration with lack of maintenance


|  | Key Data Findings: State Highw <br> Sidney, Nebraska (PEA7016) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of disabled population |
| Freight <br> Safety | Entire corridor has shoulder less than 2' <br> Hazmat route |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Crosses 100-year floodplain |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of wind turbines <br> Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor <br> Agriculture |

Key Data Findings:


Corridor Needs: State Highway 113: SH 138 near Sterling to I-80 in

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight and bicyclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 113 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2510 | 1 | 6 | (1) | - |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management

## Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- See project : SH 113 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)
- SH 113 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)



## Corridor Name

US Highway 138: SH 6 in Sterling Northeast to I-80 in Nebraska

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 138 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, serves as a Main Street, provides local access, serves as a parallel facility to the interstate for local traffic and makes east-west connections within the Northeast Colorado and Nebraska area.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor: R4-19


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 32 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for better facilities
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Concerns about safety



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ and disabled populations and minority population |  |  |
|  |  | Economics | Main Street through J ulesburg and DOLA affiliated |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns$\text { (LOSS } 3 \text { or } 4 \text { ) }$ | Pedestrian | Main Street through Sterling |
|  |  | Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy Crosses 100-year floodplain |
| Freight Safety | Entire corridor has shoulder less than $\mathbf{2}^{\prime}$ Dense wildlife crashes |  |  |
|  |  | Economics | Concentration of jobs in Sterling |
| Freight AssetManagement | Low drivability life (near Sterling) | Economics Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells Agricultural corridor Agriculture |
| Pedestrian Transit | Inter-city bus station in Sterling and Julesburg Local transit service in Sterling |  |  |
|  |  | Freight | High truck traffic near Crook |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demandEliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclists(bus stops, downtown areas)Mitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)
(including wildlife crashes)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 138 Operations \& Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Wild Animal, Fixed Objects, Sideswipe Same Direction | 2409 | (1) | (1) 60 | (1) | - |
| US 138 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2502 | $!$ | 680 | (1) | - |
| Sterling north from MP 3 to MP 13.5 | Rural road surface treatment | 61 |  | (1) | $(3$ | \$2.00 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## (3) Asset Management

- Sterling north from MP 3 to MP 13.5


- US 138 Operations \& Safety Study
- US 138 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 14 (Plains): From l-25 in Fort Collins east to I-76 in Sterling

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 14 Plains corridor is primarily to increase mobility, as well as maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

The primary Investment category is Asset Management west of the SH 14 intersection with SH 71, and Mobility east of that intersection. Sections of the corridor between the towns of Sterling, Fort Morgan, Grover, and Ault are designated as the Pawnee Pioneer Trails Scenic Byway. This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, acts as a Main Street, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections from NE Colorado to the Fort Collins/ Front Range area.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor: R4-20
- Scenic Byway (Pawnee Pioneer Trails)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 36 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for multi-modal design
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Concerns about safety



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Bicycling |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of disabled population and minority population |  | High bicycle activity High stress for bicycling |
|  |  | Economics Pedestrian | DOLA affiliated Main Street through Sterling |
| Freight Safety | Segments with shoulder less than $2^{\prime}$ Dense wildlife crashes Hazmat Route | Resiliency | Crosses 100-year floodplain |
|  |  | Economics | Concentration of jobs in Sterling |
| Freight Asset Management | Low drivability life | Economics Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells Agricultural corridor |
| Pedestrian Transit | Inter-city bus station in Sterling Local transit service in Sterling |  | Agriculture |
|  |  | Freight | High truck traffic west of Willard |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclistsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)
$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 14 (Plains): From I-25 in Fort
Collins east to I-76 in Sterling (PEA7018)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 14 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS Intelligent Transportation Systems devices between Fort Collins and Sterling | 1024 | (8) | (-1) | (1) | \$30.00 |
| SH 14 Operations \& Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Rear End, Broadside, Sideswipe Same Direction | 2410 | (1) | (-6) 0 | (1) | - |
| SH 14 Turn Lanes | Add turn lanes at access points with heavy oil and gas trucking activity | 2420 | (8) | (3) 1 | (1) | - |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2442 | (-2) | - |  | - |
| SH 14 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2501 | 1 | $60-2$ | (1) | - |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
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Bicycle

Capacity Transit Asset Management
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## Project Benefits
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Asset Management


## (P) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

- SH 14 Turn Lanes
- Region 4 Truck Parking Study

- SH 14 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure
- SH 14 Operations \& Safety Study
- SH 14 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)


State Highway 23: From Holyoke east to Nebraska (PEA7019)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 23: From Holyoke east to Nebraska

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 23 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, provides local access, and makes east-west connections within the Northeast Plains of Colorado to the Nebraska area.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 8 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvement for freight and truck movement
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents
- Frustration with lack of maintenance




## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate risk associated with natural disastersAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this corridor |  | - | - | - | - | - |

Project Types


## Project Benefits
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Asset
Management
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Freight
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## (3) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

- No projects have been identified for this corridor

- No projects have been identified for this corridor


## Corridor Name

Interstate 70 (Plains): From E-470 in Denver east to Kansas

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the I-70 Plains corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor is on the National Highway System and National Freight Network and serves as a multi-modal Interstate facility, connects to the Front Range and places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the Eastern Colorado Plains to points west in Colorado and east of Colorado-the Ports to Plains route connecting Denver to Laredo, Texas utilizes I-70 between Denver and Limon.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier I CNG, EV and H Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 54 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Desire for turn lanes
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for transit or passenger rail
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Pavement condition is poor
- Concerns about safety



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ and disabled populations and higher percentage minority population | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
|  |  | Freight Resiliency | High criticality from Limon to Seibert and Burlington east Low redundancy in Limon and from Limon to Flagler and Burlington to the border Crosses 100-year floodplain west of Limon |
| Freight Safety | Hazmat route |  |  |
| Freight Asset Management | One bridge in poor condition in Seibert | Economics | High concentration of jobs in Limon and Burlington |
| Pedestrian Transit | Regional bus services operate along corridor Inter-city bus stations in Limon and Burlington Greyhound operates along corridor Local transit services in Limon and Burlington | Economics Freight | Concentration of wind turbines Agricultural corridor Agriculture |
|  |  | Freight | High truck traffic |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles,rest stops/ truck parkingAddress roadway conditionAddress bridge in poor condition
$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
$\triangle$
Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Address safety concernsProvide additional travel options
$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Limon and Denver | Bus service between Limon and Denver. Assumes 2 days per week purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1016 | (2) | (n) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iir | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.08 |
| I-70 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and Intelligent Transportation Systems devices | 1018 | (8) | (-2) 1 | (1) | - |
| Essential Bus Service between Burlington and Denver | Essential Bus Service from Burlington to Denver 3 days per week, 1 trip per day; two vehicles | 1094 | (2) | (i) 3 (ii) | 5 | \$2.42 |
| I-70: Replace Failing Pavement | Replacement of Alkali-Silica Reaction (ASR) and Hot Mix Asphalt (HMA) pavement and associated safety improvements for four segments between Limon and Burlington. | 1095 |  |  | (1) 3 | \$175.00 |
| Truck Parking | Increase Truck Parking between Bennett and Limon. The closed Deer Trail rest area may be an adequate location after mitigating environmental contamination. | 1570 | $6$ |  | (1) | \$0.88 |
| I-70 Arriba Rest Area | Expand Rest Area parking for commercial and private vehicles | 1572 | (1) | (-2) | $8$ | \$2.00 |
| I-70 Cable Rail | In areas with defined need | 1573 | 1 | (-2) | (1) | \$7.50 |
| I-70 Arriba Rest Area | Install security cameras | 1574 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.00 |
| 170 Bridges near Limon | ```Bridge BMPs G-22-BL G-22-BC G-22-BD G-22-BE G-22-BN G-22-BF G-22-BG G-22-BH G-22-BU G- 22-BT``` | 2670 |  | (1) |  | \$4.28 |
| 170 Sibert to Stratton | Interstate reconstruction- part of \$200 M package | 2684 |  | (1) | $8$ | \$175.00 |

## Project Types
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## Project Benefits
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Mobility Options Asset Management (a) Aviation Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area




- I-70 Arriba Rest Area
- 170 Bridges near Limon
- 170 Sibert to Stratton


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Limon and Denver
- I-70 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure
- Essential Bus Service between Burlington and Denver


## (1) Safety

- I-70: Replace Failing Pavement
- Truck Parking
- I-70 Cable Rail
- I-70 Arriba Rest Area


## Corridor Name

US Highway 34 (Eastern Plains): From SH 71 in Brush east to Nebraska

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 34 Eastern Plains corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal facility, acts as a Main Street, and makes east-west connections within the Northeast Colorado area.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 60 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Desire for roadway expansion
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for rest stops/truck parking
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents
- Questions about technology/ data
- Frustration with lack of maintenance




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population and minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Segments with shoulders less than 2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (three segments) <br> Four bridges in poor condition east of Akron and <br> Eckley |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Amtrak operates along corridor <br> Regional bus station in Yuma |


| Bicycling | Segments of high stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics <br> Pedestrian | Main Street through Akron, Otis, and Wray |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Akron, Yuma, and Wray |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor <br> Agriculture |
| Freight | High truck traffic |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress unsafe passing conditionsMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Address bridges in poor conditionEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demandEliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclists (bus stops, downtown areas)Provide additional travel options)

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 34 Operations \& Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Wild Animal, Fixed Object, Overturning | 2411 | (1) | (1) - | (1) | - |
| US 34 Passing Lane | Add passing lane on US 34 (MP 183-187) | 2421 | (1) | (.) -1.3 | (1) 2 | \$2.00 |
| Region 4 Rest Area Study | Assess the feasibility of new or relocated rest areas | 2422 | $1$ | - | $!$ | - |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2442 | 6 | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| US 34 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2506 | $4$ | $60$ |  | - |

Project Types
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## (1) Asset <br> Management

- See project: US 34 Passing Lane

- Region 4 Truck Parking Study
- US 34 Passing Lane

- US 34 Operations \& Safety Study
- Region 4 Rest Area Study
- US 34 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)


## Corridor Name

US Highway 36 (Eastern Plains): From I-70 in Byers east to Kansas

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 36 Eastern Plains corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal facility, acts as a Main Street, and makes east-west connections within the Northeast Colorado area.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 12 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for multi-modal design
- Frustration with lack of maintenance




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population and minority <br> population | Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Corridor Needs: US Highway 36 (Eastern Plains): From I-70 in Byers east


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)Address bridge in poor conditionEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 36 Operations \& Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Overturning, Wild Animal, Fixed Object | 2412 | (1) (3) | ( | (1) 50 | - |
| US 36 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2499 | (1) | 680 | (1) E0) |  |

## Project Types
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## (P) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## ! Safety

- US 36 Operations \& Safety Study
- US 36 Region 4 Shoulder Study (EATPR)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expansion of NECALG's County Express Demand Response to Connect to Outrider | Additional operating dollars and vehicles to expand County Express Demand Reposes service to provider "first and last mile" connections to Outrider (project costs include annual operating at $\$ 20,000 / y e a r$ and 2 cutaway vehicles at $\$ 80,000$ each) | 1460 | (5) |  |  | \$0.36 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



SWP Goal Area


## Asset Management

- See corridor projects


## Mobility

- Expansion of NECALG's County Express Demand Response to Connect to Outrider


## Safety

- See corridor projects


CDOT Region 3, 5

## Counties:

Delta, Gunnison, Hinsdale, Montrose, Ouray, and San Miguel

## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Provide additional travel options
- Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
* Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback


## What We've Heard about the Gunnison Valley TPR

- 748 public and stakeholder comments specifically about the GV TPR
- 169 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the Gunnison Valley TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" public survey respondents in the Gunnison Valley TPR, combined with stakeholder input, selected:
- Road condition and safety
- Lack of travel options
- Growth and congestion
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the Gunnison Valley TPR (in order of frequency) include: safety, road condition, bike/ ped connectivity, transit, shoulders, congestion, and funding.

> II The Gunnison Valley TPR will accommodate the region's existing and future multimodal transportation needs by maintaining a safe, convenient, reliable, and efficient transportation network that supports the economic growth of the region by providing transportation choice for residents, visitors, and tourists of the /I region.


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics | 2015 Population: 98,088 <br> 2045 Forecasted Population: 145,370 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | 2015 J obs: 52,892 <br> 2045 Forecasted Jobs: 78,402 |
| Economics | Top Industries: agriculture, energy, outdoor recreation, <br> tourism, and hunting |


| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 2.4 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 4.1 Million |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asset <br> Management | 124 Miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 434 Miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 129 Miles of highway with low drivability life |

## Corridor Name

US Highway 50A: Between Grand J unction and Montrose

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 50 Grand J unction to Montrose corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides a direct connection between Grand Junction, Delta, and Montrose. The communities along the corridor value high levels of mobility, transportation choices, connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on manufacturing, tourism, recreation, agriculture, and commercial activity along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, hazardous materials, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 48 comments:
- Desire for better road maintenance and safety (32 comments)
- Desire for safer intersections: Confluence Dr (turn lane capacity), US 550 (safety, crosswalks, ped/ bike space) and intersection with Airport Rd (turn lane capacity, safety).
- Desire for more bus/ transit
- Desire for a bike trail



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+), Disabled Population, <br> Low-income, and Minority Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate congestion on segment South of Delta and <br> just North of Montrose (2030, 2045) <br> Moderate to High Congestion on short section just <br> North of Montrose (2045) |
| Safety <br> Freight | Three segments of corridor have shoulders less than <br> 2' (Montrose, Olathe, Delta). Three segments of the <br> corridor have elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4). <br> Dense wildlife crashes. Hazmat Route. |
| Asset <br> Management <br> Freight | Segments of Iow drivability life (main segment <br> south of Delta) |
| Transit <br> Pedestrian | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor. Local transit <br> operates on corridor. Bustang Outrider stops in <br> Montrose and Delta |
| Bicycling <br> Pedestrian | Medium High to High stress for bicycling. Main <br> street through Delta and Montrose (DOLA <br> designated Main Street) |
| Resiliency | High Criticality. Low Redundancy. Crosses and <br> parallels 100-year flood plain |
| Freight <br> Economics <br> Airport | High concentration of jobs in Montrose and Delta. <br> Agricultural corridor. Montrose Regional Airport |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove roadway conditionImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs and improve reliability for freight movementEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown)Increase connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (airport)Mitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)
Planning
Project ID

| ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 50 and US 550 |  | 1026 | (8) | (1) | (1) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Grand Junction and Telluride (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Grand Junction and Telluride. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1027 | (9) | (12) 5 (ii) | 5 | \$2.75 |
| Montrose Regional Transit Center | Plan and construct a regional transit center (including vehicle bays and fuel stations) | 1096 | (9) | (4) 5 (1i) | 0 | \$5.20 |
| Delta Park-n-Ride | Construct a Park-n-Ride in Delta to replace the current stop; 120 spaces | 1097 | (-) | (12) 3 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.45 |
| New Regional Transit Service between Montrose and Delta | General Public Fixed-Route/FlexRoute between Montrose and Delta via US 50; 1 vehicle; 5 days/week, 8 trips/day | 1098 | (2) | (1) 40 (iil 1 | 5 | \$2.20 |
| Expanded City of <br> Montrose Demand <br> Response Human <br> Services Transportation | Additional City of Montrose Human Services Transportation, 5 days/week; 3 add'I vehicles | 1099 | ( | (1) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$6.57 |
| New Local Fixed/Flex- <br> Route Transit Service in City of Delta | General Public Fixed-Route/FlexRoute; 1 vehicle; 5 days/week, 12 trips/day | 1100 | (2) | (1) $\leqslant 10$ | $\theta$ | \$3.36 |
| New Inter-regional Service between Montrose and Grand Junction | General public fixed-route service via US 50; 5 days/week, 8 trips/day; 1 medium sized bus | 1101 | -) | (4) 5 (ii) | 0 | \$4.33 |

## Project Types

Project Benefits

Riv) Quality of Life
Ricycle
Resilience

Mob
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 50 North of Montrose | Major Asset management and repairs to mainline US 50 | 1462 | (2) | (3) 3 | 9 | \$15.00 |
| US 50 Mainstreet Improvement in Delta | Reduction of lane and additional bike lanes through downtown Delta | 1463 | 63 | (1) 4 | (1) | - |
| Western Slope Maintenance and Storage Facility | - | 2340 | (2) 8 | - | $\Rightarrow 6$ | \$2.70 |
| US 50 corridor improvements in Montrose County | US 50 corridor improvements from Montrose to Olathe including safety and access improvements at Montrose Airport | 2427 | (1) 8 | \& 5 (1) | $(1)$ | \$25.00 |
| Multimodal trail crossing of Gunnison River at Highway 50 | - | 2436 | ( 6 | (1) 5 ? | (1) $)^{2}$ | - |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 3 locations: Montrose, Delta, and Gunnison | 2454 | () | (12) $\boldsymbol{H}_{3}$ | 5 | \$0.25 |
| All Points Transit Montrose Flex Route Services Expansion | Expanded City of Montrose general public fixed route services | 2475 | P) | (12) 5 | 0 | \$1.58 |
| All Points Transit charging stations for vehicles | Purchase and installation of 2 stations | 2476 | (2) | $(n)=(1)$ <br> (iin) 8 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.05 |

## Project Types
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 50 Delta South | Rural road surface treatment | 2654 | $B$ | (1) | $5$ | \$5.17 |
| US 50 Olathe South | Rural road surface treatment | 2657 |  | (1) |  | \$4.07 |
| US 50 Olathe Business Loop | Rural road surface treatment | 2663 | $3$ | $!$ | $8$ | \$1.12 |
| Intersection Improvements at US 50/US550 | This project will replace the aging signal with new infrastructure, including a new railroad interconnect. In addition, the intersection will be rebuilt with a second southbound left turn lane to address safety and capacity problems resulting from excessive queuing. | 40 |  | - |  | \$3.50 |

## Project Types
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## 0 <br> Asset Management

- US 50 North of Montrose
- Western Slope Maintenance and Storage Facility
- US 50 Delta South
- US 50 Olathe South
- US 50 Olathe Business Loop


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Grand Junction and Telluride (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Montrose Regional Transit Center
- Delta Park-n-Ride
- New Regional Transit Service between Montrose and Delta
- Expanded City of Montrose Demand Response Human Services Transportation
- New Local Fixed/Flex-Route Transit Service in City of Delta
- New Inter-regional Service between Montrose and Grand Junction
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements
- All Points Transit Montrose Flex Route Services Expansion
- All Points Transit charging stations for vehicles


## (!) Safety

- ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 50 and US 550
- US 50 Mainstreet Improvement in Delta
- US 50 corridor improvements in Montrose County
- Multimodal trail crossing of Gunnison River at Highway 50



## Corridor Name

US Highway 50B: Between Montrose and Sargents

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 50 Montrose to Sargents corridor is primarily to improve safety and maintain system quality as well as to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides a direct connection between Montrose and Gunnison. The communities along the corridor value high levels of mobility, transportation choices, connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on manufacturing, tourism, recreation, agriculture, and commercial activity along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain, and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, hazardous materials, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R3-16)
- Scenic Byway - West Elk Loop (Gunnison to SH 92)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 54 comments:
- Desire for better road maintenance and safety
- Desire for more resilience and incident management
- Desire for less congestion
- Desire for bike lane and bike/ ped connectivity
- Desire for safer intersections: US 550 (safety, crosswalks, ped/ bike space)
- Desire for more travel options
- Desire for more bus/transit




## Key Data Findings:

|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of: Aging Population (65+), Disabled Population, Lowincome Population, and Minority Population | Bicycling | High bicycle activity east of Montrose and east of Gunnison. Medium High to High stress for bicycling Main street through Montrose (DOLA designated Main Street) and Gunnison |
| Safety Freight | Six segments of corridor have shoulders less than $2^{\prime}$. One segments of the corridor have elevated crash patterns (Blue mesa) (LOSS 3 or 4). Dense wildlife | Resiliency | High Criticality (Segment close to Gunnison). Low Redundancy. Crosses and parallels 100-year flood plain |
| Asset <br> Management <br> Freight | crashes. Hazmat Route Low drivability life - one short segment (Blue Mesa) | Economics <br> Freight <br> Airport | High concentration of jobs in Montrose and Gunnison. Provides access to recreational area (Curecanti National Recreation Area and Black Canyon National Park). Gunnison-Crested Butte Regional Airport |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Black Hills and Bustang Outrider operates on corridor (Gunnison to San Luis TRP boundary). Bustang Outrider stops in Gunnison and Monarch ski area |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationProvide additional travel optionsMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Increase connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (airport)Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown)Improve bicycle accommodation

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT <br> Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on US 50 and US 550 | - | 1026 | (3) | $!$ | (1) | - |
| Gunnison Transit Center and Parking Facility | - | 1102 | (0) | (n) 0 |  | \$2.86 |
| Essential Bus Service between Montrose and Gunnison (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Montrose and Gunnison. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1103 | (9) | (x) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.00 |
| US 50 Windy <br> Point/Blue Creek <br> Canyon | This final connection on US 50 requires geometric alignment improvements, adding shoulders and building a new passing lane. New drainage culverts, rock fall mitigation, snow fences, signing, and striping are also part of the project. | 33 |  | ©(2) (2) 610 |  | \$39.00 |

## Project Types
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety improvements to address head on collisions | Gunnison County - Do Not Pass Warning (DNPW) | 1105 |  | $\theta$ | $!$ | - |
| US 50 Wildlife Fencing Gunnison County | Wildlife fencing along Blue Mesa Reservoir | 1467 | $!$ | (1) -2) | (1) 2 | \$2.50 |
| US 50 East of Gunnison Safety | Safety and mobility improvements throughout the corridor including intersections, shoulders, and other safety and mobility improvements. | 1469 | (1) | (8) -3 | $18$ | \$15.00 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 3 locations: Montrose, Delta, and Gunnison | 2454 | (-) | (n) 0 | $\theta$ | \$0.25 |
| Essential Bus Service between Montrose/Gunnison and Salida | Essential bus service between Montrose/Gunnison and Salida. Assumes one roundtrip per day, 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20 / \mathrm{mi}$ | 2708 | (-) | (i) 0 | $\theta$ | \$1.75 |
| US 50 Passing Lanes Blue Mesa (Milepost 134.6-136) | This project will add passing lanes in each direction on SH 50 near Blue Mesa. Heavy volume of trucks lead to safety and capacity problems that arise due to slow travel speeds and risky passing behaviors. | 34 | (1) | $\theta$ | (1) | \$6.00 |

## Project Types
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- US 50 Windy Point/Blue Creek Canyon


## Mobility

- Gunnison Transit Center and Parking Facility
- Essential Bus Service between Montrose and Gunnison (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements
- Essential Bus Service between Montrose/Gunnison and Salida


## (1) Safety

- ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 50 and US 550
- Safety improvements to address head on collisions
- US 50 Wildlife Fencing Gunnison County
- US 50 East of Gunnison Safety
- US 50 Passing Lanes Blue Mesa (Milepost 134.6-136)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 62: Between Placerville and Ridgway

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 62 corridor is primarily to improve mobility as well as to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility that provides commuter and visitor access between Ridgway and Telluride. The communities along the corridor value transportation choices, connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism, agriculture, access to public lands, and commercial activity along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor. This corridor has been identified as the only route to local medical facilities.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R5-6)
- Scenic Byway - San J uan Skyway


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 14 comments:
- Safety concerns (speed)
- Turn lane concern at CR24D crossing
- Desire for safer pedestrian crossing at US 550
- Road conditions on SH 62 and US 550 intersection
- Environmental concerns at SH 62 and SH 145
- Desire for more bus/transit




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of: Aging Population (65+) and <br> Disabled Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | One segment of corridor has shoulders less <br> than 2' (Ridgway). Two segments of the <br> corridor have elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4). Dense wildlife crashes |
| Transit <br> Pedestrian | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor. Local <br> transit operates on corridor. Bustang Outrider <br> stop at Ridgway |


| Bicycling <br> Pedestrian | High stress for bicycling. Main street through <br> Ridgway (DOLA designated Main Street) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Resiliency | Low Redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor. Local stop at Ridgway



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Improve bicycle accommodationAddress environmental impacts (air pollution, noise)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian (downtown)Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs,| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Grand Junction and Telluride (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Grand Junction and Telluride. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1027 | (-) | (i) $\Rightarrow$ |  | \$2.75 |
| New Regional Transit <br> Service between <br> Montrose and Telluride | New Montrose-Telluride general public fixed-route service via US 550, CO 62, and CO 145; 2 full size buses, 7 days/week, 4 trips/day; Potential stops include Montrose, Colona, Ridgway, Placerville and Telluride. | 1028 | (-) | (12) 0 (iil |  | \$4.23 |
| New Regional Transit Service between <br> Montrose and Placerville | Regional Transit Service from Montrose to Placerville 5 days/week, 8 trips/day | 1029 | (-) | (12) 0 | 5 | \$4.20 |
| SH 62 Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Ridgeway SH 145 and US 550 | 1106 | (8) | (1) | (1) | \$6.00 |
| US 62 and Railroad in Ridgway | Align N and S Railroad Ave with RAB. | 1470 | (1) | - | (1) | \$5.00 |
| Multi-modal improvements to US550/62 Intersection | - | 1489 | ( 60 | (x) 5 ( 0 | (1) | \$1.50 |

## Project Types
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overpass/underpass at Amelia Street (or other pedestrian safety solution) | - | 2425 | ( 6 | (x) ! ! | (1) | \$3.00 |
| Left turn lanes at CR 24B (eastbound traffic onto CR 24B) | - | 2437 | (a) |  | (1) | - |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 3 locations: Placerville, Ridgway, and Telluride | 2455 | (9) | (x) $\Leftrightarrow$ |  | \$0.25 |

## Project Types



Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## (9) Asset <br> Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Grand Junction and Telluride (Proposed Outrider Service)
- New Regional Transit Service between Montrose and Telluride
- New Regional Transit Service between Montrose and Placerville


## (1) Safety

- Overpass/underpass at Amelia Street (or other pedestrian safety solution)
- Left turn lanes at CR 24B (eastbound traffic onto CR 24B)
- SH 62 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure

- CDOT identifies asset treatments through a separate data-driven asset management process

- US 62 and Railroad in Ridgway
- Multi-modal improvements to US 550/62 Intersection
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements

- See previous page


## Corridor Name

State Highway 65: Between Delta (SH 92) over the Grand Mesa to I-70

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 65 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides a connection between Delta, Orchard City, and Cedaredge to I-70 through Grand Mesa National Forest. The communities along the corridor value transportation choices, connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism, agriculture, access to public lands, energy development, logging, recreational, and commercial activity along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain, agricultural, and recreational character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor. This corridor has been identified as an important route to local medical facilities.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway - Grand Mesa (Cedaredge to Mesa County Line)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 10 comments:
- Desire for better road conditions
- Desire for additional passing lanes
- Desire for wider shoulders for bikers
- Desire rock-slide repair



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+), Disabled Population and <br> Low-Income Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate Congestion on short segment North of <br> Delta (2030, 2045). Moderate to High Congestion on <br> short segment North of Delta (2045) |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life - one segment (North of Delta) |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

Corridor Projects: State Highway 65: Between Delta (SH 92) over the Grand
Mesa to I-70 (PGV7004)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 92/SH 65 <br> Intersection Improvements | - | 1473 | (1) | (5) - | (1) | \$3.75 |
| SH 65 to Eckert | Rural road surface treatment | 2645 | $3$ | 4 | $8$ | \$5.67 |
| SH 65 Grand Mesa | Rural road surface treatment | 2651 | $(6)$ | (1) | 1 | \$6.63 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## $\Leftrightarrow$ <br> Asset Management

- SH 65 to Eckert
- SH 65 Grand Mesa


## Mobility

- See project: SH 92/SH 65 Intersection Improvements


## (!) Safety

- SH 92/SH 65 Intersection Improvements



## Corridor Name

State Highway 90A: Between Colorado-Utah State border and Naturita

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 90 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, provides local access, and makes east west connections within the Major segment west of Naturita with small segment west of Montrose area. These two segments are separated by the Uncompahgre Plateau. The future goal is to connect these two segments to provide a contiguous highway. The communities along the corridor value connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. They depend on manufacturing, tourism, agriculture, and commercial activity for economic activity in the area. Significant growth in truck traffic is anticipated as a result of energy development on and near the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor while recognizing the environmental, economic and social needs of the surrounding area.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments:
- Desire for safer intersection (SH 90 and US 550/ US 50)




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of: Aging Population (65+) and <br> Disabled Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate to High Congestion on short <br> segment West of Montrose (2030, 2045). High <br> congestion on short segment West of <br> Montrose |
| Safety | Nearly all corridor has shoulders less than 2' |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficiencies$\rightarrow$
Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations7. Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs and improve reliability for freight movement

Corridor Projects: State Highway 90: Between Colorado-Utah State border

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 90B Montrose | Rural road surface treatment | 2661 | $3$ | (1) |  | \$3.64 |
| SH 90B Montrose | Rural road surface treatment | 2662 | $8$ | (1) | 18 | \$0.78 |

## Project Types
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## (3) Asset Management

- SH 90B Montrose
- SH 90B Montrose


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## ! Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## Corridor Name

State Highway 92A: Between Delta and Hotchkiss

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 92 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides a direct connection between Delta and Hotchkiss. The communities along the corridor value high levels of mobility, transportation choices, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism, access to public lands, agriculture, and natural resource recovery along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural and mountain character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor. This corridor has been identified as the only route to local medical facilities, as well as a major commuter route. For both of these reasons there is a desire for greater transit service along the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 55 comments
- Desire for better road conditions
- Desire for a safer road
- Concerns about congestion
- Desire for bike lane and bike/ ped connectivity




## Key Data Findings:

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{l|ll|l}\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Demographics } \\
\text { Transit }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Passes through census tract with higher } \\
\text { percentage of: Aging Population (65+), } \\
\text { Disabled Population and Low-income } \\
\text { Population }\end{array} & & \begin{array}{l}\text { Asset } \\
\text { Management }\end{array}\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{l}Low drivability life - two segments (main West of <br>

Hotchkiss)\end{array}\right]\)| Bicycling |
| :--- |
| Pedestrian |
| Economics |$\quad$| High stress for bicycling. Main street through |
| :--- |
| Hotchkiss (DOLA affiliated Main Street) |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs and improve reliability for freight movement| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 92: Safety Improvements | This project will reconstruct and widen the existing roadway to meet current design standards. It will also improve safety by reducing vertical curves to improve sight distance, adding 6- to 8foot shoulders, consolidating or eliminating access points, and completing intersection improvements at three county roads to, at a minimum, add left turn lanes. | 1107 | (1) 8) | 68.3 |  | \$32.92 |
| Intersection Improvements @ SH 92 and Meeker St | - | 1475 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.40 |
| Delta Public transit/human services | - | 2429 | (-) | (a) 5 (iil |  | \$0.31 |
| SH 92 Austin | Rural road surface treatment | 2658 | $(3)$ | (1) | $8$ | \$2.41 |
| SH 92 Rogers Mesa to Hotchkiss | This project will add shoulders and provide turning lanes on SH 92 at county road intersections west of Hotchkiss. Improvements will also include new culvert drains, delineation, guardrail, signing, and striping. | 39 | (1) | (3) 60 | (1) | \$8.00 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

Project Based Strategies: State Highway 92A: Between Delta and


- SH 92 Austin


- SH 92: Safety Improvements
- Intersection Improvements @ SH92 and Meeker St


## Corridor Name

State Highway 92B: Between Hotchkiss and Blue Mesa

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 92 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility between Hotchkiss and the Blue Mesa Reservoir. The communities along the corridor value high levels of mobility, transportation choices, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism, agriculture, access to public lands, and commercial activity along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural and mountain character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, recreation, commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway - West Elk Loop


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 31 comments:
- Desire for better road conditions
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for bike/ ped connectivity
- Desire for more travel options



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+), Disabled Population, <br> Low-income, and Minority Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Nearly all corridor have shoulders less than 2'. One <br> segments of the corridor has elevated crash patterns <br> (West of Jct US 50) (LOSS 3 or 4). <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life - three segments |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low Redundancy. Crosses and parallels 100-year <br> flood plain |

Economics


Corridor Needs: State Highway 92B: Between Hotchkiss and Blue Mesa

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesProvide additional travel optionsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

Corridor Projects: State Highway 92B: Between Hotchkiss and Blue Mesa

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curve Warning and Project Locations | Gunnison County - Curve Speed Warning | 1108 | $!$ | - |  | - |
| SH 92 from MP 20 to MP 25 near Hotchkiss | Rural road surface treatment | 44 | $3$ | (1) |  | \$3.50 |
| SH 92 from MP 33 to MP 45 east of Crawford | Rural road surface treatment | 45 | $(3)$ | (1) |  | \$7.80 |
| Trail: Hotchkiss town limits to high school | - | 2432 | $06$ | (n) |  | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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## Asset Management

- SH 92 from MP 20 to MP 25 near Hotchkiss
- SH 92 from MP 33 to MP 45 east of Crawford


## Mobility

- Trail: Hotchkiss town limits to high school


## (1) Safety

- Curve Warning and Project Locations


State Highway 97: Between Naturita and Nucla (PGV7008)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 97: Between Naturita and Nucla

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 97 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility between Naturita and Nucla. The communities along the corridor value transportation choices, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on manufacturing, tourism, agriculture, and commercial activity along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain, and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments


Key Data Findings: State Highway 97: Between Naturita and Nucla

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+) and Disabled Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Small segment near Nucla has shoulders less than 2' |
| Bicycling | Medium to Medium High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low Redundancy. Crosses 100-year flood plain |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 97: Between Naturita and Nucla

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficiencies$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations


Corridor Projects: State Highway 97: Between Naturita and Nucla

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this goal area | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Project Types


Project Benefits


Mobility Options
Asset
Management - Aviation
Freight
Transit

##  <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## Corridor Name

State Highway 114: Between Highway 50 south to Highway 285

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 114 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a connection between US 50 (east of Gunnison) and US 285 (Saguache). This route is the only alternative to Monarch Pass between US 50 and US 285. The communities along the corridor value connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism, agriculture, access to public lands, and commercial activity along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain, and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments:
- Desire for more safety
- Concerns on congestion
- Environmental concerns (cargo spills)


Key Data Findings: State Highway 114: Between Highway 50 south to
Highway 285 (PGV7009)

## Key Data Findings:

| Safety | Nearly all corridor has shoulders <2' <br> Nearly all corridor has elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life - All corridor |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low Redundancy <br> Parallels 100-year flood plain |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 114: Between Highway 50 south to

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Address environmental impacts (spills)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 114: Between Highway 50 south to
.................................

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 114 Safety Improvements MP 6-8 | - | 2337 | $!$ | - | $!$ | - |
| SH 114 from MP 0 to MP 8 west of Parlin | Rural road surface treatment | 56 | $9$ | $!$ |  | \$4.50 |

## Project Types

(1) Safety
(-) Freight
(8) Operations
(6) Bicycle

## Project Benefits
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- No projects have been identified for this goal area
- SH 114 Safety Improvements MP 6-8



## Corridor Name

State Highway 133: Between Hotchkiss and Carbondale

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 133 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a direct connection between Hotchkiss Paonia, Somerset, and Carbondale and serves as an important connection between the Western Slope and the I-70 corridor. The communities along the corridor value high levels of mobility, transportation choices, connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism, agriculture, and commercial activity for economic activity in the area. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain, and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, energy development, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor. This corridor has been identified as a route to local medical facilities.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R3-5; Carbondale to Bull Mountain)
- Scenic Byway - West Elk Loop


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 45 comments:
- Safety concerns (speed, shoulders, bikes)
- Desire of better road conditions
- Desire for better bike connectivity
- Desire for more bus/ transit




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of: Aging Population (65+), <br> Disabled Population and low-income <br> Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Nearly all of the corridor between Hotchkiss <br> and Somerset have shoulders less than 2'. <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |


| Resiliency | Low Redundancy. Parallels 100-year flood plain |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Economics | High concentration of jobs in Paonia. <br> Agricultural Corridor. Provides access to <br> recreational area <br> Concentration of oil and gas wells |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 133: Between Hotchkiss and Carbondale


## Corridor Needs

Improve roadway conditionAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies$\rightarrow$
Improve bicycle accommodationMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 133: Between Hotchkiss and Carbondale

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Install queue warnings on this narrow road with high congestion | Delta County - Queue Warning | 1109 | (1) | (I) | (1) | - |
| SH 133 Hotchkiss to Paonia | Reconstruction with shoulder widening | 1479 | $3$ | (n) 90 ! |  | \$100.00 |

## Project Types
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- SH 133 Hotchkiss to Paonia


- Install queue warnings on this narrow road with high congestion


## Corridor Name

State Highway 135: Between Gunnison and Crested Butte

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 135 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to increase mobility and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility between Gunnison and Crested Butte. This Highway also serves as access to the North Fork and the I-70 corridor in the summer. The communities along the corridor value transportation choices, connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism, agriculture, and commercial industries for economic activity in the area. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain, and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-tomarket products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R3-15)
- Scenic Byway - West Elk Loop


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 33 comments:
- Desire for safer road (16 comments)
- Desire for better and safer bike/ ped connectivity
- Desire for better road conditions
- Desire for better signage
- Concerns on congestion
- Desire for safer intersection US 50 and SH 135 (Gunnison)



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of Low-income Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate congestion small segment just north of <br> Gunnison (2045) |
| Safety | Two segments of the corridor have shoulders less <br> than 2'. One short segment of the corridor has <br> elevated crash patterns (Almont) (LOSS 3 or 4). <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Transit <br> Pedestrian | Gunnison Valley RTA operates on corridor |
| Bicycling <br> Pedestrian <br> Economics | High bicycle activity south of Crested Butte <br> Medium to Medium High stress for bicycling <br> Main street through Gunnison and Crested Butte |
| Resiliency | Low Redundancy. Crosses and parallels 100-year <br> flood plain. Small section Avalanche path (South of <br> Aspen Mountain road Jct) |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Crested Butte. <br> Provides access to recreational area (Scenic byway <br> and Crested Butte ski area) |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 135: Between Gunnison and Crested

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Improve safety concernsAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs,tourist destinations, and recreationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian (downtown)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove bicycle accommodation


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crested Butte <br> Mountain Express Bus <br>  <br> Storage Facility | Construct a 11,340 square foot heated steel building with metal siding; 14 bays -2 bays will be used for bus washing and storage, 12 bays will be used for bus storage; 4" concrete floor | 1110 |  | $3$ | $\theta$ | \$3.00 |
| Shared Crested Butte Storage Facility for Outrider and Gunnison Valley RTA | 1 acre lot; 6 bays; 6,000 square feet facility for bus storage | 1112 | (-) |  |  | \$2.25 |
| Gunnison Valley RTA Bus Maintenance and Storage Facility | - | 1113 | (\%) | $3$ |  | \$4.60 |
| Gunnison Valley RTA Upgrading of Current Bus Stops and Construct New Bus Stops | - | 1114 |  | (n) 5 |  | \$1.62 |
| Essential Bus Service between Crested Butte and Gunnison (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Crested Butte and Gunnison. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1115 |  | (x) 0 |  | \$1.27 |
| High commuter traffic | Gunnison County - Queue Warning | 1116 | 4 | - | 4 | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 135 corridor improvements in Gunnison County | Corridor improvements including intersection improvements at Gunnison County Roads 738 and 740 | 1480 | (1) | (I) | (1) 3 | - |
| SH 135 Safety Improvements MP 2021 | - | 2338 | (1) | (1) | (1) | - |
| SH 135 Intersection Improvements | Improvements to the Intersections of SH 135 and Gunnison County Roads 740 (skew intersection). | 2423 | (1) 8 | (1) | (1) 0 | - |
| Trail connection (Shady Island Park to Trail on south side of Gunnison River) | - | 2433 | ( 60 | (12) $0^{2}$ | (1) E | - |
| SH 135 at Red Lady Ave Intersection Improvements | - | 2439 | (1) 3 | (3) | (1) 0 | - |
| Gunnison Valley RTA - <br> Expansion Buses | Expand existing fleet by 3 buses | 2481 | ) | (1) 5 (in | $\theta$ | \$2.40 |
| Gunnison Valley RTA - <br> Expanded Service <br> Hours | Extend existing operating hours; $\$ 850 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$ | 2482 | (2) | (4) 5 | 5 | \$8.50 |
| SH 135 South of Crested Butte | Rural road surface treatment | 2648 | 9 | (1) | 9 | \$6.82 |

## Project Types

## Project Benefits
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## o <br> Asset Management

- SH 135 South of Crested Butte


## $\Rightarrow$ Mobility

- Crested Butte Mountain Express Bus Maintenance \& Storage Facility
- Shared Crested Butte Storage Facility for Outrider and Gunnison Valley RTA
- Gunnison Valley RTA Bus Maintenance and Storage Facility
- Gunnison Valley RTA - Upgrading of Current Bus Stops and Construct New Bus Stops
- Essential Bus Service between Crested Butte and Gunnison (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Trail connection (Shady Island Park to Trail on south side of Gunnison River)
- Gunnison Valley RTA - Expansion Buses
- Gunnison Valley RTA - Expanded Service Hours


## (!) Safety

- High commuter traffic
- SH 135 corridor improvements in Gunnison County
- SH 135 Safety Improvements MP 20-21
- SH 135 Intersection Improvements
- SH 135 at Red Lady Ave Intersection Improvements

and........


## Corridor Name

State Highway 141: Between Dove Creek and Grand Junction, thru Naturita

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 141 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility between the West End of San Miguel and Montrose counties and US 50 south of Grand J unction. The communities along the corridor value connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on manufacturing, tourism, agriculture, access to public lands, natural resource recovery, and commercial activity for economic activity in the area. Due to the nature of economic activity, hazardous waste trucks frequently travel along this corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Scenic Byway - Unaweep Tabeguache (Mesa County Line to Naturita)

What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments


Key Data Findings: State Highway 141: Between Dove Creek and Grand

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+) and Disabled Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety <br> Freight | Hazmat Route. Nearly all corridor has shoulders less <br> than 2' |
| Asset <br> Management <br> Freight | Low drivability life - five short segments |
| Bicycle <br> Pedestrian <br> Economics | High stress for bicycling. Main street through <br> Naturita (DOLA affiliated Main Street) |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | Low Redundancy. Parallels 100-year flood plain |
| Freight <br> Economics | Provides access to recreational area. Concentration <br> of oil and gas wells. High percentage of truck traffic |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 141: Between Dove Creek and Grand

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian (downtown)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 141: Between Dove Creek and Grand
Junction, through Naturita (PGV7012)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nucla/Naturita Park-nRide | Construct a Park-n-Ride in Nucla/Naturita area; 100 spaces | 1117 | (-) | (4) 3 | 5 | \$1.20 |
| Multi-modal project in Naturita | ADA, curb and gutter, crosswalks, RRFB's, restriping | 1481 | (1) 60 | (n) \% 0 ! | (1) | \$0.50 |
| SH 141 Naturita North and SH 97 (DEVOLUTION) | Rural road surface treatment | 2633 |  | (1) |  | \$10.38 |
| MP 16.2 to MP 60.13 near Lickrock and MP 108.54 to MP 112.507 near Redvale | Rural road surface treatment | 82 |  | $!$ |  | \$16.00 |
| North of Naturita from MP 76 to MP 95.8 | Rural road surface treatment | 83 | $(3)$ | (1) | $8$ | \$12.00 |

## Project Types
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Project Based Strategies: State Highway 141: Between Dove Creek and
Grand J unction, through Naturita (PGV7012)

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- SH 141 Naturita North and SH 97 (DEVOLUTION)
- MP 16.2 to MP 60.13 near Slick Rock and MP 108.54 to MP 112.507 near Redvale
- North of Naturita from MP 76 to MP 95.8
- Nucla/Naturita Park-n-Ride



## Corridor Name

State Highway 145: US 160 to J unction with State Highway 141

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 145 corridor is primarily to improve mobility as well as to increase safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, connecting visitors and commuters between the communities of Montrose, Ridgway, Placerville, and Telluride. The corridor is an alternative to Red Mountain Pass between Ouray and Durango. The communities along the corridor value high levels of mobility, transportation choices, connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on manufacturing, tourism, agriculture, and commercial activity along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain, and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-to market products in and through the corridor. This corridor has been identified as an important route to local medical facilities.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System (Placerville to Cortez)
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R5-2; Dolores County Line to Telluride)
- Scenic Byway - Unaweep Tabeguache (Naturita to Dolores County Line)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 24 comments:
- Desire for safer road (11 comments)
- Concerns about congestion
- Desire for more shoulders and passing lanes
- Desire for a bike trail/ bike lane
- Desire for better tourism management




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+) and Disabled Population | Transit <br> Pedestrian |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate to high congestion Placerville to <br> Telluride (2030, 2045). High congestion South of <br> Placerville (2045) | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor (South of <br> Placerville to Southwest TPR). Local Transit operates <br> on corridor. Bustang Outrider stops at Telluride and <br> Placerville |
| Safety | Nearly all corridor has shoulders less than 2'. <br> One segment of the corridor has elevated crash <br> patterns (Norwood) (LOSS 3 or 4). Dense wildlife <br> crashes | Bicycling <br> Pedestrian <br> Economics | | Very high bicycle activity west of Telluride and high |
| :--- |
| activity from Telluride to TPR Southwest border. |
| High stress for bicycling. Main street through |
| Norwood and Telluride |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 145: US 160 to J unction with State


## Corridor Needs

Address unsafe passing conditionsMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsIncrease connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (airport)Improve bicycle accommodationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian (downtown)Provide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (avalanche)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Grand Junction and Telluride (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Grand Junction and Telluride. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1027 |  | ( $2 \Rightarrow$ 0iil | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.75 |
| New Regional Transit Service between Montrose and Telluride | New Montrose-Telluride general public fixed-route service via US 550, CO 62, and CO 145; 2 full size buses, 7 days/week, 4 trips/day; Potential stops include Montrose, Colona, Ridgway, Placerville and Telluride. | 1028 |  | (x) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$4.23 |
| Expanded Interregional Transit Service between Telluride and Rico | 2 full size expansion buses | 1030 |  | (n) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.70 |
| Expansion of the Town of Mountain Village Intercept Parking Garage (Phases 1 \& 2) | Expand the Intercept Parking <br> Garage from 460 spaces to 760 | 1118 | () | (n) 5 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$12.60 |
| Completion of the Town of Mountain Village Intercept Parking Garage | Completion of the Intercept Parking Garage to 920 spaces | 1119 | (9) | (a) 0 | $s$ | \$10.75 |
| Major Upgrade of the Town of Mountain Village Gondola | Alternative to full gondola replacement | 1120 | (-) | (1) | $\theta$ | \$25.20 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Telluride Shandoka Parking Structure | New structure; 1000 spaces | 1121 | (-) | ( $2 \wedge$ | 0 | \$37.50 |
| Telluride Facility Expansion and Remodel | Remodel and expand facilities | 1122 | (-) | (x) $\Rightarrow$ | * | \$0.50 |
| SMART Admin, Maintenance, Storage Facility | Location unknown | 1123 | (-) | (x) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$7.00 |
| Replacement of the Town of Mountain Village Gondola | Replacement of the gondola including (1) demolition of current lift and stations, (2) Redesign of lift, stations, and associated infrastructure, and (3) construction of new lift, stations, and associated infrastructure. | 1124 |  | (1) | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$53.80 |
| SH 145: Safety and Mobility Improvements between Sawpit and Keystone Hill (Shoulder Widening and/or Passing Lanes) | Shoulder widening and/or addition of passing lane between Sawpit and Keystone Hill. | 1125 | (1) | $(n) \square 50$ | (1) | \$15.20 |
| Curvy sections of SH 145 north of Cortez | Curve Speed Warning | 1126 | (1) | - | (1) | - |

## Project Types
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project <br> Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multi-modal project. Sawpit/Placerville, Norwood, Rico | ADA, curb and gutter, crosswalks, RRFB's, restriping | 1482 | ( |  | (1) | \$5.00 |
| Underpass between Lawson Hill/Mountain Village | - | 2424 | ( 6.6 | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ ! | (1) | \$2.50 |
| SMART van \& bus replacement | - | 2430 | (-) | $1$ | $s$ | \$0.41 |
| Trail connection between Meadows Trail and Valley Floor Trail | - | 2434 | ( 60 | (1) $\rightarrow$ ! | (1) | - |
| SH 145 Bus pullout and shelters | Bus pullouts and shelters for SMART service where necessary as volumes and congestion grow; requires a study of the corridor to determine ideal and suitable locations; current estimate at $\$ .5 \mathrm{M}$ each stop/pullout (assumes 3 total) | 2440 |  |  | $\theta$ | \$1.50 |
| Down Valley Connector Trail between Placerville \& Illium | - | 2441 | (d) 6 | (n) $\Leftrightarrow$ ! | (1) | \$5.00 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 3 locations: Placerville, Ridgway, and Telluride | 2455 | (-) | (r) 0 | * | \$0.25 |
| MP 16.2 to MP 60.13 near Lickrock and MP 108.54 to MP 112.507 near Redvale | Rural road surface treatment | 82 |  | (1) | 18 | \$16.00 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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## (9) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Grand Junction and Telluride (Proposed Outrider Service)
- New Regional Transit Service between Montrose and Telluride
- Expanded Inter-regional Transit Service between Telluride and Rico


## ! Safety

- SH 145: Safety and Mobility Improvements between Sawpit and Keystone Hill (Shoulder Widening and/or Passing Lanes)
- Curvy sections of SH 145 north of Cortez



## (P) Asset <br> Management

- MP 16.2 to MP 60.13 near Lickrock and MP 108.54 to MP 112.507 near Redvale


## Mobility

- Expansion of the Town of Mountain Village Intercept Parking Garage (Phases 1 \& 2)
- Completion of the Town of Mountain Village Intercept Parking Garage
- Major Upgrade of the Town of Mountain Village Gondola
- Telluride Shandoka Parking Structure


## ! Safety

- Multi-modal project. Sawpit/Placerville, Norwood, Rico
- Underpass between Lawson Hill/Mountain Village
- Trail connection between Meadows Trail and Valley Floor Trail

- See the Previous page


## Mobility

- Telluride Facility Expansion and Remodel
- SMART Admin, Maintenance, Storage Facility
- Replacement of the Town of Mountain Village Gondola
- SMART van \& bus replacement
- SH145 Bus pullout and shelters
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements


## (!) Safety

- Down Valley Connector Trail between Placerville \& Illium


## Corridor Name

State Highway 149: From US 160 north to US 50 west of Gunnison

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 149 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility and is the sole connection between Lake City and US 50. The communities along the corridor value connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism, agriculture, public lands access, and natural resource recovery along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain, and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor. This corridor has been identified as an important route to local medical facilities.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway - Silver Thread


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 36 comments:
- Desire for better road conditions
- Desire for more bicyclist safety
- Safety concerns (wildlife)


Key Data Findings: State Highway 149: From US 160 north to US 50 west

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+), Disabled Population and <br> Low-income Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Nearly all of the corridor has shoulders less than 2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life - three segments <br> (around Lake City) |
| Bicycling <br> Economics <br> Pedestrian | High stress for bicycling <br> Main street through Lake City (DOLA designated Main <br> Street) |
| Resiliency | Low Redundancy <br> Crosses and parallels 100-year flood plain |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian (downtown)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Hinsdale County Demand Response Human Services Transportation | New Hinsdale County human services transportation. | 1127 |  | (n) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.75 |
| SH 149 from MP 70 to MP 92 north of Lake City | Rural road surface treatment | 51 | $3$ | (1) | $8$ | \$12.10 |
| SH 149 Demand Response | New limited local demand response service 2 days per week connecting with Hinsdale County. Primary service South Fork Creede. Possibly reduce service in winter and added service in summer. Operating cost of \$75,000 per year, requires 1 new cutaway at \$80,000 | 2055 | (-) | (x) 0 | (1) | \$1.55 |
| SH 149 Safety Improvements | SH 149 safety improvements from US 50 to the Town of Lake City | 2339 | (1) | (I) | 4 | \$100.00 |

## Project Types
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

## 0

- SH 149 from MP 70 to MP 92 north of Lake City


## Mobility

- New Hinsdale County Demand Response Human Services Transportation
- SH 149 Demand Response


## (!) Safety

- SH 149 Safety Improvements


State Highway 347: From US 50 to the Black Canyon (PGV7016)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 347: From US 50 to the Black Canyon

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 347 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility between US 50 and the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park. The communities along the corridor value transportation choices, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism and agriculture for economic activity in the area. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 comment:
- Desire for more bicyclist safety



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+), Disabled Population and <br> Low-income Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Nearly all corridor has shoulders less than 2' |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low Redundancy |
| Environment <br> Economics | Provides access to recreational area (Black Canyon <br> of the Gunnison National Park) |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 347: From US 50 to the Black Canyon

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficiencies$\Theta^{-}$Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this goal area | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


State Highway 348: Between Olathe and Delta (PGV7017)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 348: Between Olathe and Delta

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 348 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility between Olathe and Delta. The communities along the corridor value safety and system preservation. The local economy depends on agriculture and freight movement connections to the regional transportation network. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of freight and farm-to-market products in and through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments:
- Safety concerns (shoulders)


Key Data Findings: State Highway 348: Between Olathe and Delta

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+), Disabled Population, <br> Low-income Population, and Minority Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Nearly all corridor has shoulders less than 2' |
| Bicycle <br> Pedestrian <br> Economics | High stress for bicycling. Main street through Olathe |
| Resiliency | Low Redundancy. Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Freight <br> Economics | Agricultural corridor |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 348: Between Olathe and Delta

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian (downtown)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traffic signal SH 348 and Conf Drive (bypass) | - | 2428 | (1) 8 | (i) (I) | (1) | - |
| SH 348 Olathe | Rural road surface treatment | 2664 | (3) | (1) | 8 | \$0.80 |
| SH 348 West of Olathe | Rural road surface treatment | 2665 | 3 | (1) | 19 | \$1.77 |

## Project Types
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Project Based Strategies: State Highway 348: Between Olathe and Delta

## Asset Management

- SH 348 Olathe
- SH 348 West of Olathe



## Corridor Name

US Highway 550: Between Durango and Montrose

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 550 corridor is primarily to improve mobility as well as to maintain system quality and to increase safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides a direct connection between Montrose, Ridgway, Ouray, and Durango and also access to Telluride via SH 62/ SH 145. The communities along the corridor value transportation choices, connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. The local economy depends on tourism, agriculture, access to public lands, energy development, and freight movements along the corridor. Users of this corridor want to preserve the rural, mountain, and agricultural character of the area while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, and farm-tomarket products in and through the corridor. Important wildlife linkages exist for elk, deer, big horn sheep, and mountain lion along the corridor between Montrose and Ridgway. This corridor has been identified as the only route to local medical facilities, as well as a major commuter route. For both of these reasons there is a desire for greater transit service along the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R3-4)
- Scenic Byway - San Juan Skyway (Ridgway to San Juan County Line)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 93 comments:
- Desire for safer road (33 comments, center lane dangerous, passing Ianes, shoulders, guard rails, bike/ ped connectivity)
- Desire for better road conditions
- Desire for wildlife mitigation
- Desire for shoulders and passing lanes
- Desire for better bike/ ped connectivity
- Desire for more bus/ transit



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of: Aging Population (65+), Disabled Population, <br> Low-income, and Minority Population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate congestion South of Montrose to Colona <br> (2030, 2045). Moderate to High congestion on short <br> segment South of Montrose (2030, 2045) |
| Safety <br> Freight | Six segments of the corridor have shoulders less <br> than 2'. Three segments of the corridor have <br> elevated crash patterns (Pandora, Ouray and Colona) <br> (LOSS 3 or 4). Dense wildlife crashes |
| Asset <br> Management <br> Freight | Low drivability life - three segments (main segment <br> south of Ridgway) |
| Transit <br> Pedestrian | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor (Ridgway to <br> Montrose). Local transit operates on corridor |
| Bicycling <br> Pedestrian <br> Economics | High bicycle activity south of Ridgway. High stress <br> for bicycling. Main street through Montrose (DOLA <br> designated Main Street) and Ouray |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | High Criticality. Low Redundancy. Large avalanche <br> path area (Ouray to Southwest TPR) |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Montrose. Provides <br> access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Address unsafe passing conditionsAddress safety concernsAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, recreation, and tourist destinationsEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (avalanche)Mitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesProvide additional travel optionsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove bicycle accommodationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian (downtown)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT <br> Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on US 50 and US 550 | - | 1026 | (8) | $!$ | 18 | - |
| Essential Bus Service between Grand Junction and Telluride (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Grand Junction and Telluride. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1027 | (9) | (x) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.75 |
| New Regional Transit <br> Service between <br> Montrose and Telluride | New Montrose-Telluride general public fixed-route service via US 550, CO 62, and CO 145; 2 full size buses, 7 days/week, 4 trips/day; Potential stops include Montrose, Colona, Ridgway, Placerville and Telluride. | 1028 | (2) | (x) 0 |  | \$4.23 |
| New Regional Transit Service between Montrose and Placerville | Regional Transit Service from Montrose to Placerville 5 days/week, 8 trips/day | 1029 | () | (1) 4 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$4.20 |
| US 550 Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Montrose and Silverton | 1031 | (8) | - |  | \$30.00 |
| Montrose Park-n-Ride | Construct a Park-n-Ride in Montrose (SH 550) to replace the current IC and regional stop at the gas station; 120 spaces | 1128 | (-) | (n) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.45 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ridgway Park-n-Ride | Construct a Park-n-Ride in Ridgway | 1129 | (-) | (x) 0 | $\theta$ | \$0.20 |
| New Regional Ouray <br> County Combined <br> General Public/Human <br> Services <br> Transportation | New Ouray County combined general public/human services transportation; 7 days/week; 1 vehicle | 1130 | (-) | (x) 0 | 0 | \$2.19 |
| US 550 Montrose to Ouray County Line Safety Improvements | This project addresses deficiencies on US 550 between Montrose and Colona. Improvements include a new passing lane, turning lanes as county road intersections, wildlife fencing, new signing, and roadway striping. | 32 | (1) |  | (1) | \$17.00 |
| US 550: Ridgway to Ouray Shoulder Widening | Shoulder widening between Ridgway and Ouray. | 1132 | (1) |  | (1) | \$6.93 |

## Project Types
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 550: Shoulder Improvements, Deer Fencing and Animal Underpasses between Uncompahgre River and Colona (Billy Creek) | This project will improve three miles of the shoulders along US 550 between the Uncompahgre River and Colona at Billy Creek. An animal underpass will be constructed, as well as deer fencing and animal escape ramps. | 1133 | $!$ |  |  | \$30.57 |
| Pedestrian Safety | Montrose County - Pedestrian Detectors (intersection) | 1134 | $i$ | (1) |  | - |
| Lots of head on collisions | Ouray County - Forward Collision Warning (FCW) | 1135 | (1) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| US 550 and CR 24 <br> Intersection <br> Improvements | Widening and restripe for turn lane onto CR 24. ROW | 1471 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.33 |
| US 550 Pacochupuk South Roadway Mobility and Safety Improvements | Current Scope: Overlay, restriping access improvements, centerline rumble strips, existing shouldering. Minor widening, passing lanes, and wildlife improvements are funding dependent. Current Status: Design for shelf. May be combined with US550 Ouray to Ridgway Resurfacing. | 85 | (1) |  | ! 0 | \$8.40 |

## Project Types

## Project Benefits
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Corridor Projects: US Highway 550: Between Durango and Montrose

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 550 Otter Road to County Line | Add passing lanes | 1486 | D | $\Leftrightarrow(\square=!$ | (1) | \$6.00 |
| US 550 Red Mountain FLAP | Intersection, cribwall and parking improvements | 1487 | (8) 3 | $\text { (4) } 9)=1$ |  | \$4.10 |
| Silverton Truck Parking Area (Red Mountain Pass/Molas Pass) | Increase Truck Parking | 1488 | (-) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.18 |
| Multi-modal improvements to US550/62 Intersection | - | 1489 | ( 6 | (n) (I) $\rightarrow$ | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Completion of Uncompaghre Trail from Montrose to Ouray | - | 2426 | ( 160 | (4) (9) ! | (1) | \$16.00 |
| Overpass/underpass at CR 10 (multimodal) | - | 2431 | ( ${ }^{6}$ | (4) ! ! | 1 \% | \$2.00 |
| MP 97 Highway Widening | - | 2435 | (1) | $\text { (i) } B$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| Left turn lane at Mall Road | - | 2438 | (8) | (I) 1 | (1) | - |
| MP 106 to MP 114.5 near Billy Creek | Rural road surface treatment | 76 | 5 | (1) | 5 | \$6.50 |

## Project Types
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- US 550: Shoulder Improvements, Deer Fencing and Animal Underpasses between Uncompahgre River and Colona (Billy Creek)
- MP 106 to MP 114.5 near Billy Creek



## $\sigma$ <br> Asset Management

- See the Previous page


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements | Chain Station improvements to provide adequate lighting and space for trucks to pull over and for drivers to chain up safely including LED lighting, signing and striping, VMS signs, and paving as needed. | 1025 |  |  |  | \$4.50 |
| GVTPR Shoulder Impv | Shoulder Improvements on rural highways throughout the Gunnison Valley TPR | 1484 | (1) | (i) $60-1$ |  | \$13.60 |
| Region 5 Shoulder Study (GVTPR) | Region will hire independent consultant to identify the best location for limited shouldering funds. | 1490 | (1) |  | (1) | - |

## Project Types
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## P Asset Management

- See corridor projects
- GVTPR Shoulder Impv


## (4) Safety

- FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements
- Region 5 Shoulder Study (GVTPR)



## CDOT Region 3

## Counties:

Eagle, Garfield, Lake, Pitkin, Summit

- $/$ The vision for the Intermountain TPR is to be a region composed of physically distinct, unique, diverse communities interconnected by an integrated transit and multimodal transportation network that offers access and connectivity and promotes preservation of the unique character of each community through open-space buffering, while providing economic, cultural, environmental, and outdoor recreational benefits. \#I



## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Provide additional travel options
- Address environmental impacts
- Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
- Integrate technologies (EV, CNG, Hydrogen, ITS, Communication)
* Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback


## What We've Heard about the Intermountain TPR

- 2,179 public and stakeholder comments specifically about the IM TPR
- 306 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the Intermountain TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" public survey respondents in the IM TPR, combined with stakeholder input selected: Road Condition and Safety, Lack of Travel Options, Growth and Congestion
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the Intermountain TPR (in order of frequency) include: Safety, Road Condition, Bus service/ Transit, Congestion, Passenger Rail, Bike/Ped Connectivity, Pedestrian Access, Incident Management (weather, floods, rockslides), Trucking/ Freight


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics | 2015 Population: 165, 218 <br> 2045 Forecasted Population: 249, 347 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | 2015 J obs: 122,363 <br> 2045 Forecasted J obs: 179, 820 |
| Economics | Top Industries: Tourism and Outdoor Recreation, Health and <br> Wellness |
| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 5.2 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 9.5 Million |
| Asset <br> Management | 65 Miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 395 Miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 75 Miles of highway with low drivability life |

Interstate 70: I-70: Glenwood Springs to Eisenhower Tunnel


## Corridor Name

Interstate 70/ State Highway 6: I-70 Glenwood Springs to Eisenhower Tunnel

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the I-70 corridor between Glenwood Springs to the Eisenhower Tunnel is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal interstate facility connecting to places outside the region and making eastwest connections within the Colorado Rocky Mountains. In addition, it provides for hazardous materials transport and military defense for our country. The transportation system in the area serves towns, cities, and destinations within and beyond the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R3-7
- Tier 1 CNG, EV and Hydrogen Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 557 comments relating to the I-70/ SH6 corridor
- Pavement condition is poor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Desire for passenger rail
- Frustration with congestion
- Desire for transit improvements
- Concerns about safety
- Desire improvements for freight and truck movement
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Concerns for safety due to wildlife management
- Address environmental impacts (air quality)



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate congestion near Avon (2030, 2045) |
| Safety | Elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Freight <br> Safety | Several segments with shoulders <2'; Dense <br> wildlife crashes; Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | 12 bridges in poor condition |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity and high stress most of |


| Mobility Hub <br> Transit <br> Pedestrian | Bustang West Line operates on corridor - stops in <br> Eagle and Vail; Greyhound operates on corridor Eagle <br> County Transit; Vail Transit; Roaring Fork <br>  <br> Beaver Creek Transit operate near/ or on corridor |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Keystone |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy- Glenwood Springs to Gypsum, Avon <br> to SH 91; High criticality; Parallels 100-year <br> floodplain; Avalanche path near Vail and Frisco |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs along corridor <br> Provides access to recreational area <br> Eagle County Regional Airport |



| Corridor Needs |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Address bridges in poor condition <br> Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreation <br> ( Mitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wild life crashes) <br> © Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain, avalanche, rockfalls) <br> Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas) | Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles <br> Address environmental impacts (air quality) <br> Increase connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (airport) <br> Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations <br> Integrate technologies (EV, CNG, Hydrogen, ITS, Communication) <br> Eliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicycles <br> Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor |


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Craig and Frisco (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Craig and Frisco. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1032 | (-) | (n) $\rightarrow$ aill | $\theta$ | \$3.06 |
| Avon Transit Bus Shelters | Construct nine bus shelters | 1136 | (-) | (12) 0 | 5 | \$0.27 |
| Beaver Creek Boulevard Bus Pullouts | Construct and extend three bus pullouts on West Beaver Creek Boulevard | 1137 | (9) | (x) $\rightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.15 |
| Avon Transit Bus Pullouts | Construct five new bus pullouts to support two-way operations | 1138 | (-) | (1) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.25 |
| Avon Transit Regional Transportation Center Electric Charging | Install electric charging station at Avon Regional Transportation Center (24 Stations) | 1139 | (9) |  | $\theta$ | \$0.50 |
| Avon Transit Fleet Electrification | Convert nine diesel buses to electric buses | 1140 | (-) | (1) $\Rightarrow$ (ili) | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$7.20 |
| Eagle County Lake Creek Apartments Multi-use Transit Center | Improve the existing Lake Creek Apartments stop with a new shelter, restrooms, improved bus turnaround, electric charging infrastructure and meeting/multi-functional space | 1142 | (-) | (x) 0 | $\theta$ | \$7.00 |
| Gypsum Park-n-Ride | Parking lot, bus lane, and transit shelter | 1143 | (-) | (n) 4 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.70 |
| Vail Transportation Center Overhead Electric Charging Infrastructure | Install overhead electric charging infrastructure on the top deck of Vail Transportation Center to allow for electric bus operations. | 1144 | (-) |  | 0 | \$0.50 |

## Project Types

| (1) Safety | (1) Capacity |
| :---: | :---: |
| (-) Freight | (-) Transit |
| (8) Operations | Asset Management |
| 6.0 Bicycle | ( $\lambda$ Pedestrian |

Project Benefits
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-70 Truck Parking Information Management System (TPIMS) Pilot Implementation (MP 117.000134.000) | Implement TPIMS pilot program across four existing public truck parking facilities along I-70 east of Glenwood Springs, including installation of parking management infrastructure, connection to CDOT's TMC, and development of parking management algorithms. The parking management system will provide parking occupancy data for public dissemination through CDOT website and privately-developed apps via existing TMC channels. The four sites included in the pilot project are CDOT's No Name Rest Area (mm 119), CDOT's Grizzly Creek Rest Area (mm 121), CDOT's Bair Ranch Rest Area (mm 128), and CDOT's Dotsero Truck Parking Facility (mm 133). This segment of I-70 has existing ITS infrastructure to support the project, including fiber backbone along I-70 with connections to the Rest Areas. The Hanging Lake TMC is also located within the project limits, providing an existing local facility to monitor implementation and operations as needed. | 1163 | $6$ | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.20 |
| I-70 EJMT - Trailer snow removal system | Purchase and install a snow removal system designed to safely remove snow that has built up on the top of trailers. The benefits of this system are the reduction of vertical clearance challenges, the reductions of blowing or falling snow from the tops of trailers, and the improved fuel efficiency. We are looking to place one system in each direction. | 1164 | (-) | (1) | (1) | \$0.30 |
| Summit County <br> Transit and Operations Facility | Design of new transit and operations facility | 1165 | (-) | 2) (iil) | $\theta$ | \$0.50 |
| Cottonwood Pass -I-70 Bypass around Glenwood Canyon | Addition of Cottonwood Pass to the State Highway System with associated upgrades | 1886 | (1) | (i) 5 | * | \$15.00 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits



## SWP Goal Area



Corridor Projects: Interstate 70/ State Highway 6: I-70 Glenwood Springs to

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-70 Transportation Management Organization | - | 1887 | (8) | - | (1) | \$0.10 |
| I-70 Gypsum Interchange improvements | - | 1888 | (8) | (8) -2 | (1) 0 | \$4.40 |
| I-70 Interchange Modifications to West Vail Exit (MP 173) | - | 1889 | (3) | (8) -2 | (1) 边 | \$5.00 |
| US 6 Intersection Reconstruction- SH 13, Railroad Ave, Whitewater | - | 1890 | (1) (8) | (8) -2 | (1) 0 | \$2.50 |
| I-70 New Interchange west of Edwards | - | 1892 | (8) | (8) -2 | (1) 0 | \$4.00 |
| I-70 New Interchange east of Eagle | - | 1893 | (8) | (8) -2 | (1) 0 | \$4.00 |
| Transit Stations and Park-N-Rides for Ride Glenwood | - | 1894 | (\%) | (1) $\Rightarrow$ (iil | 0 | \$2.50 |
| Transit Center at Eagle County Airport | - | 1895 | (2) | (12) $\overbrace{0}$ | 0 | \$2.00 |
| I-70 Interchange Modifications to Avon Exit (MP 167) | - | 1896 | (1) (8) | (8) -2 | (1) E) | \$4.00 |
| Transit Service between Denver and Summit County | - | 1897 | (9) | (1) $\boldsymbol{H}_{6}$ (iil) | H0) | \$2.00 |
| I-70 F Ramp, Intersection, and Overpass Improvements | - | 1898 | (1) (8) | (8) (-2) | (1) 0 | \$2.36 |
| I-70 Advanced Guideway System MP 142 to MP 260 | - | 1899 | (1) (8) | - | (1) 0 | \$0.10 |
| Transportation Demand Management Program | - | 1900 | (8) | - | $\theta$ | \$2.00 |
| Dual Turn Lane, Northbound SH 9 to Eastbound I-70 | - | 1901 | (8) | (3) (-2) | (1) | \$0.80 |
| Vail Intermodal Site | - | 1903 | (2) | $\text { (11) } \Leftrightarrow 6$ | * | \$15.00 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits

(i) Economic Vitality
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { (1) Public Health } & \text { Quality of Life } \\ \text { (I) Tourism } & \text { Resilience } \\ \text { (d) Environmental } & \text { Dedestrian }\end{array}$


## SWP Goal Area



Corridor Projects: Interstate 70/ State Highway 6: I-70 Glenwood Springs to
.. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-70 Wrong Way Ramp Detection | - | 1904 | (1) | - | 4 | \$1.50 |
| Rolling/Phased Road Closures during Storms | Develop Implementation plan using VMS and other tools. | 1905 | (1) | (J) | (1) | - |
| I-70 Grooved Pavement Program on Vail Pass | - | 1906 | (1) | (-2) | (1) | \$1.40 |
| I-70 Incident Investigation Sites for Disabled Vehicles | - | 1907 | (1) | - | (1) \# | \$5.30 |
| I-70 Advanced Guideway System MP 142 to M 260 | - | 1908 | (1) 8 | - | (1) \% | \$5.60 |
| I-70 Highway Advisory, Radio, and Variable Message Signs in Vail Area | - | 1909 | (1) | (-2) | (1) | - |
| I-70 Improved Reflectorizing and Signing at Dowd, Vail Pass, Wolcott | - | 1910 | (1) | (-2) | (1) | - |
| I-70 Advanced Technology Roadway Delineation | - | 1911 | (1) | (-) | (1) | \$3.40 |
| I-70 Advanced Pavement Delineation, Lighting, Glare Screens | - | 1912 | (1) | (-2) | (1) | \$2.10 |
| I-70 Wolcott Area Curve Safety Modifications | - | 1913 | (1) | (-) | (1) 今 | \$18.00 |
| I-70 Construction of Snow Slide Mitigation in west Vail Pass Area | - | 1915 | (1) | (-) 0 | (1) | \$31.60 |
| I-70 Black Gore Creek Erosion Control on Vail Pass | - | 1916 | (1) | -\%) | (1) | \$20.00 |
| Sediment Control on Straight Creek | - | 1917 | (1) | (-) 0 | (1) | \$18.00 |
| I-70 near Copper Mountain | Install New Truck Parking | 1918 | (-) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.51 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits

(i.) Economic Vitality
(1) Public Health
(I) Tourism
(d) Environmental
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## SWP Goal Area



Corridor Projects: Interstate 70/ State Highway 6: I-70 Glenwood Springs to

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-70 Climbing/Descending Lanes over Vail Pass MP 181 to MP 195 | - | 1921 | (1) | (3) (-2) | (1) Et | \$270.00 |
| I-70 Climbing Lane between Avon and Post Blvd (Eastbound) | - | 1922 | (1) | (3) - | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$3.00 |
| Reconstruct US 6 Rifle to Silt | - | 1923 | 13 | (-2) | $4$ | \$5.00 |
| Vail Pass Trail along I-70 (repairs, drainage improvements) | - | 1926 | d 6 |  | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.30 |
| Glenwood Springs to South Canyon Trail | - | 1927 | $\cdots 6$ | (i) (i) $\Leftrightarrow 1$ | (1) 0 | \$2.00 |
| Trail from Two Rivers Park to No Name | - | 1928 | (1) 6 | (i) (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ ! | (1) $\Rightarrow$ | \$4.00 |
| Town of Vail Missing Trail Links - Gore Valley Regional Trail System | - | 1929 | (1) 60 | (1) (3) $\Leftrightarrow$ c ! | (1) \# | \$1.80 |
| Gypsum to Dotsero Segment - Eagle Valley Regional Trail System | - | 1930 | (1) 60 | (i) (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ \% | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.00 |
| Minturn to Red Cliff Segment - Eagle Valley Regional Trail System | - | 1931 | ( 6 | (12) (1) $\overbrace{0}$ (1) | (1) | \$1.70 |
| Dowd Junction to Minturn Segment, Eagle Valley Regional Trail System | - | 1932 | ( 60 | (i) (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ ! | (1) 0 | \$1.20 |
| Eagle to Gypsum, Eagle Valley Regional Trail System | - | 1933 | $\cdots 6$ | (12) (1) ! | (1) 0 | \$3.00 |
| Buffalo Ridge Pedestrian Overpass | - | 1934 | (1) 6 | (14) (1) $\Leftrightarrow 1$ | (1) E | \$1.50 |
| Main Vail Underpass Pedestrian Improvements | - | 1935 | ( 60 |  | (1) E | \$1.30 |

## Project Types

| 10 | Safety | Capacity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Freight | Transit |  |
| Operations | Asset |  |
| Management |  |  |
| Bicycle | Pedestrian |  |

## Project Benefits

(i) Economic Vitality
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { (1) Public Health } & \text { Quality of Life } \\ \text { II } & \text { Tourism } \\ \text { (1) Environmental } & \text { Resilience } \\ \text { (I) Pedestrian }\end{array}$



SWP Goal Area

Corridor Projects: Interstate 70/ State Highway 6: I-70 Glenwood Springs to
........................................................

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cascade Pedestrian Overpass | - | 1936 | ( ${ }^{6} 6$ | (1) (i) $\overbrace{0}$ ! | (1) 0 | \$4.00 |
| Vail Frontage Roads (geometric, bike/ped improvements) | - | 1937 | ( ${ }^{1} 6$ | (1) (I) $\rightarrow$ ! | (1) 0 | \$25.00 |
| I-70 Airport Interchange and Intermodal Connector |  | 1938 | (8) (1) | (\%) | (1) \# | \$60.00 |
| Construct Pedestrian and Bicycle facilities over I-70 at Devereaux Road | - | 1939 | N 1 | (i) (1) $\overbrace{0}$ ! | (1) 0 | \$0.86 |
| I-70 Cut Slope Revegetation | - | 1940 | (1) | (2) | (1) | \$0.42 |
| I-70 Mobile Emissions Testing Stations | - | 1941 | (1) | (-2) | (1) | \$1.10 |
| I-70 Remote Roadway Condition Testing System | - | 1942 | (1) | (2) | (1) E0 | - |
| I-70 Remote Video Surveillance on Vail Pass | - | 1943 | (1) | (2) | (1) 0 | \$3.40 |
| I-70 ITS Training Program | - | 1944 | (1) | (-2) | (1) 0 | \$0.03 |
| I-70 Automated Fare Collection/ITS Technologies | - | 1945 | (\%) | (4) © | -20 | \$0.65 |
| I-70 and SH 6 High Capacity Data Transmission Link | - | 1946 | (8) | (-) | (1) 0 | \$1.20 |
| I-70 Call Box System | - | 1948 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.21 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




SWP Goal Area
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Corridor Projects: Interstate 70/ State Highway 6: I-70 Glenwood Springs to

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vail Noise Barriers | - | 1949 | (1) | - | (1) | \$45.00 |
| I-70 Noise Wall, MP 201 to MP 203 | - | 1950 | (1) | - | (1) | - |
| Copper Mountain Noise Wall | - | 1951 | (1) | - | 4 | \$2.00 |
| I-70 West: Dowd Canyon safety and capacity improvements | I-70 Dowd Canyon mainline safety improvements | 1952 | (1) | (8) -3) | 1) | - |
| Entrance to Aspen - Cut and Cover Tunnel | - | 1953 | (1) | (8) $\%$ | (1) | \$53.10 |
| I-70 Interchange Modifications, Gypsum Exit (MP 140) | - | 2386 | (8) | (8) -3) | (1) | \$2.00 |
| Increase Bustang frequency Summit, Eagle and Garfield counties | Consistent frequency throughout day to connect transit agencies | 2446 | (-) | (1) $\Rightarrow$ | $\theta$ | - |
| Parachute to Glenwood Springs Regional | - | 2447 | (-) | (1) $\rightarrow$ (in) | $\theta$ | - |
| Essential Bus Service between Craig and Vail (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Craig and Vail. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1033 | (-) | (-1) * | ® | \$2.66 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits


Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-70 Advanced Guideway | Advanced Guideway System along a 144-mile corridor from Glenwood Springs to Jefferson County in the Denver Metro Area. Planning Project IDentified as the preferred transit alternative in the I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS finalized in March 2011. | 2704 | (9) |  |  | - |
| I-70 West Vail Pass Safety Improvements - Phase 1 | This project will make improvements to improve the safety and traffic operations of West Vail Pass by reducing crashes and improving freight mobility through this critical corridor. Improvements include the addition of 5 miles of auxiliary lane in the Eastbound direction, curve reconstructions, shoulder widening, median glare screen, wildlife fencing and underpasses, variable speed limit signs and other signage comprising an Active Traffic Management system, and reconstruction of an emergency truck ramp. | 42 | (1) |  | (1) | \$140.00 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits





Mobilit
Management
Freight
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## 0 <br> Asset Management

- I-70: Glenwood Canyon Critical Asset Repair


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Craig and Frisco (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Avon Transit Bus Shelters
- Beaver Creek Boulevard Bus Pullouts
- Avon Transit Bus Pullouts
- Avon Transit Regional Transportation Center Electric Charging
- Avon Transit Fleet Electrification


## ! Safety

- I-70 West: Exit 203 Interchange Improvements
- I-70 Auxiliary Lane East Frisco to Silverthorne
- West of Eisenhower Tunnel - Speed harmonization, Dynamic lane assign, Tire checkpoint
I-70 EJMT - Trailer snow removal system



## 0 <br> Asset Management

- I-70 Glenwood Canyon Critical Asset Repair Phase 2


## Mobility

- Eagle County Lake Creek Apartments Multi-use Transit Center
- Gypsum Park-n-Ride
- Vail Transportation Center Overhead Electric Charging Infrastructure
- Multimodal Facility Near Dowd Junction Interchange
- Vail Transit Bus Electrification


## (1) Safety

- I-70 Transportation Management Organization
- I-70 Gypsum Interchange improvements
- I-70 Interchange Modifications to West Vail Exit (MP 173)
- US 6 Intersection Reconstruction- SH 13, Railroad Ave, Whitewater
- I-70 New Interchange west of Edwards



## 0 <br> Asset Management

- I-70 West: Dowd Canyon Interchange


## $\pi$ <br> Mobility

- Glenwood Springs Electric Buses and Charging Infrastructure - Hanging Lake Service
- Vail Transit Electric Bus Charging Infrastructure
- Eagle County Interchange Park-nRides/Transit Center Improvements
- Eagle County Electrification of Bus Fleets


## (1) Safety

- I-70 New Interchange east of Eagle
- I-70 Interchange Modifications to Avon Exit (MP 167)
- I-70 F Ramp, Intersection, and Overpass Improvements
- I-70 Advanced Guideway System MP 142 to MP 260
- I-70 Wrong Way Ramp Detection



## (P) Asset Management

- See the previous page


## $\because$ <br> Mobility

- Dowd Junction to Minturn Segment, Eagle Valley Regional Trail System
- Eagle to Gypsum, Eagle Valley Regional Trail System
- Vail Frontage Roads (geometric, bike/ped improvements)
- I-70 Remote Roadway Condition Testing System


## ! Safety

- Main Vail Underpass Pedestrian Improvements
- Cascade Pedestrian Overpass
- I-70 Airport Interchange and Intermodal Connector
- Construct Pedestrian and Bicycle facilities over I-70 at Devereaux Road
- I-70 Cut Slope Revegetation



## (1) Asset Management

- I-70 West: Silverthorne Interchange


## 

- I-70 Eagle \& Summit County Truck Parking Feasibility Study
- I-70 Truck Parking Information Management System (TPIMS) Pilot Implementation (MP 117.000-134.000)
- Summit County Transit and Operations Facility
- Transit Center at Eagle County Airport


## (1) Safety

- Dual Turn Lane, Northbound SH 9 to Eastbound I-70
- Rolling/Phased Road Closures during Storms
- I-70 Grooved Pavement Program on Vail Pass
- I-70 Incident Investigation Sites for Disabled Vehicles



## 3 <br> Asset Management

- I-70 West Vail Pass Auxiliary Lanes, NHPP 0701-240


## Mobility

- Cottonwood Pass - I-70 Bypass around Glenwood Canyon
- Transit Stations and Park-N-Rides for Ride Glenwood
- Transit Service between Denver and Summit County
- Transportation Demand Management Program


## (1) Safety

- I-70 Advanced Guideway System MP 142 to M 260
- I-70 Highway Advisory, Radio, and Variable Message Signs in Vail Area
- I-70 Improved Reflectorizing and Signing at Dowd, Vail Pass, Wolcott
- I-70 Advanced Technology Roadway Delineation



## $(9$ <br> Asset Management

- See the previous page


## Mobility

- I-70 Climbing Lane between Avon and Post Blvd (Eastbound)
- Glenwood Springs to South Canyon Trail
- Trail from Two Rivers Park to No Name
- Town of Vail Missing Trail Links - Gore Valley Regional Trail System
- Gypsum to Dotsero Segment - Eagle Valley Regional Trail System


## ! Safety

- Sediment Control on Straight Creek
- I-70 Climbing/Descending Lanes over Vail Pass MP 181 to MP 195
- Vail Pass Trail along I-70 (repairs, drainage improvements)
- Minturn to Red Cliff Segment - Eagle Valley Regional Trail System
- Buffalo Ridge Pedestrian Overpass



## (9) Asset Management

- Reconstruct US 6 Rifle to Silt


## $\Rightarrow$ Mobility

- Vail Intermodal Site
- I-70 near Copper Mountain
- I-70 Automated Fare Collection/ITS Technologies
- Increase Bustang frequency Summit, Eagle and Garfield counties
- Parachute to Glenwood Springs Regional


## ! Safety

- I-70 Advanced Pavement Delineation, Lighting, Glare Screens
- I-70 Wolcott Area Curve Safety Modifications
- I-70 Construction of Snow Slide Mitigation in west Vail Pass Area
- I-70 Black Gore Creek Erosion Control on Vail Pass



## $(9$ <br> Asset Management

- See the previous page


## Mobility

- I-70 Remote Video Surveillance on Vail Pass
- I-70 and SH 6 High Capacity Data Transmission Link
- Entrance to Aspen - Cut and Cover Tunnel
- I-70 Interchange Modifications, Gypsum Exit (MP 140)


## ! Safety

- I-70 Mobile Emissions Testing Stations
- I-70 ITS Training Program
- I-70 Call Box System
- Vail Noise Barriers
- I-70 Noise Wall, MP 201 to MP 203
- Copper Mountain Noise Wall
- I-70 Dowd Canyon Realignment
- I-70 West Vail Pass Safety Improvements-Phase 1

State Highway 6F: Loveland Pass - from I-70/ Loveland Pass to


## Corridor Name

State Highway 6: Loveland Pass I-70/ Loveland Pass to Silverthorne Interchange

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 6F corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal interstate facility making east-west connections within the Colorado Rocky Mountains and providing redundancy to I-70. The transportation system in the area serves towns, cities, and destinations within and beyond the corridor.

Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 169 comments relating to the I-70/ SH6 corridor
- Frustration with congestion
- Concerns about safety
- Concerns for safety due to wildlife management
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for transit improvements
- Pavement condition is poor
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Address environmental impacts (air quality)
- Desire for passenger rail


|  | Key Data FindingS: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Two segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |  | Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity-adjacent to corridor <br> High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Safety | Several segments with shoulders < ' ; Dense <br> wildlife crashes; Hazmat route | Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Keystone |  |



## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Mitigate risk associated with natural disastersImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand
destinations, and recreation

Corridor Projects: State Highway 6: Loveland Pass I-70/ Loveland Pass to

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 6 Widening, Dillon Dam Road to Lake Dillon Drive | - | 1954 | (1) | (6) 1 | (1) | \$4.60 |
| US 6 Loveland Pass MP 218-228 | Safety and Shoulder improvements | 2387 | (1) | (3) 60 | (1) 0 | \$40.00 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight


## 0 <br> Asset <br> Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## (1) Safety

- US 6 Widening, Dillon Dam Road to Lake Dillon Drive

State Highway 6E: Eagle to Minturn/ SH 24 (SH 6E MM 149. 718 to SH 6
MM 174.541) (PIM7001C)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 6: Eagle to Minturn/ SH 24

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 6E corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal interstate facility making east-west connections within the Colorado Rocky Mountains and providing redundancy to I-70. The transportation system in the area serves towns, cities, and destinations within and beyond the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- 169 comments relating to the I-70/ SH6 corridor
- Frustration with congestion
- Concerns about safety
- Concerns for safety due to wildlife management
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for transit improvements
- Pavement condition is poor
- Frustration or concerns about truck/ freight
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Address environmental impacts (air quality)
- Desire for passenger rail



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of $65+$ population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Several segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Safety | Several segments with shoulders $<2^{\prime} ;$ <br> Dense wildlife crashes; Hazmat route |
| Asset <br> Management | Two bridges in poor condition in Gypsum and <br> east of Eagle |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity-adjacent to corridor <br> High stress for bicycling |


| Mobility Hub <br> Transit <br> Pedestrian | Regional bus route operates on corridor-stops in <br> Gypsum, Avon, Edwards, Eagle, Vail <br> Local transit stops in Avon and Vail |
| :--- | :--- |
| Eagle County Transit operates on corridor <br> Vail Transit operates on corridor <br> Avon/ Beaver Creek Transit operates on corridor |  |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main street through Edwards |
| Resiliency | Parallels 100-year floodplain |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Eagle, Avon and Vail <br> Provides access to recreational area <br> Eagle County Regional Airport |



| Corridor Needs |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations <br> © Eliminate shoulder deficiencies <br> © Mitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes) <br> $\triangle$ Address bridge in poor condition <br> $\triangle$ Improve bicycle accommodation | Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreation <br> Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles <br> Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas) <br> Increase connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (airport) |


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eagle County US 6 Bus Rapid Transit | Improving Highway 6 to include raised platforms and protected travel lanes. Installing electric buses charging infrastructure and purchasing additional electric buses | 1141 | (9) | (x) 5 | $\theta$ | \$88.40 |
| SH 6 Eagle River Bridge and Connecting Road to County Fairgrounds | - | 1955 | (3) | - |  | \$2.80 |
| SH 6 Eagle River Bridge east of Eagle (bridge repl., bike/ped improvements) | - | 1956 | ( 6.6 | (x) 0 | (1) | \$1.50 |
| SH 6 Wolcott to Squaw Creek Road Improvements | - | 1961 | (1) | - | (1) | \$3.00 |
| SH 6 Avon Road to Eagle Road Improvements | - | 1962 | (1) | - | (1) | \$10.71 |
| SH 6 Lake Creek Road to Avon Road Improvements | - | 1963 | (1) | - | (1) | \$36.50 |
| SH 6 Eagle Road to Dowd Junction Improvements | - | 1964 | (1) 8 | - | (1) | \$11.42 |
| SH 6 Squaw Creek Road To Lake Creek Road Improvements | - | 1965 | (1) | - | ! | \$10.80 |
| SH 6 Eagle County Airport to Eagle Improvements | - | 1966 | (1) | (1) | (\%) | \$5.10 |
| SH 6 Gypsum to Eagle County Airport Improvements | - | 1967 | (1) 8 | (1) | (1) | \$7.51 |

Project Types

| (1) Safety | Capacity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Freight | Transit |
| Operations | Asset |
| Management |  |
| Bicycle | Pedestrian |

## Project Benefits




SWP Goal Area

Corridor Projects: State Highway 6: Eagle to Minturn/ SH 24 (PIM7001C)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 6 E Eagle to Minturn | Safety and Shoulder improvement | 2388 | (1) | (8) 60 -6 | (1) | \$75.00 |
| Highway 6 Frequency Increase | Improve the frequency of the Highway 6 route to a minimum of 30 minute frequency throughout the day, year round. | 2480 | (-) | (r) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$7.50 |
| Avon Park and Ride | Design and construction of West Beaver Creek Blvd Park and Ride | 2545 | (-) | (n) | $\theta$ | \$1.00 |
| Avon Park and Ride | Design and construction of Lake Creek and Benchmark Road Park and Ride | 2692 | (-) | (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$0.75 |
| Avon Park and Ride | Design and construction of East Beaver Creek Blvd Park and Ride | 2693 | (9) | (12) $\Rightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$0.75 |

## Project Types

## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management


- SH 6 Eagle River Bridge and Connecting Road to County Fairgrounds


## Mobility

- Eagle County US 6 Bus Rapid Transit
- SH 6 Wolcott to Squaw Creek Road Improvements
- SH 6 Avon Road to Eagle Road Improvements
- SH 6 Lake Creek Road to Avon Road Improvements
(1) Safety
- SH 6 Eagle River Bridge east of Eagle (bridge repl., bike/ped improvements)
- SH 6 Eagle Road to Dowd Junction Improvements

- See the previous page


## Mobility

- Highway 6 Frequency Increase
- Avon Park and Ride
- Avon Park and Ride
- Avon Park and Ride
- SH 6 Eagle County Airport to Eagle Improvements
- SH 6 Gypsum to Eagle County Airport Improvements
(1) Safety
- SH 6 Squaw Creek Road To Lake Creek Road Improvements
- US 6 E Eagle to Minturn

Glenwood Springs (PIM7002)


## Corridor Name

Interstate 70 (West of Glenwood Springs): I-70A: DeBeque to Glenwood Springs

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the I-70 corridor west of Glenwood Springs is primarily to increase mobility as well as to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal Interstate facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the Colorado River Valley and the Colorado Rocky Mountains. In addition, it provides for hazardous materials transport and military defense for our country. The transportation system in the area primarily serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor as well as destinations outside of the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 1 CNG, EV and Hydrogen Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 80 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for regional transit
- Need for truck/ freight rest stops
- Integrate technologies (EV, CNG, Hydrogen, ITS, Communications)


Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of disabled population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Two segments of elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders < ' <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset Management | Three bridges in poor condition |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling-adjacent to corridor |

\(\left.\left.$$
\begin{array}{l|l}\begin{array}{l}\text { Mobility Hub } \\
\text { Transit } \\
\text { Pedestrian }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Bustang West Line operates on corridor-stops in } \\
\text { Glenwood springs, Rifle, and Parachute } \\
\text { Greyhound operates on corridor }\end{array} \\
\text { Amtrak route operates on corridor } \\
\text { Roaring Fork Transportation Authority operates } \\
\text { on corridor }\end{array}
$$\right] \begin{array}{ll}High criticality <br>

Parallels 100-year floodplain near Silt\end{array}\right]\)| Resiliency | Concentration of jobs in Glenwood Springs, New <br> Cconomics |
| :--- | :--- |
| Castle, Silt, Rifle, and Parachute <br> Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Provides access to recreational area (BLM) |  |




| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential bus service between Glenwood Springs and Grand Junction (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Glenwood Springs and Grand Junction. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1040 | (2) | (n) $\theta$ (iir | $\theta$ | \$2.20 |
| New Local Fixed-Route Circulator Transit Service between Parachute and Rifle | Implement new circulator bus service from Parachute to Rifle | 1167 | (2) | (4) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iir | 5 | \$1.10 |
| New Castle Autonomous Circulator Bus | - | 1168 | (9) | (12) 0 | 0 | \$0.50 |
| New Castle Park-n-Ride Expansion | New surface parking or structured parking on existing Park-n-Ride | 1169 | (9) | (1) $\rightarrow$ (iil | $\theta$ | \$1.52 |
| Silt, Rifle, and Parachute Park-n-Ride Improvements | New construction, improvements, and expansions to Park-n-Rides in Silt, Rifle and Parachute | 1170 | (9) | (12) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iil | $\theta$ | \$2.70 |
| I-70: Garfield County Interchange Improvements (New Castle) | Upgrade of current 4-way stop at the intersection of I-70 Spur/US 6 with a roundabout concluded to be necessary from a recently completed corridor study for I-70. | 1171 | (1) | $\theta$ | (1) | \$15.00 |
| I-70: Garfield County Interchange Improvements (Silt) | Upgrade of current 4-way stop with a roundabout concluded to be necessary from a recently completed corridor study for I-70 in accordance with recent corridor study guidance. | 1172 | (1) (8) | - | (1) | \$54.00 |
| I-70: Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Glenwood Springs and the Utah border | 1173 | (3) | -2 | (1) | \$47.00 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits



Mobility Option
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (ln millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-70 Wrong Way Ramp Detection | - | 1904 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Rolling/Phased Road Closures during Storms | Develop Implementation plan using VMS and other tools. | 1905 | (1) | (3) | (1) \# | \$0.00 |
| Upgrade I-70 Pedestrian Overpass At MP 74 | - | 1968 | * 60 | $(1) \theta$ | (1) 0 | \$0.60 |
| Colorado River Pedestrian Bridge at Elk Creek | - | 1969 | $\cdots 6$ | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | (1) \# | \$1.20 |
| Bike Trail along US 6 in New Castle | - | 1970 | * 60 | (1) $\theta$ ctic | (1) 0 | \$2.50 |
| Regional Pedestrian and Bikeways in Parachute | - | 1971 | (1) 60 | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (1) | (1) 0 | \$2.30 |
| Consider additional truck parking across from existing location | - | 1973 | (2) | - | 0 | \$0.59 |
| I-70 in New Castle, CO | Increase Truck Parking | 1974 | (2) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.48 |
| I-70 in Silt, CO | Increase Truck Parking | 1975 | (2) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.48 |
| I-70 Rifle Rest Area | Increase Truck Parking | 1976 | (-) | - | 5 | \$0.25 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits


## SWP Goal Area



| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (ln millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-70: Garfield County Interchange Improvements (New Castle) | Upgrade of current 4-way stop at the intersection of I-70 Spur/US 6 with a roundabout concluded to be necessary from a recently completed corridor study for I-70. | 1977 | (8) (1) | - | (1) | \$30.00 |
| Parachute E/W MP 68 to MP 86.5 (I-70 Reconstruction) | - | 1978 | (9) | (3) -1 |  | \$48.00 |
| Reconstruct I-70 Interchange at MP <br> 87 (West Rifle) | - | 1979 | (3) | (3) - 1 | $9$ | \$15.00 |
| New I-70 Interchange at MP 101.5 | - | 1980 | (8) | (8) 2 | (1) 包 | \$10.10 |
| New I-70 Interchange at MP 72 | - | 1981 | (3) | (8) -2 | (1) 0 | \$29.60 |
| Upgrade I-70 Interchange at MP 75 | - | 1982 | (8) | (3) (-2) | (1) | \$18.90 |
| Roundabouts at I-70 Interchange Ramps MP 90 | - | 1983 | (1) | (8) -2 | (1) 0 | \$1.50 |
| US 6 Improvements in Parachute | - | 1985 | (1) ${ }^{8}$ | (3) $)^{2}$ | (1) E0) | \$2.40 |
| I-70 Underpass at MP 74 | - | 1986 | (1) | 610 | (1) E | \$7.30 |
| I-70 to US 6 Connection at MP 94 | - | 1987 | (8) | (3) 2 | $\theta$ | \$25.00 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




[^9]
## SWP Goal Area



| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reconstruct I-70/US 6/SH 82 Intersection | - | 1988 | (1) | (8) -2 |  | \$5.00 |
| New I-70 Overpass at MP 104 |  | 1989 | (1) (8) | (8) - | (1) E | \$8.70 |
| US 6 Improvements in New Castle | - | 1990 | (1) (8) | (3) -2 | (1) | \$6.00 |
| US 6/Cooley Mesa Drive Traffic Signal | - | 1991 | (1) ${ }^{3}$ | (3) -2 | (1) E | \$0.16 |
| Landscaping/Noise Barrier along I70 in Parachute | - | 1993 | (1) | (iii) | (1) | \$3.50 |
| Glenwood West I-70 MP 110 to MP 119 |  | 1994 | (1) |  | (1) 0 | \$28.00 |
| Essential Bus Service between Craig and Grand Junction (Proposed Outrider Service) | Essential Regional Bus Service from Craig to <br> Grand Junction; one roundtrip/day 365 <br> days/year. Two vehicles at $\$ 425,000$ each | 2125 | (2) | (4) $\sim_{0}$ (iin | 5 | \$3.16 |
| Increase Bustang frequency Summit, Eagle and Garfield counties | Consistent frequency throughout day to connect transit agencies | 2446 | (2) | (12) $\sim_{0}$ | $\theta$ | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobs Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



## 3 <br> Asset Management

- Parachute E/W MP 68 to MP 86.5 (I-70 Reconstruction)


## Mobility

- Essential bus service between Glenwood Springs and Grand Junction
- New Local Fixed-Route Circulator Transit Service between Parachute and Rifle
- New Castle Autonomous Circulator Bus
- New Castle Park-n-Ride Expansion
- Silt, Rifle, and Parachute Park-n-Ride Improvements
Bike Trail along US 6 in New Castle


## (!) Safety

- I-70: Garfield County Interchange Improvements (New Castle)
- I-70: Garfield County Interchange Improvements (Silt)
- I-70: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure
- I-70 Wrong Way Ramp Detection



## 3 <br> Asset Management

- Reconstruct I-70 Interchange at MP 87 (West Rifle)


## Mobility

- Consider additional truck parking across from existing location
- I-70 in New Castle, CO
- I-70 in Silt, CO
- I-70 Rifle Rest Area
- I-70 to US 6 Connection at MP 94
- I-70 Underpass at MP 74
- US 6 Improvements in Parachute


## (!) Safety

- Rolling/Phased Road Closures during Storms
- Upgrade I-70 Pedestrian Overpass At MP 74
- Colorado River Pedestrian Bridge at Elk Creek
- Regional Pedestrian and Bikeways in Parachute


- Reconstruct I-70/US 6/SH 82 Intersection

- I-70: Garfield County Interchange Improvements (New Castle)
- Roundabouts at I-70 Interchange Ramps MP 90
- Essential Bus Service between Craig and Grand Junction
- Increase Bustang frequency Summit, Eagle and Garfield counties


## ! Safety

- New I-70 Overpass at MP 104
- US 6 Improvements in New Castle
- US 6/Cooley Mesa Drive Traffic Signal
- Glenwood West I-70 MP 110 to MP 119
- New I-70 Interchange at MP 101.5
- New I-70 Interchange at MP 72
- Upgrade I-70 Interchange at MP 75
- Landscaping/Noise Barrier along I-70 in Parachute

State Highway 9: Fairplay to Breckenridge (PIM7003)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 9: Fairplay to Breckenridge

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 9 corridor south of Breckenridge is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility connecting to places outside the region and making northsouth connections within the Upper Blue River Valley. The transportation system serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor as well as destinations outside the corridor

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 34 comments specifically about this corridor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for transit improvements

Key Data Findings: State Highway 9: Fairplay to Breckenridge (PIM7003)

## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate congestion (2030) <br> High congestion (2045) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Several segments with shoulders < ' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one segment south of <br> Breckenridge) |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Inter-city bus station in Fairplay <br> Regional bus route operates on corridor- stop in <br> Breckenridge <br> Summit Stage and Breckenridge Free Ride operate on <br> corridor |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> High criticality <br> Parallels 100-year floodplain |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Breckenridge <br> Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wild life crashes)Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Improve bicycle accommodations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 9: Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Fairplay and Breckenridge | 1002 | (8) | (1) | (1) | \$19.00 |
| Acquisition and Improvements of Fairplay Bus Barn | Acquisition and improvement CDOT owned property 850 Hathaway. Partnership with Park County, CDOT Region 2, Bustang Outrider. | 1175 | (-) | (1) | $\theta$ | \$2.00 |
| SH 9 Park-n-Ride (at County Road 1) | Acquisition and paving CDOT owned parcel at Hwy 9 and CR1. Partnership with Park County, CDOT Region 2, Bustang Outrider. | 1176 | (-) | (n) $\rightarrow$ (in) | $\theta$ | \$3.30 |
| Essential Bus Service between Fairplay and Breckenridge (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Fairplay and Durango. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1177 | (-) | (-1) $\Rightarrow$ |  | \$1.18 |
| SH 9 (North of Hoosier Pass) | Chain up station for CMV's heading south over Hoosier Pass | 1178 | (-) | (9) $!$ | 13 | \$5.00 |
| SH 9 South (improve to CDOT standards, Breckenridge to top of Hoosier Pass) | - | 1995 | (3) | (1) |  | \$24.00 |
| SH 9 South Shoulder Improvements | Improve to CDOT standards, Breckenridge to top of Hoosier Pass | 2389 | (1) | - | (1) 9 | \$50.00 |
| Local circulation expansion of Breckenridge/Summit County | Expansion of Breckenridge/summit county | 2448 | (-) | (x) | 5 | - |

## Project Types



Project Benefits





Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Beneffits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S. Park and Main intersection and Ped improvement | - | 2451 | $\cdots$ (1) | (t) -2 | (1) E0) | \$10.00 |
| Rec Path Blue river to Hoosier | - | 2452 | N 60 | (12) 0 | (1) \# | - |
| Free Ride Mobility Project (Breckenridge First-Last Mile) | Breckenridge would like to study the locations and resources needed to improve the last mile options for the Town. This would include electric bike docking stations at the Breck Transit Station and certain parking lots within Town | 2477 | 63. | (10) (I) $\Leftrightarrow$ <br> (iii) | (1) 0 | \$0.15 |
| Free Ride Transit Wayfinding Update | Breckenridge would like to update all maps, bus stop signs, shelter signs and transit wayfinding to improve legibility of transit service information | 2478 | (2) | (i) 5 | 5 | \$0.50 |
| Free Ride Service Expansion | In the next 10 years the Town would look to offer more services during peak hours of the day and peak days to help reduce the amount of cars driving around town. This would include late night service as well to help with the employee population. This would be a $20 \%$ increase in services. | 2479 | (9) | (12) 0 | $\theta$ | \$23.50 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits




Mobility
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## o <br> Asset Management

- SH 9 (North of Hoosier Pass)
- SH 9 South (improve to CDOT standards, Breckenridge to top of Hoosier Pass)
- SH 9 South Shoulder Improvements


State Highway 9: Breckenridge to I-70 at Frisco (PIM7004)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 9: Breckenridge to I-70 at Frisco

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, connecting to places outside the region and making northsouth connections within the Upper Blue River Valley

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 107 comments specifically about this corridor
- Frustration with congestion
- Desire for transit improvements
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Pavement condition is poor
- Need for truck/ freight rest stops

The Vision for the SH 9 corridor from Breckenridge to Frisco is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality

## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | One segment moderate congestion (2030) <br> One segment high congestion (2030) <br> High congestion (2045) |
| :---: | :--- |
| Safety | Several segments with shoulders <2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Mobility Hub <br> Transit <br> Pedestrian | Regional bus route operates on corridor <br> Inter-City bus station in Frisco <br> Breckenridge Transit Free Ride operates on corridor <br> Summit Stage transit operates on corridor |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> High criticality <br> Parallels 100-year floodplain |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Breckenridge and Frisco <br> Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wild life crashes)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)


| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost (In |  |  |  |  |  |
| millions) |  |  |  |  |  |$|$

Project Types


Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New SH 9 South Bus Pullouts | Specific plans will be identified in the CDOT Hwy 9 South Access Control Plan, 2018. Shoulder paving, signage and shelter construction in the Blue River area | 1194 | (9) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.50 |
| Terminal Charging at Frisco Transportation Center | - | 1195 | (-) | (x) $x^{3}$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$12.00 |
| SH 9: Frisco North | Completion of corridor including minimal widening, water quality and drainage improvements, and improvements to two intersections including the potential for the replacement of a signal with a roundabout. | 1196 | (1) 8 | $\text { (3) } 3$ | - | \$13.82 |
| Town of Breckenridge Intermodal Center and Park-N-Ride, Phase II | - | 1902 | (-) | (4) $\rightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$10.00 |
| SH 9 Iron Springs to Main Street | This is the final segment of a larger project that began in 2004 to widen SH 9 from Frisco to Breckenridge to four lanes. This project constructs two roundabouts, signal improvements, and new pedestrian connections, including an underpass. | 36 |  | $\text { (B) } 90$ |  | \$18.00 |

## Project Types

Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## o <br> Asset Management

- Tiger Dredge Parking Structure


## Mobility

- New Inter-regional Transit Service between Summit County and Colorado Springs
- Breckenridge Gondola Lots Parking/Transit Station
- Breckenridge Charging Infrastructure in Bus Storage Facilities
- Breckenridge Parking Feasibility Study for Ice Rink
- Breckenridge Technology and Capital Improvements
- Breckenridge New Shuttles for Upper Warriors Mark Service
- Breckenridge Replacement of 15 Diesel Buses with Electric
- Breckenridge Fleet Maintenance and Public Works Administration Building Expansion



## o <br> Asset Management

- See the previous page.


## Mobility

- Breckenridge Bus Storage Facility
- Breckenridge McCain Parking/Transit Station
- Breckenridge Ice Rink Lot Parking/Transit Station
- Breckenridge Bus Shelters
- Frisco Transit Center - Phases 2-6
- New Summit County Transit Operations Center
- Terminal charging at Summit County Transit Operations Facility
- New SH 9 South Bus Pullouts
- Terminal Charging at Frisco Transportation Center
- Town of Breckenridge Intermodal Center and Park-N-Ride, Phase II


State Highway 9: North of I-70 to Kremmling (PIM7005)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 9: North of I-70 to Kremmling

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 9 corridor north of $\mathrm{I}-70$ is primarily to improve safety while maintaining system quality and increasing mobility

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes north-south connections within the Lower Blue River Valley, providing for commuter travel and public land access

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R3-10

What we heard about the Corridor

- 133 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor
- Concerns about speeding
- Desire for passenger rail
- Desire for transit improvements
- Desire for regional transit
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Concerns for safety due to wildlife management
- Frustration or concerns about truck/ freight


## Key Data Findings:

| Safety | Two segments with shoulders $<^{\prime}$ <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (north of Heenley) |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Summit Stage transit stop in Dillon |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling (north half of corridor) |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Silverthorne |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> High criticality (southern section) <br> Parallels 100-year floodplain |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Dillon <br> Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove bicycle accommodationMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)Provide additional travel optionsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Address unsafe passing conditions

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID |  | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 9 - North Corridor from Silverthorne to Kremmling (Improve to CDOT standards) | - | 1997 | (3) | (1) |  | \$40.00 |
| SH 9 South of Green Mtn Reservoir | Rural road surface treatment | 2644 | $(9)$ | (1) | 18 | \$7.65 |
| SH 9 Green Mtn Reservoir Ph 1 | Rural road surface treatment | 2647 | (3) | (1) | $\bigcirc$ | \$7.18 |
| SH 9 Green Mtn Reservoir Ph 2 | Rural road surface treatment | 2650 | $(3)$ | (1) | 3 | \$5.75 |

Project Types

Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit
Transit Safety
Aviation

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- SH 9 South of Green Mtn Reservoir
- SH 9 Green Mtn Reservoir Ph 1
- SH 9 Green Mtn Reservoir Ph 2


RANSPCR
State Highway 13: Rifle to Meeker (PIM7006)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 13: Rifle to Meeker

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 13 Rifle to Meeker corridor is to provide an intermodal transportation network that will enhance the safety aspects while simultaneously preserving the wildlife, viewscape, and outdoor recreational benefits of this critical north-south alternative link.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 14 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for improved transit
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher poverty <br> levels and higher percentage of minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Entire corridor has elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 <br> or 4) |
| Freight |  |
| Safety |  |$\quad$| Dense wildlife crashes |
| :--- |
| Hazmat route |, | Freight |
| :--- |
| Asset <br> Management |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit |
| Low drivability life <br> Bustang West Line stop in Rifle <br> RFTA regional bus station in Rifle <br> Meeker Streaker operates on corridor - stops in Rifle <br> and Meeker |
| Bicycling | | High stress for bicycling |
| :--- |
| Freight <br> Resiliency |
| Low redundancy |
| Economics | | Concentration of jobs in Rifle |
| :--- |
| Provides access to recreational area (BLM) |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wild life crashes)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 13: Rifle North | Reconstruction of NHS and high volume truck route to add shoulders, game fence and wildlife underpasses. | 1198 | $8$ | (1) 60) |  | \$60.00 |
| SH 13: Rifle North Phase II | Reconstruction of NHS and high volume truck route to add shoulders, game fence and wildlife underpasses. | 1199 | $(9)$ | (1) 60 |  | \$25.00 |
| ITS: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 40 and SH 13 | - | 1200 | (8) | (1) |  | - |
| Rio Blanco Divide SH 13 Improvements MP 4 to MP 22.7 | - | 1998 | (1) | (8) -2.8 | 4 | \$60.00 |
| Extend Park Avenue south to New Intersection at SH 13 | - | 1999 | (1) | (.) - | (1) | \$0.90 |
| Reconstruct SH 13, SH 6 through Rifle | - | 2000 | $3$ | (8) -6) |  | \$6.50 |
| Connect SH 13 Bypass at 11th in Rifle | - | 2002 | (1) | (8) -6 | ! 0 | \$1.30 |
| Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG) | Expand marketing, outreach, and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG). Marketing is \$20,000 per year for 10 years. Total cost is $\$ 200,000$ | 2004 | (9) | (2) $\rightarrow$ | 0 | \$0.20 |
| SH 13 GarCo Rio Blanco Hill (Milepost 11.3 to 16.2) | This project reconstructs SH 13 to meet current design standards including wider shoulders, drainage improvements, and a wildlife underpass. | 37 | (1) | (1) 6 | $0 \Leftrightarrow$ | \$26.00 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit


Safety
Aviation

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

## $(9$ <br> Asset Management

- SH 13: Rifle North
- SH 13: Rifle North Phase II
- Reconstruct SH 13, SH 6 through Rifle


## Mobility

- ITS: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; fiber on US 40 and SH 13
- Extend Park Avenue south to New Intersection at SH 13
- Connect SH 13 Bypass at 11th in Rifle
- Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)


PLAN
US Highway 24: Dowd J unction to Leadville (PIM7007)


## Corridor Name

US Highway 24: Dowd J unction to Leadville

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US Highway 24 corridor north of Leadville is primarily to improve safety, while maintaining system quality and increasing mobility

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, provides commuter access, serves as a secondary route for I-70 and makes east-west connections within the Arkansas River and Eagle River valleys. The transportation system in the area primarily serves destinations outside of the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R3-8
- Scenic Byway (Top of the Rockies)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 96 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Concerns with growth and congestion
- Desire for regional transit
- Pavement condition is poor
- Questions about technology/ data
- Highway is also Main Street

Key Data Findings: US Highway 24: Dowd J unction to Leadville (PIM7007)

## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate congestion near Dowd J unction <br> $(2030,2045)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Several segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Safety | Several segments with shoulders <2' |
| Asset <br> Management | One bridge in poor condition |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (two segments south of Red Cliff) |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | ECO Transit operates on corridor-stops in Minturn, <br> Red Cliff, and Leadville |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity <br> High stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Minturn and DOLA affiliated <br> Main Street through Leadville |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove bicycle accommodationEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationAddress bridge in poor condition

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leadville North Park-n-Ride | New park-n-ride in Leadville | 1201 | (2) | (12) $\Leftrightarrow 0$ | 0 | \$0.25 |
| Leadville Bus Shelters | New bus shelters in Leadville (assumes 4 total) | 1202 | (9) |  | $\theta$ | \$0.10 |
| SH 24 Minturn to Leadville Safety Impv | Safety and mobility improvements throughout the corridor including intersections, shoulders, and other safety and mobility improvements. | 1203 | (1) |  |  | \$9.60 |
| SH 24 Dowd Junction to Minturn Improvements | - | 2005 | (1) 8 | (1) | (1) 0 | \$3.10 |
| SH 24 Minturn to White River National Forest Improvements | - | 2008 | (1) 8 | (1) | (1) 0 | \$0.60 |
| Acquisition of Tennessee Pass <br> Rail Corridor or Trail and Rail | - | 2009 | ( 6.6 | (i) (1) 0 | 0 | \$15.00 |

## Project Types


(1) Capacity
Transit
Asset
Management
Pedestrian

## Project Benefits




Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management

- SH 24 Minturn to Leadville Safety Impv


## Mobility

- Leadville North Park-n-Ride
- Leadville Bus Shelters
- Acquisition of Tennessee Pass Rail Corridor or Trail and Rail


## ! Safety

- SH 24 Dowd Junction to Minturn Improvements
- SH 24 Minturn to White River National Forest Improvements




## Corridor Name

## US Highway 24

Leadville to Buena Vista

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US Highway 24 corridor south of Leadville is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the Arkansas River Valley area. The transportation system in the area primarily serves destinations outside of the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Top of the Rockies)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 11 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for regional transit
- Concerns about safety


## Key Data Findings:

| Safety | Several segments with shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ <br> Hazmat route |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life- one segment |
| Mobility Hub <br> Transit | Regional bus stations in Leadville |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity in Leadville <br> High stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | DOLA affiliated Main Street through Leadville |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Improve bicycle accommodationAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress safety concernsEliminate shoulder deficienciesEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

Corridor Projects: State Highway 24 Leadville to Buena Vista (PIM7008)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Salida and Leadville (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Salida and Leadville. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1034 | (2) | (1) 5 Oin | 3 | \$1.75 |
| US 24 from MP 179.5 to MP 184.8 south of Leadville | Rural road surface treatment | 50 | 3 | (1) | 9 | \$5.80 |

## Project Types

Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit Safety
Aviation

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- US 24 from MP 179.5 to MP 184.8 south of Leadville


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Salida and Leadville (Proposed Outrider Service)


State Highway 82: Glenwood Springs to Aspen (PIM7009)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 82: Glenwood Springs to Aspen

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 82 corridor between Glenwood Springs and Aspen is primarily to increase mobility as well as to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal roadway on the National Highway System, providing commuter access, and making east-west connections within the Roaring Fork River Valley. The transportation system in the area primarily serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor as well as destinations outside the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R3-6

What we heard about the Corridor

- 197 comments specifically about this corridor
- Frustration with congestion
- Concerns for safety due to wildlife management
- Pavement condition is poor
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for transit improvements
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | High congestion (2030, 2045) |
| Safety | Several segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Safety | Several segments with shoulders <2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (north of Carbondale) |
| Mobility Hub <br> Transit <br> Pedestrian | RFTA regional route operates on corridor- stops in <br> Carbondale, Basalt, El J ebel, Snowmass Village, <br> Woody Creek, Aspen, Catherine, and Glenwood <br> Springs (from RFTA map) <br> Glenwood Springs Transit operates on the corridor, <br> local provider in Aspen and Snowmass Village |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Aspen and Glenwood Springs |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity <br> Medium-high stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> High criticality |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs <br> Provides access to recreational area <br> Aspen-Pitkin County Airport |
| Es |  |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 82: Glenwood Springs to Aspen

## Corridor Needs

Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreation (including local intersections)Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove bicycle accommodationAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Increase connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (Aspen-Picken county airport)Mitigate risk associated with natural disastersEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aspen Buttermilk Pedestrian Underpass | Pedestrian underpass for transit stops at Buttermilk | 1205 | ( | $\begin{aligned} & -n) \Rightarrow \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ | (1) | \$7.00 |
| Basalt River Park Bus Station Improvements | Replacement bus shelter and associated Improvements on Two Rivers Road | 1206 | (-) | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | - | \$0.25 |
| Basalt \& El Jebel Bus Circulator | Create local bus circular system for Basalt \& El Jebel | 1207 | (-) | (1) $\rightarrow$ | 5 | \$1.10 |
| Glenwood Springs 27th Street and VelociRFTA BRT Pedestrian Crossing | Grade separated ped crossing at 27th Street/SH82/VelociRFTA BRT station | 1208 | d | (1) $\Leftrightarrow 6$ (?) 1 | (1) | \$12.00 |
| Glenwood Springs 23rd Street Pedestrian Crossing | Pedestrian crossing at 23rd Street in Glenwood Springs | 1209 | ( | $(n) \Leftrightarrow$ ! | (1) | \$8.00 |
| Glenwood Springs Bus Maintenance Facility Expansion | Renovation and expansion of the Glenwood Springs bus maintenance facility | 1210 | (-) | $(3)$ | $\bigcirc$ | \$40.00 |
| RFTA Fleet Expansion (CNG) to Support New Service | Expansion buses for five priority service expansions | 1211 | (9) | (n) $\Leftrightarrow$ | * | \$11.30 |
| RFTA 27th Street BRT Station Parking Expansion | Proposed expansion of parking by 65 spaces, either surface or structured | 1212 | (-) | (-1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$4.45 |
| Willits Town Center Parking Expansion | Proposed 50 underground spaces at Willits Town Center | 1213 | (2) | (a) $\Rightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$2.00 |
| Carbondale BRT Station Parking Expansion | Proposed 85 surface parking spaces | 1214 | (-) | (1) $\overbrace{0}$ | $\bigcirc$ | \$3.55 |
| Grand Avenue BRT Station Improvements | Upgrade northbound and southbound bus stops on the 900 block of Grand Avenue to BRT standards | 1215 | (-) | (n) $\rightarrow$ | * | \$0.87 |
| New Transit Station in Glenwood Springs | New, more extensive transit station in Glenwood Springs, to the west of downtown | 1216 | (9) | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | \% | \$3.67 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits

Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit


Safety
Aviation

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management
Mobility
Safety
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Name } & \text { Pescription } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Planning } \\ \text { Project ID }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Primary } \\ \text { Project } \\ \text { Types }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Aspen Maintenance Facility Phase } \\ \text { 9: Replacement of Fuel Farm }\end{array} & \text { Replace six underground fuel storage tanks } \\ \text { Project } \\ \text { Benefits }\end{array}\right)$

## Project Types

| Safety | (1) Capacity |
| :---: | :---: |
| Freight | (2) Transit |
| (8) Operations | Asset Manage |
| 60 Bicycle | A Pedestrian |

## Project Benefits

## SWP Goal Area

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aspen Airport/BRT Connection | Improved passenger connection between Airport BRT Station and the airport, consistent with Airport Master Plan | 1228 | (-) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$38.60 |
| RFTA UVMS BRT: Medium Term Alternative | Build preferred alignment, dedicated lanes, station improvements | 1229 | (9) | (n) (i) | * | \$164.00 |
| RFTA UVMS BRT Long Term <br> Alternative: Retrofit Buses to Autonomous Control | Retrofit Buses to Autonomous Control | 1230 | (-) | (n) $\rightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$9.60 |
| Snowmass Transit Center | Consolidate regional and local transit services in one location accommodating 4-5 regional bus bays and 5 local bus bays with at-grade access to the commercial core and public lands. Project will include the relocation of an arterial roadway, pedestrian access improvements, and the replacement of any displaced public parking. | 1231 | (-) | (4) 5 ( 0 |  | \$11.00 |
| Snowmass Owl Creek Road Roundabout Bus Stops | Regional RFTA bus stops to be incorporated in Owl Creek Road roundabout development. | 1232 | (9) | (x) $\rightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$1.00 |
| Snowmass Bus Stop <br> Reconstruction at Meadow <br> Ranch and Snowmass Chapel | Meadow Ranch stop is planned to be built in 2018. The Snowmass Chapel stop allows for transfers to regional RFTA system is in the planning process. | 1233 | (9) | (n) $\Rightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$0.25 |
| Snowmass Firehouse Bus Stop | Firehouse bus stop allows for transfers to regional RFTA service. | 1234 | (9) | (n) (i) | 5 | \$1.20 |
| Snowmass Bus Storage Facility | Snowmass bus storage facility | 1235 | (9) | $(3)$ | E | \$2.00 |
| SH 82 Multimodal Safety Improvements | Mobility improvements in Glenwood Springs, completion of entrance to Aspen, expansion of transit, bicycle and pedestrian mobility, and improved wildlife mitigation. | 1236 | ( 60 |  | (1) | \$100.00 |
| RFTA-Aspen Maintenance Facility Renovation | Existing, RFTA maintenance facility renovation | 1237 | (9) | $(3)$ | \# | \$1.00 |

## Project Types

| (1) Safety | Capacity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Freight | Transit |
| Operations | Asset |
| Management |  |
| (8) Bicycle | Pedestrian |

Project Benefits
(i) Economic Vitality
(1) Public Health
(I) Tourism
(d) Environmental



Freight
Transit

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 82/Willits Lane Traffic Signal | - | 2014 | (1) (8) | - | (1) \# | \$0.28 |
| SH 82 Improvements per Access Control Plan | - | 2015 | (1) (3) | - | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.10 |
| Intersection Reconstruction SH 82/SH 133 | - | 2016 | 19 | - | (1) \#8) | \$11.40 |
| Structure \# G-08-T SH 82 Upper Bypass Bridge Replacement | - | 2017 | 8 | (1) | (1) 8 | \$8.00 |
| Reconstruct Red Canyon Road/SH 82 Intersection | - | 2018 | 19 | (1) | 4.8 | \$2.20 |
| Reconstruct SH 82/CMC/Cattle Creek Road Intersections | - | 2019 | $(9)$ | (1) | 4.8 | \$5.30 |
| Bike/Ped Improvements to SH 82 through Glenwood Springs | - | 2020 | ( 10 | (1) (1) $x_{0}$ | (1) | \$1.70 |
| Relocation of SH 82 EIS - Traffic Model | - | 2021 | (8) | - | E) | \$2.00 |
| Midland Avenue Underpass | Vehicle and pedestrian underpass at Midland Avenue in Basalt | 2023 | ( | (i) (I) $\Leftrightarrow$ 610 | (1) 0 | \$20.00 |
| Expand service to Aspen airport area | - | 2449 | (2) | (14) 앙 (1) | 5 | - |
| SH 82 Pedestrian Overpass | - | 2013 | ( 6 | (A) $\hat{B}$ <br> (ii) ! | (1) E | \$1.20 |

Project Types


Project Benefits



## SWP Goal Area

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ride Glenwood OnDemand Service | Expansion of Ride Glenwood to include several electric on-demand vehicles and required routing/dispatching technology. | 2450 | (-) | (a) $\Rightarrow$ O | $\theta$ | \$7.95 |
| El Jebell Road intersection | - | 2453 | (8) | (1) | (1) $\leftrightarrows$ | \$4.00 |
| Service Expansion | In general, RFTA plans to increase service, particularly during peak hours, to address increasing demand, and to provide more consistent BRT service between seasons. It is likely that demand on the I-70 corridor will increase. IF RFTA receives support from Garfield County, RFTA may increase frequency, coverage and span of service to address those needs. For planning purposes, assumes a doubling of service with an annual operational cost of $\$ 3 \mathrm{M}$ per year with 6 expansion vehicles required over the next 20 years at a cost of $\$ 1$ million per vehicle. | 2486 | (-) | (-1) $\Rightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$36.00 |
| Town of Snowmass Village Senior Services | Begin Senior transit service to cover people outside of the fixed route service area. | 2488 | (-) |  |  | \$1.24 |
| Glenwood Springs South Bridge | New off-system bridge over Roaring Fork River west of SH 82 near Glenwood Springs Airport | 2696 | (1) | (3) 3 | * 1 | \$60.00 |

Project Types


Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management

## Mobility

- Basalt River Park Bus Station Improvements
- Basalt \& El Jebel Bus Circulator
- Glenwood Springs Bus Maintenance Facility Expansion
- RFTA Fleet Expansion (CNG) to Support New Service
- RFTA 27th Street BRT Station Parking Expansion
- Willits Town Center Parking Expansion
- Carbondale BRT Station Parking Expansion
- Grand Avenue BRT Station Improvements
- New Transit Station in Glenwood Springs
- Aspen Maintenance Facility Phase 9: Replacement of Fuel Farm
- Aspen Maintenance Facility Phase 6: Parts Room and Storage
- Improvements to Mid Valley Highway 82 Bus Stations


## (1) Safety

- Aspen Buttermilk Pedestrian Underpass
- Glenwood Springs 27th Street and VelociRFTA BRT Pedestrian Crossing
- Glenwood Springs 23rd Street Pedestrian Crossing



## o <br> Asset Management

- Structure \# G-08-T SH 82 Upper Bypass Bridge Replacement


## Mobility

- Aspen Junction (Basalt) Park-n-Ride Expansion
- RFTA Replacement of Employee Housing and Offices
- RFTA Expansion of Employee Housing and Office Space
- BRT Enhancements to Brush Creek Intercept Lot/Park-n-Ride
- Aspen Maintenance Facility Phase 7: Additional Indoor Bus Storage
- Aspen Maintenance Facility Phase 8: CNG Fueling
- RFTA Optimized BRT: Short Term Alternative
- New Vehicles to Provide Service Connection to ECO Transit
- Aspen Airport/BRT Connection
- RFTA UVMS BRT: Medium Term Alternative
- RFTA UVMS BRT Long Term Alternative: Retrofit Buses to Autonomous Control


## Safety

- SH 82 Multimodal Safety Improvements
- SH 82 Pedestrian Overpass
- SH 82/Willits Lane Traffic Signal

- Reconstruct Red Canyon Road/SH 82 Intersection
- Reconstruct SH 82/CMC/Cattle Creek Road Intersections


## Mobility <br> - Snowmass Transit Center

- Snowmass Owl Creek Road Roundabout Bus Stops
- Snowmass Bus Stop Reconstruction at Meadow Ranch and Snowmass Chapel
- Snowmass Firehouse Bus Stop
- Snowmass Bus Storage Facility
- RFTA-Aspen Maintenance Facility Renovation
- Relocation of SH 82 EIS - Traffic Model
- Expand service to Aspen airport area
- Ride Glenwood On-Demand Service
- Service Expansion
- Town of Snowmass Village Senior Services
- Glenwood Springs South Bridge


## (!) Safety

- SH 82 Improvements per Access Control Plan
- Bike/Ped Improvements to SH 82 through Glenwood Springs
- Midland Avenue Underpass
- El Jebell Road intersection


State Highway 82: Aspen to Twin Lakes (PIM7010)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 82: Aspen to Twin Lakes

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 82 corridor between Aspen and SH 24 is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the Arkansas River and Roaring Fork River valleys. The transportation system in the area primarily serves destinations outside of the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R3-6
- Scenic Byway (Twin Lakes)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 70 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns with growth and congestion
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for transit
- Pavement condition is poor



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulder <2' |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life-one segment |
| Mobility Hub <br> Transit | Regional bus station in Aspen |


| Bicycling | High-very high bicycle activity <br> High stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Twin Lakes |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Aspen <br> Provides access to recreational area |




Corridor Projects: State Highway 82 Aspen to Twin Lakes (PIM7010)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG) | Expand marketing, outreach, and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG). Marketing is $\$ 20,000$ per year for 10 years. Total cost is \$200,000 | 2004 | (-) | (1) $\Rightarrow$ \% | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.20 |
| SH 82 Town of Aspen | Safety and intersection improvements within the Town of Aspen | 2390 | (1) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | (i) 0 | (1) | - |
| SH 82 Independence Pass | Safety, stabilization, and shoulder improvements | 2391 | 4 | $\text { (i) (1) } 96$ | (1) | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## (P) Asset <br> Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)


## ! Safety

- SH 82 Town of Aspen
- SH 82 Independence Pass

State Highway 91: Leadville to Copper Mountain (PIM7011)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 91: Leadville to Copper Mountain

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 91 corridor is primarily to improve safety, maintain system quality and increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, provides commuter access, and makes north-south connections within the Arkansas River Valley and Ten Mile Creek areas. The transportation system in the area primarily serves destinations outside of the corridor. This corridor serves as a critical alternate route during I-70 closures.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Top of the Rockies)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 61 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for transit improvements
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Pavement condition is poor

Key Data Findings: State Highway 91: Leadville to Copper Mountain

## Key Data Findings:

| Safety | Several segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| :---: | :--- |
| Safety | Two segments with shoulders < ' $^{\prime}$ <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| Transit | Summit Stage's Lake County Commuter Route <br> operates on route with stop in Leadville <br> Copper Mountain Resort Transit operates on corridor |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity <br> High stress for bicycling- segments |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Avalanche path near Leadville |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (avalanche)Improve bicycle accommodationEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Provide additional travel optionsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 91, Copper Mountain to Summit of Fremont Pass | - | 2024 | (8) | (3) (\%) | 0 | \$28.00 |
| SH 91 improvements in Lake County | - | 2025 | (1) (8) | (3) (3) | (1) | - |

Project Types

Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit
!
Safety
Aviation

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- SH 91, Copper Mountain to Summit of Fremont Pass


## (!) Safety

- SH 91 improvements in Lake County


State Highway 131: Wolcott to Steamboat Springs (PIM7012)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 131: Wolcott to Steamboat Springs

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 131 corridor is primarily to improve safety, with maintaining system quality and increased mobility as secondary concerns.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes north-south connections within the Upper Colorado River Valley area. The transportation system in the area primarily serves destinations outside of the corridor.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 14 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for better bicycle facilities

Key Data Findings: State Highway 131: Wolcott to Steamboat Springs

## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate congestion near Wolcott (2045) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Two segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Bicycling | High bicycle activity near Wolcott <br> High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 131: Wolcott to Steamboat Springs

## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Improve bicycle accommodationEliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs,tourist destinations, and recreation


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 131 Shoulder Widening, Wolcott to Routt County Line | - | 2026 | (1) | 60 | (1) | \$11.59 |
| SH 131/State Bridge Acceleration/Deceleration lanes | - | 2027 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.59 |
| SH 131 Realignment from Wolcott north across Eagle River | - | 2028 | (1) | - | (1) | \$8.50 |

Project Types


Project Benefits



SWP Goal Area


## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- SH 131 Realignment from Wolcott north across Eagle River


## (!) Safety

- SH 131 Shoulder Widening, Wolcott to Routt County Line
- SH 131/State Bridge Acceleration/Deceleration lanes




## Corridor Name

State Highway 133: Hotchkiss to SH 82 at Carbondale

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 133 corridor is primarily to improve safety, while maintaining system quality and increasing mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes north-south connections within the Crystal River Valley. The corridor also serves as an important access to l-70 corridor for the West Slope communities. The transportation system in the area primarily serves destinations outside of the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R3-5
- Scenic Byway (West Elk Loop)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 65 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for wider shoulders


## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate congestion near Carbondale (2045) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Safety | Several segments with shoulder <2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Regional bus station in Carbondale |
| Bicycling | High bicycle activity near Carbondale <br> High stress for bicycling (one segment) |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Avalanche path near Redstone <br> Road sloughs off toward reservoir <br> (MM 20-MM 34)(rockfall) |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Carbondale <br> Provides access to recreational area |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 133: Hotchkiss to SH 82 at Carbondale

## Corridor Needs

Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (avalanche, rockfall)Improve bicycle accommodationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)(Carbondale)Mitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesProvide additional travel optionsAddress increasing congestion to improve access to touristdestinations and recreation


Corridor Projects: State Highway 133 Hotchkiss to SH 82 at Carbondale

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In <br> millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High congestion Narrow road | Queue Warning | 1240 | (1) | (1) | (1) | - |
| Rio Grande Trail (paved trail through Roaring Fork Valley) | - | 2029 | ( 60 | (8) (1) (I) <br> $\Leftrightarrow$ (1) | (1) 0 | \$4.80 |
| SH 133: Expand RFTA Commuter Service between Carbondale and Hotchkiss | SH 133: Expand RFTA Commuter Service between Carbondale and Hotchkiss. Additional operating cost of \$20,000/year. | 2030 | ) | (12) -6 | 5 | \$0.20 |
| Reconstruction of SH 133 in Carbondale | - | 2031 | 8 | (8) (3) |  | \$24.10 |
| SH 133 Pitkin County | Safety and Shoulder improvements | 2392 | (1) | $\begin{gathered} \text { (1) (1) } \\ 60 \end{gathered}$ | (1) 0 | - |

Project Types


Project Benefits



SWP Goal Area
Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

## $\sigma$ <br> Asset Management

- Reconstruction of SH 133 in Carbondale


## Mobility

- Rio Grande Trail (paved trail through Roaring Fork Valley)
- SH 133: Expand RFTA Commuter Service between Carbondale and Hotchkiss


## (!) Safety

- High congestion Narrow road
- SH 133 Pitkin County


State Highway 139: I-70 to Rangely (PIM7014)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 139: I-70 to Rangely

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 139 corridor is primarily to improve safety with system quality and mobility improvements as secondary concerns.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes north-south connections within the Douglas Pass area. The transportation system in the area primarily serves destinations outside of the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Dinosaur Diamond)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 10 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of disabled population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Two segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Safety | One segments with shoulders $<^{\prime} \mathbf{'}^{\prime}$ <br> Hazmat route |
| Bicycling | High stress to bicycling-north section |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Avalanche path up north |
| Economics | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (avalanche)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationAddress safety concerns

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG) | Expand marketing, outreach, and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG). Marketing is \$20,000 per year for 10 years. Total cost is $\$ 200,000$ | 2004 | (-) | (x) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.20 |
| SH 139 Douglas Pass stabilization and reconstruction | This project will stabilize and reconstruct the roadway template on Douglas Pass in Garfield County. This is a potential $\$ 7$ million Federal FLAP project and will require a match | 2032 | $8$ | (1) | 13 | - |
| SH 139 from MP 37.5 to MP 52.8 north of Douglas Pass | Rural road surface treatment | 53 | $(5)$ | (1) | 9 | \$8.40 |
| SH 139 from MP 15 to MP 19 near Dinosaur Diamond | Rural road surface treatment | 54 | (3) | (1) | (1) | \$2.20 |

## Project Types

Project Benefits




Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Fraight

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- SH 139 from MP 37.5 to MP 52.8 north of Douglas Pass
- SH 139 from MP 15 to MP 19 near Dinosaur Diamond


## Mobility

- Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)


State Highway 300: SH 24 at Malta to End (PIM7015)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 300: SH 24 at Malta to End

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 300 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, provides local access to the National Fish Hatchery, and makes east-west connections within the Arkansas River Valley. The transportation system in the area primarily serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments specifically about this corridor


|  | Key Data Findings: | Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Asset Management | One bridge in poor condition | Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life | Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor(i) Address bridge in poor conditionEliminate shoulder deficiencies
(2) Corridor Projects: State Highway 300 SH 24 at Malta to End (PIM7015)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 300 Bridge Replacement | - | 2033 | 9 | (1) | (1) 9 | - |
| SH 300 Safety | Safety and Shoulder improvements (MP 0- 3.3) | 2393 | (1) | 60 | (1) | - |
| SH 300 from MP 0 to MP 3.3 west of Leadville | Rural road surface treatment | 49 | 8 | (1) | 8 | \$2.50 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight


Safety
Aviation

SWP Goal Area


(P) Asset

Management

- SH 300 Bridge Replacement
- SH 300 from MP 0 to MP 3.3 west of Leadville


State Highway 325: SH 13 North of Rifle to End at County Road 217


## Corridor Name

State Highway 325: SH 13 North of Rifle to End at Countr Road 217

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 325 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality, with safety and mobility improvements as secondary concerns.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, provides local access, and makes north-south connections within the Rifle Gap area. The transportation system in the area primarily serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 4 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for transit


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high poverty levels <br> and higher percentage of minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Entire corridor has shoulder <2' |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Bustang West line station in Rifle <br> Regional bus station in Rifle |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area (BLM) |



## Corridor Needs

Improve access to recreationEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove bicycle accommodationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG) | Expand marketing, outreach, and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG). Marketing is $\$ 20,000$ per year for 10 years. Total cost is $\$ 200,000$ | 2004 | ) | (n) $\cos ^{3}$ | 5 | \$0.20 |
| Reconstruct SH 325 Rifle Gap Road (safety \& geometric improvements) | - | 2034 | 19 | - |  | \$2.00 |
| SH 325 Safety | Safety and Shoulder Improvements (MP 0-12) | 2394 | (1) | 610 | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |

## Project Types

Project Benefits




Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## (1) Asset Management

- Reconstruct SH 325 Rifle Gap Road (safety \& geometric improvements)


## $\Rightarrow$ Mobility

- Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)


## (!) Safety

- SH 325 Safety



## 5 <br> Northwest TPR Corridor Profiles - Final

## CDOT Region 3

## Counties:

Grand, J ackson, Moffat, Rio Blanco, Routt

> The vision for the Northwest TPR is to establish and maintain a realistic, balanced multimodal transportation system that consists of a cohesive network of transit options and effectively addresses current and future needs while at the same time protecting the quality of life and the safety of the Northwest region's diverse population and visitors. I


## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Provide additional travel options
- Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
* Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback


## What We've Heard about the Northwest TPR

- 2146 public and stakeholder comments specifically about the NW TPR
- 155 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the Northwest TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" public survey respondents in the NW TPR, combined with stakeholder input selected:
- Road Condition and Safety
- Lack of Travel Options
- Growth and Congestion
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the Northwest TPR (in order of frequency) include: safety, road condition, bus/ transit service, shoulders, and bike/ ped connectivity


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics | 2015 Population: 58,929 <br> 2045 Forecasted Population: 82,201 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | 2015 J obs: 39,374 <br> 2045 Forecasted J obs: 53,049 |
| Economics | Top Industries: Tourism and Outdoor Recreation, Health and <br> Wellness |
| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 1.6 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 2.6 Million |
| Asset <br> Management | 102 miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 454 miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 248 miles of highway with low drivability life |



## Corridor Name

State Highway 9: I-70 North to Kremmling

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 9 corridor is primarily to improve safety, maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an inter/ intraregional facility and is becoming a commuter corridor to bedroom communities that connects to places outside the region as well as communities within the Blue River Valley, and to Summit and Grand Counties. Safety is a substantial concern for this corridor; in several areas passing lanes and intersection improvements are needed.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R3-10)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 21 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Need for truck/ freight rest stops
- Safety concerns related to wildlife management


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high poverty levels |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Majority of corridor has elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Safety | Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat Route |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit <br> Mobility Hub | Greyhound route through Kremmling <br> Amtrak station in Kremmling <br> Inter-city bus station in Kremmling |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area (BLM) <br> Concentration of jobs in Kremmling |



## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove bicycle accommodationImprove access to recreationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)Address unsafe passing conditions


Project Types



## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



## (1) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- See project: SH 9 - Widening along Green Mountain Reservoir MP 126-119




## Corridor Name

State Highway 13: Rifle North to Wyoming Border

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 13 corridor is primarily to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an inter/ intraregional facility that provides local access as well as a north-south connection linking the communities from Rifle north to the Wyoming border area. Additionally, this corridor serves as an alternate route when I-70 closes. Energy extraction including coal, oil, oil shale, and natural gas will continue to result in an increase in heavy vehicles that serve the industry.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 51 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Concerns for safety due to wildlife management
- Desire improvements for freight and truck movement
- Desire for rest stops/ truck parking
- Concerns about economic vitality
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for passing lanes


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of disabled population |
| :---: | :---: |
| Safety | Several segments with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Freight Safety | Several segments with shoulders <2' Dense wildlife crashes Hazmat Route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life, most of the segment from Hamilton to Meeker and north of Craig |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Inter-city bus station in Craig |
| Bicycling | Medium high and high stress for bicycling |
| Economics Pedestrian | DOLA affiliated Main Street through Meeker and Craig |
| Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Meeker and Craig Concentration of oil and gas wells near Hamilton, Craig, and north to the Wyoming border Active coal mining Provides access to recreational area (BLM) |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wild life crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove access to recreationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019-SH 13 to CR 3 South MM 115.6-120.8 <br> - Full HMA reconstruction w/ shoulder widening | - | 1684 | (1) 6 | 68 | 1) 8 | \$12.00 |
| Nordic Trail Widening-Howelsen Hill | - | 1685 | ( | (4) (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (1) | (1) \% | \$7.20 |
| 2020-SH 13 Oak Creek Canyon - MM52-56 Project is in early design. Widen shoulders \& HMA overlay. Slide repair/mitigation | - | 1686 | (1) | (3) 6 | (1) 3 | - |
| Roadway Widening (Perch Pond to Hamilton), seven miles | - | 1687 | (1) | (8) -2 | (1) \# | \$39.00 |
| SH 13 MM 90-120 Wildlife mitigation | - | 1688 | (1) | (4) -2 | (1) 0 | \$45.00 |
| 2021-SH 13 Hamilton South Phase 2 - SH 13 MM 63-71 - Project is in early design. Widen shoulders if possible. HMA overlay. | - | 1689 | (1) | 60 | (1) 0 | - |
| SH 13 Hamilton South Wildlife mitigation | - | 1690 | (1) | ( | (1) | \$21.00 |
| Downtown Meeker pedestrian crossing across Highway 13 | - | 1691 | ( | $(1) \geqslant 0$ | (1) 00 | \$1.50 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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Corridor Projects: State Highway 13: Rifle North to Wyoming Border

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market Street Sidewalk Project (South Side) | - | 1692 | ( | (i) (i) ( | (1) 0 | \$1.37 |
| Bus Garage |  | 1693 | (9) | 8 | 0 | \$2.50 |
| Multi Gov Fleet Station | - | 1694 | (9) | 8 | $\theta$ | \$0.80 |
| Essential Bus Service between Craig and Grand Junction (Proposed Outrider Service) | Essential Regional Bus Service from Craig to Grand Junction; one roundtrip/day 365 days/year. Two vehicles at \$425,000 each | 2125 | (9) | (12) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iis | $\theta$ | \$3.16 |
| SH 13 Rio Blanco South | MP 18 to MP 16 | 2376 | $(6)$ | (3) -2 | 6 | \$2.00 |
| Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG) | Expand marketing, outreach, and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG). Marketing is $\$ 20,000$ per year for 10 years. Total cost is $\$ 200,000$ | 2377 | ) | (14) $\Leftrightarrow$ | 5 | \$0.20 |
| 2020-SH 13 Hamilton South - MM 69.5 - 76.5 - Project is in early design. Looking to widen shoulders if possible without purchasing ROW. HMA overlay. Slide repair/mitigation | - | 2512 | (1) | (3) | (1) | \$7.20 |
| SH 13 Shoulder widening Hamilton South | - | 2513 | (1) |  | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$48.00 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits
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## $\square$ <br> Asset Management

- SH 13: Rio Blanco South to County Line Shoulders and Passing Lanes
- SH 13: Wyoming South
- 2019/2020 - SH 13 to CR 5 North \& South MM 15.6-21.2 RBC Alternate Bid - Concrete and HMA option, Full Reconstruction w/ shoulder widening


## Mobility

- SH 13 from I-70 to Craig - Freight Route
- SH 13 Fortification Creek
- Nordic Trail Widening-Howelsen Hill
- 2020-SH 13 Oak Creek Canyon - MM52-56 - Project is in early design. Widen shoulders \& HMA overlay. Slide repair/mitigation
- Roadway Widening (Perch Pond to Hamilton), seven miles
- SH 13 MM 90-120 Wildlife mitigation
- 2021-SH 13 Hamilton South Phase 2 - SH 13 MM 63-71 - Project is in early design. Widen shoulders if possible. HMA overlay.



## 3 <br> Asset Management

- STIP \& Project Priority/SH 13 WY-S. Construction - MP123.03-110.83 Design Fully Funded - Phase from above
- 2019-SH 13 to CR 3 South MM 115.6-120.8 - Full HMA reconstruction $\mathrm{w} /$ shoulder widening
- SH 13 Rio Blanco South


## Mobility

- Bus Garage
- Multi Gov Fleet Station
- Essential Bus Service between Craig and Grand Junction (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)
- 2020-SH 13 Hamilton South - MM 69.5-76.5-Project is in early design. Looking to widen shoulders if possible without purchasing ROW. HMA overlay. Slide repair/mitigation


## (1) Safety

- Market Street Sidewalk Project (South Side)
- SH 13 Shoulder widening Hamilton South


State Highway 14: US 40 to County Line (PNW7003)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 14: US 40 to County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 14 corridor is primarily to improve safety and maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an inter/ intraregional facility that provides local, recreational and tourist access to and within North Park.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Cache La Poudre-North Park)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 16 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for rest stops/ truck parking



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Safety | Several segments with shoulders <2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat Route |


| Asset <br> Management | One segment of low drivability life nearing <br> Walden |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Walden <br> Provides access to recreational area (BLM) |


Corridor Needs
(A) Eliminate shoulder deficiencies
(Aitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including
wildlife crashes)
Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor
Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles
( 5 Corridor Projects: State Highway 14: US 40 to County Line (PNW7003)
Planning
Project ID

| Primary | Additional | SWP Goa |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project | Project | Areas |
| Types | Benefits |  |

Project Cost (In millions)

| SH 14 from MP 12 to MP 18 north <br> of Grizzly Ranch | Rural road surface treatment | 52 |  | $\$ 7.00$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Expand Jackson County Council on <br> Aging Service | Expand service from Senior Center in <br> Jackson County to provide service to <br> more populations | 2378 | $\$ 1.05$ |  |

Project Types


Project Benefits
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## A Asset <br> Management

- SH 14 from MP 12 to MP 18 north of Grizzly Ranch

- Expand Jackson County Council on Aging Service


## (1) Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area



## Corridor Name

US Highway 34: North of Granby to Estes Park

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the U.S. 34 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor, while a component of the National Highway System, also provides local and intra-regional access as well as a direct connection to Rocky Mountain National Park. Currently the corridor is being used by heavy trucks for transporting trees killed by the recent beetle infestation in addition to heavy summer tourism traffic.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System (North of Granby to Grand Lake)
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R3-14)
- Scenic Byway (Colorado River Headwaters)
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 21 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns with growth and
congestion
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for better bicycle facilities

Key Data Findings: US Highway 34: North of Granby to Estes Park

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Several segments with shoulder <2' <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Asset <br> Management | One segment of Iow drivability life near Grand Lake <br> One bridge in poor condition near Grand Lake |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Amtrak stop in Granby <br> Inter-city bus station in Granby |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Grand Lake <br> Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove access to recreationImprove bicycle accommodationEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additiona I Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 34 from MP 6 to MP 15 near Grand Lake | Rural road surface treatment | 47 | (\%) | (1) | 18 | \$11.50 |
| Hwy 34 and Hwy 40. | Roundabout | 1697 | (1) 8 | (a) 0 | 1) 5 | \$5.00 |
| New US 34 Fixed-Route Lift Service from Granby to Grand Lake | Expand Winter Park service (The Lift) from Granby to Grand Lake; Estimate of 1 new fixed route diesel bus at $\$ 450,000$ and operating cost of $\$ 150,000 /$ year | 2379 | (-) | (n) 0 | $\theta$ | \$1.95 |

## Project Types

Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit Safety
Aviation

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- Hwy 34 and Hwy 40.
- US 34 from MP 6 to MP 15 near Grand Lake


## $\Leftrightarrow$ Mobility

- New US 34 Fixed-Route Lift Service from Granby to Grand Lake


## ! Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area




## Corridor Name

US Highway 40 East: West of Craig East to Empire/ I-70 (PNW7005)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the U.S. 40 corridor (Segment 2) is primarily to maintain system quality, improve safety and increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility that connects to places outside the region as well as linking communities, recreation sites and agricultural operations within the Corridor. US 40 between Craig and Steamboat is a commuter link and US 40 from the Front Range to Steamboat Springs serves tourism and recreational traffic.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R3-13 (Kremmling to $\mathrm{I}-70$ ) and R3-12
- Scenic Byway (Kremmling to Granby) (Colorado River Headwaters)
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 225 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Pavement condition is poor
- Desire for transit
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Frustration with congestion
- Desire improvements for freight and truck movement
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with high poverty levels and higher percentage of minority population | Bicycling Economics Pedestrian |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Growth | Moderate congestion (2030); moderate to high congestion (2045) |  |
| Safety | Majority of corridor has elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) | Transit Mobility Hub Pedestrian |
| Freight Safety | Several segments with shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ Dense wildlife crashes Hazmat Route |  |
| Freight Asset Management | Two segments of low drivability life near Kremmling and Granby |  |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs; Concentration of oil and gas wells in Hayden; Active coal mining permit in Hayden; Provides access to recreational area; Hayden-Yampa Valley Regional Airport | Freight Resiliency |

High to very high bicycle activity near Steamboat Springs and Winter Park; High Stress for bicycling from Kremmling to SH 14 Main Street through Empire, Fraser, Kremmling, DOLA designated Main Street through Granby and Steamboat Springs, DOLA affiliated Main Street through Craig

Greyhound Bus operates on the corridor from DenverSteamboat
Inter-city bus stations in Craig, Hayden, Miner, Steamboat, Kremmling, Hot Sulphur Springs, and Winter Park Amtrak Route from Kremmling to Denver Steamboat Springs Transit operates along corridor Lift Transit Services operate on corridor

Low redundancy; High criticality between Craig and Steamboat springs; Crosses 100-year floodplain



| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (ln millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Craig and Frisco (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Craig and Frisco. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1032 | (e) | (1) 0 (iin | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$3.06 |
| Essential Bus Service between Craig and Vail (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Craig and Vail. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1033 | \%) | (12) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$2.66 |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 40 and SH 13 | Add fiber network on US 40 and SH 13 | 1035 | (8) | (1) | (1) | - |
| Winter Park Transit <br> Maintenance \& Storage Facility | Build a facility in Winter Park area for transit vehicle maintenance, storage and operations | 1244 | P) | 9 | $\theta$ | \$20.50 |
| Steamboat Springs Transit Fleet Expansion | Expand Steamboat Springs Transit Fleet with 4 Diesel/Electric Hybrid Buses | 1245 | (2) | (4) 40 | 5 | \$2.40 |
| Steamboat Springs <br> Transportation Center Redesign and Build (Phase I) | Design entire SSTC and build shore side sawtooth transit bays between SSTC and Ski Time Square. | 1246 | (9) | (1) 5 (in 3 | 3 | \$2.30 |
| Grand County Paratransit Van for Seniors Program | Purchase additional vehicle to add to existing fleets | 1247 | (\%) | (4) $\Rightarrow$ | 3 | \$0.50 |
| Winter Park Cooper Creek Square Transit Center | Purchase new building for use at a Transit Center where our current transit hub is located in Downtown Winter Park | 1248 | (9) | (1) (3) $\Rightarrow$ in | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.56 |
| Middle Park Park-n-Ride | Create regional transportation hub and Park-n-Ride facility that is centrally located in East Grand County; 50 spaces | 1249 | (2) | (12) $\Rightarrow$ (iir | 5 | \$0.75 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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Safety Management Aviation Freight

Transit

## SWP Goal Area



| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (ln <br> millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Steamboat Springs Transportation Center Build (Phase II) | Improve pedestrian connections, transit/shuttle access and improve safety in the GTC | 1250 | (2) | $\rightarrow \pi$ | 5 | \$15.70 |
| Steamboat Springs Transit <br> Facility Improvements | Remodel existing transit facilities to increase storage, improve efficiency and add housing | 1251 | (-) | (t) $x^{3}$ | $\theta$ | \$4.45 |
| Hayden Park-n-Ride | Create regional transportation hub and Park-nRide facility that is located in Hayden | 1252 | ( | (1) $\Rightarrow$ Oin | 50 | \$1.65 |
| New Local Transit Service in Craig | Create and implement transit system that serves the City of Craig | 1253 | (2) | (12) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$6.13 |
| Steamboat Springs Transit Planning Study: Develop BRT Routes to Remove Traffic and Service Remote Parking Lots | Develop bus rapid transit routes to incorporate remote parking lots with high traffic areas | 1254 | (2) | $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.25 |
| Western Steamboat Springs Transit Service | Expand Steamboat Springs into western Steamboat Springs | 1255 | (\%) | (12) 3 | 0 | \$11.60 |
| Essential Bus Service between Craig and Idaho Springs (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service from Craig to Idaho Springs. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1256 | (2) | (12) $\overbrace{0}$ | 0 | \$3.38 |
| US 40 East of Kremling Shoulder Impv | Reconstruction and additional paved shoulder widening and passing lanes East of Kremmling. | 1257 | (1) 8 | $\begin{gathered} (1)(2) 0 \\ 60 \end{gathered}$ | (1) 06 | \$20.50 |
| US 40 West. of Kremling Shoulder Impv. | Reconstruction and additional paved shoulder widening and passing lanes West of Kremmling. | 1258 | (1) 8 | (N) (1) 6 | (1) Et) | \$21.00 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (ln millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 40: Fraser to Winter Park and US 40/CR 804 | Construction of capacity improvements on US 40 between Fraser and Winter Park, likely widening to a four lane facility and intersection improvements at US 40/CR 804 | 1259 | (1) |  | (1) 0 | \$20.00 |
| US 40: Steamboat Springs to Steamboat II | Widening of roadway and addition of intersection turn lanes and dedicated bus lane. | 1260 | (8) 1 | (-2) | (1) 0 | \$28.00 |
| US 40: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and Intelligent Transportation Systems devices between I-70 and Kremmling | 1261 | (3) | -2 | (1) 0 | \$30.00 |
| Head on collisions | Do Not Pass Warning (DNPW) | 1262 | (1) | (3) (-2) | (1) \% | - |
| Winter Park Maintenance Facility | New, Design of new maintenance facility | 1263 | (9) | 9 | $\theta$ | \$0.20 |
| Steamboat Springs Transit Center Renovation | Reconstruct a major transit center | 1264 | -) | 18 | 3 | \$18.00 |
| Shoulder/Island Improvement - 8th Ave to CR 7 | - | 1698 | (1) | (1) 60 | (1) 0 | \$0.10 |
| US 40/CR 804 Roundabout | - | 1699 | (1) 3 | (1) -2 | (1) 0 | - |
| 4-lane widening Slate Creek to Downhill Drive | - | 1700 | (1) | (8) (3) | (1) 0 | \$18.00 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { (4) Economic Vitality } & \text { Quality of Life } \\ \text { (n) Public Health } & \text { Resilience } \\ \text { (I) Tourism } & \text { Environmental } \\ \text { (1) Pedestrian }\end{array}$
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Corridor Projects: US Highway 40 East: West of Craig East to

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US40-12th Street to 13th Street Improvements | - | 1701 | (1) | - | (1) | \$3.90 |
| 4-lane widening Downhill Drive to Elk River Road | - | 1702 | (1) | (8) -5 | $\cdots$ * | \$3.00 |
| Indian Trails/US40 Intersection | - | 1703 | (8) | (8) - | 0 ¢ | \$1.20 |
| EB US40 Off Ramp/Mount Werner Roundabout and Drainage | - | 1704 | (1) 8 | (-3) | (1) | \$1.70 |
| Traffic Light Improvement Green St and US 40 | - | 1705 | 18 | (-) | (1) | \$0.56 |
| Roundabout on Hwy 40Downtown Winter Park | - | 1706 | (1) 8 | (1) - -2 | (1) | \$3.50 |
| Hwy 40 widening from Fraser to County Road 8 | - | 1707 | (1) | (8) -2 | 0 ¢ | - |
| Mm 227 to + 229 Between Fraser and Winter Park and Tabernash MM224 to 227 | Roadway widening | 1708 | $D$ |  | (1) | - |
| US40 Passing Lanes - East of Rabbit Ears - MP 160-162 | - | 1709 | $D$ | (8) (1) - 1 | (1) | \$2.00 |

## Project Types




Project Benefits
(4) Economic Vitality
(1) Public Health
Tourism
Environmental



Mob
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit
SWP Goal Area


Asset Management
Mobility
Safety




| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Truck Parking, Kremmling | Add Truck Parking in this area | 2382 | (-2) | - | 0 | \$1.18 |
| Truck Parking | Increase Truck Parking (Steamboat). Most likely through private investment. | 2383 | -2) | - | 5 | \$1.18 |
| Truck Parking | Increase Truck Parking CDOT's Hayden rest area. | 2384 | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ | - | 5 | \$0.12 |
| Grand Seniors Parking Lot Renovation for Mountain Family Center Campus | - | 2483 | 9 | (ii) |  | \$0.05 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 4 locations: Fraser, Granby, Kremmling, and Hot Sulfur Springs | 2494 | (2) | (n) 0 (in | 5 | \$0.30 |
| Mt. Harris Canyon | - | 2515 | (1) | (1) -2 | (1) | - |
| Left Turn at Finley Lane and 40 | - | 2516 | (8) | (-2) | (1) 0 | - |
| Banners over HWY 40 | - | 2517 | (1) | - | (1) |  |
| Shared Use Path (Concrete) - US 40 from Wicks Ave. to CR 7 | - | 2518 | ( 60 | (4) $\Leftrightarrow$ (1) | (1) 0 | \$0.93 |
| US 40 Shoulders - MP 163.5-171.5 | - | 2519 | (1) | (1) 6 | (1) | \$20.00 |

Project Types
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## SWP Goal Area



Corridor Projects: US Highway 40 East: West of Craig East to
Empire/ I-70 (PNW7005) (Part 9/9)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North of Kremmling MM178 to MM184 (Kremmling to Hwy 134) | - | 2520 | (1) | - | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| North of Kremmling MM157 to MM176 (Just north of Wolford to Hwy 14) | - | 2521 | (1) | - | (1) | - |
| US 40 / SH 14 Park and Ride | - | 2546 | (9) | (n) $\Rightarrow$ (iin | 0 | \$2.25 |
| US 40 East of Hayden Ph 1 | Rural road surface treatment | 2643 | $(3)$ | (1) | 8 | \$5.72 |
| US 40 East of Hayden Ph 2 | Rural road surface treatment | 2646 | (8) | (1) | 9 | \$4.86 |
| US 40 Tabernash West | Rural road surface treatment | 2653 | (8) | (1) | 9 | \$7.15 |
| Winter Park Bus lane/parking improvements | Bus lane and parking improvements <br> - Cooper Creek Way in Winter Park | 2710 | ( | (3) 0 | 9 | \$0.52 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## (3) Asset Management

- US 40 East of Kremling Shoulder Impv
- US 40 West. of Kremling Shoulder Impv.
- Winter Park Bus lane/parking improvements


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Craig and Frisco (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Essential Bus Service between Craig and Vail (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Winter Park Transit Maintenance \& Storage Facility
- Steamboat Springs Transit Fleet Expansion


## (1) Safety

- ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 40 and SH 13
- US 40: Fraser to Winter Park and US 40/CR 804
- US 40: Steamboat Springs to Steamboat II
- US 40: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure



## (1) Asset Management

- US 40 Passing Lanes W. of Kremling
- US 40 Passing Lanes Craig to Stmbt


## Mobility

- Steamboat Springs Transportation Center Redesign and Build (Phase I)
- Grand County Paratransit Van for Seniors Program
- Winter Park Cooper Creek Square Transit Center
- Middle Park Park-n-Ride
- Hayden Park-n-Ride
(1) Safety
- Head on collisions
- Shoulder/Island Improvement - 8th Ave to CR 7
- US 40/CR 804 Roundabout
- 4-lane widening Slate Creek to Downhill Drive
- US40-12th Street to 13 th Street Improvements



## (A) Asset Management

- 2022-US 40 Craig - US 40 MM 80.7-92 Minor rehab - 1.5"-2.0" HMA with milling to match curb \& gutter
- Jersey Barrier Replacement - W 4th St / US 40 to Ranney St


## Mobility

- Steamboat Springs Transportation Center Build (Phase II)
- Steamboat Springs Transit Facility Improvements.
- New Local Transit Service in Craig
- Steamboat Springs Transit Planning Study: Develop BRT Routes to Remove Traffic and Service Remote Parking Lots


## ! Safety

- 4-lane widening Downhill Drive to Elk River Road
- Indian Trails/US40 Intersection
- EB US40 Off Ramp/Mount Werner Roundabout and Drainage
- Traffic Light Improvement - Green St and US 40
- US 40 and CR 54 (Red Dirt Hill or YMCA)



## P Asset Management

- Jersey Barrier Replacement - E 4th St / US 40 to Lincoln St
- Downhill Drive/US40 Intersection


## Mobility

- Western Steamboat Springs Transit Service
- Essential Bus Service between Craig and Idaho Springs (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Winter Park Maintenance Facility
- Steamboat Springs Transit Center Renovation


## ! Safety

Roundabout on Hwy 40 - Downtown Winter Park

Hwy 40 widening from Fraser to County Road 8

- Mm 227 to + 229 Between Fraser and Winter Park and Tabernash MM224 to 227 US40 Passing Lanes - East of Rabbit Ears MP 160-162



## P Asset Management

- Shelton Ditch Bridge
- 2019-US 40 Elk Springs - MM 31-371.5" HMA Overlay


## Mobility

- STIP \& Project Priority/US 40 East - US 40 E from SH 13 to Empire Jct
- MM 206 ( Entrance to Drowsy Water Ranch)
- US40 Curve Mitigation and Truck Ramp Improvements - MP 140.5-142.5
- Downtown Winter Park Streetscape Improvement (bike/ped improvements)


## (1) Safety

- US40 Passing Lanes - West of Hayden MP 103-105
- 4-lane widening Elk River Road to Dream Island
- US 40 passing lanes between Hayden and Craig
- MM 190 to MM 201 (Rock Scaling safety improvements in Byers Canyon



## (P) Asset Management

- Surface Treatment (Dinosaur to Craig), 90 miles
- Grand Seniors Parking Lot Renovation for Mountain Family Center Campus


## Mobility

- US 40 Rockfall Mitigation in Byer's Canyon
- Rabbit Ears Pass Traction Sand Mitigation
- Berthoud Pass Erosion Control
- US40 West Pedestrian Connection and Underpass
- Truck Parking


## (1) Safety

- 2019-Craig Residency ADA Project Constructing and/or modifying ADA ramps in Craig, Hayden \& Rangely
- Pedestrian/Sidewalks along Highway 40 between Steamboat Springs and Hayden
- Brandon Circle Pedestrian Underpass
- US40 Pedestrian Improvements - Pine Grove Road to Walmart



## (3) Asset Management

- 2019-US 40 Craig East BPM - 5 Bridges in Moffat \& Routt Counties - 3 in/close to Craig, 2 near Hayden - Preventative Maintenance and scour mitigation


## Mobility

- Truck Parking, Kremmling
- Truck Parking
- Truck Parking
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements


## ! Safety

- US 40 Craig to Empire Jct
- Left Turn at Finley Lane and 40
- Banners over HWY 40
- Shared Use Path (Concrete) - US 40 from Wicks Ave. to CR 7



## (3) Asset Management

- US 40 East of Hayden Ph 1
- US 40 East of Hayden Ph 2
- US 40 Tabernash West


## Mobility

- US 40 / SH 14 Park and Ride
- North of Kremmling MM178 to MM184 (Kremmling to Hwy 134)
- Mt. Harris Canyon


## (1) Safety

US40 Shoulders - MP 163.5-171.5

- North of Kremmling MM157 to MM176 (Just north of Wolford to Hwy 14)
US 40 Wildlife mitigation 90-120 - East of Craig



## Corridor Name

US Highway 40 West: Utah Border to West of Craig

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the U.S. 40 corridor (Segment 1) is primarily to maintain system quality, improve safety and increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

Overall this corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility that provides inter/ intra-regional connections to both places within and outside the region.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Scenic Byway, Utah borderline to Dinosaur (Dinosaur Diamond)
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 15 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Pavement condition is poor
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities


|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographics Transit | Passes through a census tract with higher percentage of disabled population | Mobility Hub Transit | Greyhound Bus, between Denver and Steamboat Inter-city bus stop in Dinosaur and Craig |
| Safety | Several segments with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) | Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Maybell |
|  | One segment with shoulders <2' | Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Freight Safety | Dense wildlife crashes Hazmat Route | Economics | High truck traffic west of Craig and Maybell Provides access to recreational area (BLM) |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Two segments of low drivability life |  |  |



[^10]| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on US 40 and SH 13 | Add fiber network on US 40 and SH 13 | 1035 | (8) | (1) | (1) | - |
| Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG) | Expand marketing, outreach, and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG). Marketing is $\$ 20,000$ per year for 10 years. Total cost is \$200,000 | 2377 | (-) | (n) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.20 |
| Increase Truck Parking | Increase Truck Parking (Dinosaur to Elk Springs). Most likely through private investment. | 2385 | (-) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.33 |

## Project Types



[^11]
## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
reigh
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## (3) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)
- Increase Truck Parking
(1) Safety
- ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 40 and SH 13



## Corridor Name

US Highway 64: Dinosaur to Meeker

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US Highway 64 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality and improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an intra-regional facility that provides local access as well as connecting the communities of Dinosaur, Rangely and Meeker.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway - Dinosaur to Rangely (Dinosaur Diamond)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 8 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Pavement condition is poor


|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Safety | Several segments with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
|  |  | Pedestrian <br> Economics | DOLA affiliated Main Street through Rangely |
| Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' Dense wildlife crashes Hazmat Route |  |  |
|  |  | Resiliency | Low redundancy |
|  |  | Freight Economics | Concentration of jobs in Rangely Concentration of oil and gas wells Active coal mining permits Provides access to recreational area (BLM) |
| Asset Management | Low drivability life - two segments |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Pedestrian Transit | Inter-city bus station in Dinosaur Rio Blanco County Meeker Streaker services |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |



[^12]| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project <br> Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 64 Shoulder widening Meeker to Rangely | - | 1738 | (1) | (1) 6 | (1) | \$190.00 |
| 2021-SH 64 Rangely/US 40 Dinosaur - <br> SH 64 MM 19.8-28 \& US 40 MM 0-7 <br> Minor rehab - anticipate 1.5"-2.0" HMA | - | 1739 | (1) | (-) 3 |  | - |
| Roadway Widening, Rangely to SH 13, 73.5 miles (project cost $+/-\$ 3 \mathrm{M} /$ mile) | - | 1740 | (1) | - | (1) | \$221.00 |
| Pedestrian Path, Kennedy to Kenny Reservoir | 5 Miles of Path out to Kenny Reservoir from Kennedy Drive | 1741 | ( 6.6 | (n) $\because$ | 0 (1) | - |
| Main Street/ Hwy 64 Pedestrian Walk Improvements | Pedestrian improvements | 1742 | ( |  | 0 ( 0 | \$0.75 |
| Pedestrian Path, Hwy 64 up Kennedy Drive | 1 Mile path up Kennedy Drive | 1743 | ( | (1) | (1) | - |
| Replace Wood Bridge at MM 70.175 | - | 1744 | $(8)$ | (I) ! | 13 | \$1.20 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 64/CR 5 Bridge replacement, SH 64 improvements, and CR 5 improvement | - | 1745 | 8 | (1) ! |  | \$13.00 |
| Replace Narrow Concrete Bridge at White River - MM 54.421 | - | 1746 | 3 | (I) ! | 19 | \$1.50 |
| Extend Length of Box Culvert | - | 1747 |  | (J) | 1 | \$0.90 |
| Workforce transit to Picenance Creek | - | 1748 | (-) | (-1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Restrooms on SH 64 | - | 1749 | 3 | (1) | 0 | \$0.50 |
| SH 64 East of Rangely | Rural road surface treatment | 2659 | ) | (1) | 9 | \$4.50 |
| SH 64 from MP 44 to MP 56 west of Meeker | Rural road surface treatment | 46 | (3) | (1) | $(9)$ | \$8.80 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits



Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilience
Pedestrian


Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit
SWP Goal Area



## (1) Asset <br> Management

- 2021-SH 64 Rangely/US 40 Dinosaur - SH 64 MM 19.8-28 \& US 40 MM 0-7 Minor rehab anticipate 1.5"-2.0" HMA
- Replace Wood Bridge at MM 70.175
- Extend Length of Box Culvert
- Restrooms on SH 64
- SH 64 East of Rangely
- SH 64 from MP 44 to MP 56 west of Meeker


## Mobility

- Pedestrian Path, Kennedy to Kenny Reservoir
- Main Street/ Hwy 64 Pedestrian Walk Improvements
- Pedestrian Path, Hwy 64 up Kennedy Drive
- Workforce transit to Picenance Creek


## (!) Safety

- SH 64 Shoulder widening Meeker to Rangely
- Roadway Widening, Rangely to SH 13, 73.5 miles (project cost $+/-\$ 3 \mathrm{M} /$ mile
- SH 64/CR 5 Bridge replacement, SH 64 improvements, and CR 5 improvement
- Replace Narrow Concrete Bridge at White River - MM 54.421

State Highway 125: North of Granby to the Wyoming Border (PNW7008)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 125: North of Granby to the Wyoming Border

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 125 corridor is primarily to improve safety and maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an inter/ intraregional facility that provides local access, and makes north-south connections within the north of Granby to Wyoming line area. Also, this corridor serves as an alternate route to the Front Range when Berthoud Pass closes during the winter.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 23 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Questions about technology/ data

Key Data Findings: State Highway 125: North of Granby to the Wyoming
Border (PNW7008)

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through a census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' <br> Hazmat Route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life for most of the corridor |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Amtrak stop in Granby <br> Inter-city bus station in Granby |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Walden |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics <br> Freight | High truck traffic near Wyoming border <br> Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MM 1 to MM 9 (increased traffic w $\backslash$ Lazy U and additional homes) | Shoulder Improvements | 1750 | (1) | (1) | (1) | - |
| South of Walden MM 30 to 52 | - | 1751 | 3 | (-2) | 5 | - |
| Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG) | Expand marketing, outreach, and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG). Marketing is $\$ 20,000$ per year for 10 years. Total cost is \$200,000 | 2377 | (-) | (i) 3 | $\leftrightarrow$ | \$0.20 |
| SH 125 Walden North | Rural road surface treatment | 2656 | 3 | (1) | 9 | \$5.55 |
| SH 125 Cowdrey | Rural road surface treatment | 2660 | ( | (1) | S | \$6.42 |
| SH 125 from MP 53.3 to MP 60 north of Walden | Rural road surface treatment | 55 | 6 | (1) | 9 | \$1.00 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Quality of Lif
Bicycle
Resilience
Pedestrian
Pedestrian
an


Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## (1) Asset Management

- South of Walden MM 30 to 52
- SH 125 Walden North
- SH 125 Cowdrey
- SH 125 from MP 53.3 to MP 60 north of Walden


## Mobility

- Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)


## ! Safety

- MM 1 to MM 9 (increased traffic w $\backslash$ C Lazy $U$ and additional homes)




## Corridor Name

State Highway 127: Northeast of Walden to the Wyoming Border

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an intra-regional facility that provides local access.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments specifically about this corridor


## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 127 corridor is primarily to improve safety and to maintain system quality.


| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through a census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ population |  |  |
|  |  | Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) | Economics Freight | High truck traffic Provides access to recreational area |
| Freight Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulder $<\gtrless^{\prime}$ Hazmat Route |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficiencies$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)


## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilience
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## (P) Asset <br> Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


- No projects have been identified for this goal area

State Highway 131: Wolcott North to Steamboat Springs/ US 40


## Corridor Name

State Highway 131: Wolcott North to Steamboat Springs/ US 40

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 131 corridor is primarily to improve safety and maintain system quality as well as to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a local commuter corridor and as an inter/intra-regional facility that connects to places outside the region including an alternative north-south route from l-70 to the recreational facilities within the Steamboat Springs area. Additionally, this corridor serves as a potential link to transit/ future rail artery along l-70.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R3-11


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 17 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for regional transit
- Concerns about safety

Key Data Findings: State Highway 131: Wolcott North to Steamboat

## Key Data Findings:

| Safety | Several segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulder $<^{\prime}$ <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Oak Creek |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Steamboat Springs |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)Provide additional travel optionsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Craig and Vail (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Craig and Vail. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1033 | (-) | (n) 0 | ¢ | \$2.66 |
| SH 131 Safety improvements Widening and paved shoulders | - | 1752 | (1) | (1) 6 | (1) | \$25.00 |
| SH 131 shoulder widening (MM 21 51) | - | 1753 | (1) | (a) 6 | (1) | \$105.00 |
| SH 131 Shoulders - North and South of Yampa MP 35-45 | - | 1754 | (1) | (n) 6 | (1) | \$35.00 |
| Continued widening from where it left off before Oak Creek Canyon to Eagle City line | - | 1755 | (1) | (1) 0 | (1) 5 | - |
| Widening of 131 through Oak Creek Canyon (Phase I-minor reshouldering and Phase II full project) | - | 1756 | (1) | (1) 6 | (1) 5 | - |
| South Routt Park and Ride Facility | - | 1757 | (-) | (3) | $\theta$ | \$1.65 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits





Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
reigh
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process




## Corridor Name

State Highway 134
Gore Pass, US 40 to SH 131

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 134 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality and improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor primarily serves as a connecting facility linking SH 131 with US 40 as well as providing access to public lands. This is corridor is also an alternate route when I-70 and Rabbit Ears Pass are closed. However, if and when Rabbit Ears Pass is closed this corridor needs to be cleared for safe travel.

Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high <br> percentage of poverty levels |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Several segments with elevated crash <br> patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) |  | Economics | Provides access to recreational area |
| Safety | Several segments with shoulders <2' |  | Low redundancy |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 134: Gore Pass, US 40 to SH 131


[^13]| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (ln millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Widening from Y at Toponas to Grand County line | - | 1758 | (1) | - | $\theta$ | - |
| Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG) | Expand marketing, outreach, and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG). Marketing is $\$ 20,000$ per year for 10 years. Total cost is $\$ 200,000$ | 2377 | (9) | (12) $\Leftrightarrow$ | 0 | \$0.20 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## (1) Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area

State Highway 139: Loma North to Rangely (PNW7012)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 139: Loma North to Rangely

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 139 corridor is primarily to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an inter/ intraregional facility that connects to places both within and outside the region, including a direct connection to l-70.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Dinosaur Diamond)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor
- Desire for wider shoulders

Key Data Findings: State Highway 139: Loma North to Rangely (PNW7012)


## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (including wildlife crashes)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 139: Little Horse South | Safety improvements to CO 139 near Little Horse South will include surface reconstruction and the addition of 6-foot-wide paved shoulders. This project will begin at the south end of the Canyon Pintado National Historic District. | 1266 | 13 | $\text { (i) } 60$ |  | \$22.79 |
| SH 139 Safety improvements Addition of paved shoulders - MM 39.5-72 | - | 1759 | (1) | (1) 9 | (1) | \$23.00 |
| Repair/maintenance of Hwy 139 | - | 1760 |  | (I) ! |  | - |
| Widening, Repair Douglas Pass, Surface Treatment | - | 1761 | $(3)$ | (I) | (1) | \$20.00 |
| SH 139 Douglas Creek | Rural road surface treatment | 2652 | 3 | (1) | 19 | \$6.78 |
| SH 139 South of Rangely | Rural road surface treatment | 2655 | $(3)$ | (1) | 1 | \$7.10 |
| SH 139 from MP 37.5 to MP 52.8 north of Douglas Pass | Rural road surface treatment | 53 | $(3)$ | (1) | (1) | \$8.40 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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## Corridor Name

State Highway 317: Hamilton to Pagoda

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 317 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a local facility providing local access to recreational sites and public lands.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments specifically about this corridor

Key Data Findings: State Highway 317: Hamilton to Pagoda (PNW7013)


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through a census tract with higher <br> percentage of disabled population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders <2' |
| Asset <br> Management | One segment of low drivability life |


| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Provides access to recreational area (BLM) |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor
$\rightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

Corridor Projects: State Highway 317: Hamilton to Pagoda (PNW7013)
Primary Additional SWP
Planning
Project ID

Project Types
Expand marketing, outreach, and
coordination of Mountain Rides
(NWCCOG). Marketing is $\$ 20,000$ per
year for 10 years. Total cost is
$\$ 200,000$

2377
Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)

Expand marketing, outreach, and year for 10 years. Total cost is \$200,000

Project
Benefits

(14) 3 $\Leftrightarrow$

Project Types


Project Benefits



Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilience
Pedestrian


Mobility Options
Asset
Management A Aviation
Freight
Aviation

SWP Goal Area


Project Based Strategies: State Highway 317: Hamilton to Pagoda


## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)


## (1) Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area

State Highway 318: Utah Border to the J unction with US 40 (PNW7014)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 318: Utah Border to the J unction with US 40 (PNW7014)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 318 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the northwest portion of the TPR area.

Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- 4 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor

Key Data Findings: State Highway 318: Utah Border to the J unction with


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through a census tract with higher <br> percentage of disabled population |  | Bicycling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$| Economics stress for bicycling |
| :--- |$\quad$ Provides access to recreational area (BLM)



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor
$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expand marketing, outreach and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG) | Expand marketing, outreach, and coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG). Marketing is $\$ 20,000$ per year for 10 years. Total cost is \$200,000 | 2377 | (9) | (x) 0 |  | \$0.20 |
| SH 318 (Far) West of Maybell | Rural road surface treatment | 2649 | 3 | (1) | $(8)$ | \$6.74 |
| Rehab and Overlay - CR 10 N to CR 21 | - | 1762 | (3) | (1) | 1 | - |
| SH 318 from MP 0 to MP 15 east of Browns Park | Rural road surface treatment | 48 | $8$ | (1) | 3 | \$9.50 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## (3) Asset <br> Management

- SH 318 (Far) West of Maybell
- Rehab and Overlay - CR 10 N to CR 21
- SH 318 from MP 0 to MP 15 east of Browns Park
- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## (!) Safety

coordination of Mountain Rides (NWCCOG)

## Mobility

- Expand marketing, outreach and



## Corridor Name

State Highway 394: Craig to CR 30 (PNW7015)

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a local facility providing local access.

Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- 4 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor
- Desire for better pedestrian
facilities
- Desire for better bicycle facilities

The Vision for the State Highway 394 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality and to improve safety.


Key Data Findings:

| Safety | Several segments with shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Craig |



Corridor Needs
$\triangle$ Eliminate shoulder deficiencies

Corridor Projects: State Highway 394: Craig to CR 30 (PNW7015)
Planning
Project ID

Primary Additional
Project Project Types
Shared Use Path (8' shoulder
enlargement) - Victory Way / US 40 to SH 394

Description
1763

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilience
Pedestrian


Mobility Options
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit


- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## ! Safety

- See project: Shared Use Path ( $8^{\prime}$ shoulder enlargement) - Victory Way / US 40 to SH 394

Corridor Projects: Non-Corridor Specific (Part 1/2)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-70 Wrong Way Ramp Detection | - | 2349 | (1) | (-6) | (1) | \$4.50 |
| Region Wide Dilemma Zone Detection | - | 2350 | (1) | - | ! | \$1.50 |
| Region Wide <br> Unsignalized <br> Intersection Warning <br> Systems | - | 2351 | 4 | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HSIP + HRRR Off-system LA Program | - | 2352 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.10 |
| Region 3 HSIP | - | 2353 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HRRR Offsystem LA Program | - | 2354 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HSIP | - | 2355 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HRRR Offsystem LA Program | - | 2356 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HSIP | - | 2357 | (1) | - | ! | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HRRR Offsystem LA Program | - | 2358 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HSIP | - | 2359 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |

## Project Types


Capacity
Asset
Managemen
Pedestrian

## Project Benefits

(i) Economic Vitality
(1) Public Health
Tourism
Environmental


## SWP Goal Area



Mobil
Management
Freight

Corridor Projects: Non-Corridor Specific(Part 2/2)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 3 HRRR Offsystem LA Program | - | 2360 | (1) | - | 4 | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HSIP | - | 2361 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HRRR Offsystem LA Program | - | 2362 | (1) | - | 1 | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HSIP | - | 2363 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HRRR Offsystem LA Program | - | 2364 | (1) | - | 4 | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HSIP | - | 2365 | ! | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HRRR Offsystem LA Program | - | 2366 | (1) | - | 4 | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HSIP | - | 2367 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Region 3 HRRR Offsystem LA Program | - | 2368 | (1) | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Strategic Safety - 6 inch striping | - | 2369 | 1 | - | (1) | \$0.58 |
| Strategic Safety - 6 inch striping | - | 2370 | ! | - | 4 | \$1.20 |
| Strategic Safety - 6 inch striping | - | 2371 | (1) | - | 4 | \$1.20 |
| NWTPR Shoulder Improvements | - | 2375 | (1) | (-) | (1) | \$3.00 |

## Project Types


 Transit
Asset
Management
Pedestrian

## Project Benefits

(i.) Economic Vitality
(1) Public Health
(I) Tourism
(d) Environmental

SWP Goal Area



- See corridor projects


## Mobility

- See projects:, I-70 Wrong Way Ramp Detection, NWTPR Shoulder Improvements

- I-70 Wrong Way Ramp Detection
- Region Wide Dilemma Zone Detection
- Region Wide Unsignalized Intersection Warning Systems
- Region 3 HSIP + HRRR Off-system LA Program
- Region 3 HSIP
- Region 3 HRRR Off-system LA Program
- Region 3 HSIP
- NWTPR Shoulder Improvements

- See corridor projects


- Region 3 HRRR Off-system LA Program
- Region 3 HSIP
- Region 3 HRRR Off-system LA Program
- Region 3 HSIP
- Region 3 HRRR Off-system LA Program
- Region 3 HSIP
- Region 3 HRRR Off-system LA Program
- Region 3 HSIP



## Asset Management

- See corridor projects



## (1) Safety

- Region 3 HRRR Off-system LA Program
- Region 3 HSIP
- Region 3 HRRR Off-system LA Program
- Region 3 HSIP
- Region 3 HRRR Off-system LA Program
- Strategic Safety - 6 inch striping
- Strategic Safety - 6 inch striping
- Strategic Safety - 6 inch striping


## CDOT Region 2

Counties:
Huerfano, Las Animas

> II The vision for the South Central TPR will provide a safe, reliable, cost-effective, and accessible multimodal transportation system that accommodates and enhances the region's high quality of life while preserving the environments that make Huerfano and Las Animas Counties great places to live, work, and visit. II


## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Address roadway condition
- Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
- Provide additional travel options
- Integrate technologies (such as EV, fiber, ITS, and communication)
- Address environmental impacts (air pollution)
* Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback


## What We've Heard about the South Central TPR

- 227 public and stakeholder comments specifically about the South Central TPR
- 63 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the South Central TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" public survey respondents in the South Central TPR, combined with stakeholder input, selected: Lack of travel options, Road condition and safety, and Freight
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the South Central TPR (in order of frequency) include: bus service/ transit, safety, road condition, passenger rail, trucking and freight


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics | 2015 Population: 19, 789 <br> 2045 Forecasted Population: 17,595 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | 2015 J obs: 9,224 <br> 2045 Forecasted J obs: 9,309 |
| Economics | Top industries: tourism, oil and gas |
| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 1.07 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 1.39 Million |
| Asset <br> Management | 69 miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 279 miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 63 miles of highway with low drivability life |

State Highway 10: Between I-25 (Walsenburg) and the Pueblo County


## Corridor Name

State Highway 10: Between I-25 (Walsenburg) and the Pueblo County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 10, I-25 (Walsenburg) to Pueblo County Line, corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 10 serves as a regional facility providing both local access and regional connectivity between
Walsenburg and La Junta. This corridor is a designated Colorado Freight Corridor and provides freight mobility as well local and regional connections.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for safer conditions for bicycling
- Desire for turn Ianes
- Would like CDOT to evaluate the I25 and SH 10 intersection for improvements

Key Data Findings: State Highway 10: Between I-25 (Walsenburg) and the


## Key Data Findings:

Demographics
Transit

| Transit | percentage of 65+, disabled, minority, and <br> low-income populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' <br> One segment with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4); Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Segments of Iow drivability life |


| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Very low redundancy |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic (greater <br> than 20\%) |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 10: Between I-25 (Walsenburg) and the


## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficienciesCorridor Projects: State Highway 10: Between I-25 (Walsenburg) and the
Pueblo County Line (PSC7001)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-25: SH 10/ US 160 <br> Interchange <br> Reconstruction at Walsenburg | Reconstruction of I-25/SH 10/US 160 Interchange (MP 50). | 1036 | (8) $!$ | 13 |  | \$50.00 |
| Proposed SH 10 <br>  <br> Resurfacing | Widen SH 10 along the highway at selected areas, resurface the roadway (Between MP 0.0 and MP 79.6 at selected areas and resurface the highway between MP 0.0 and MP 46.6). | 1492 | (1) | 60 |  | \$10.00 |
| SH 10 Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Wild Animal, Fixed Objects, and Overturning. | 2341 | (1) | (1) | (1) | \$0.03 |
| Walsenburg East | Rural road surface treatment. | 2618 | (3) | (1) | 5 | \$7.85 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



- Walsenburg East



## ! Safety

- Proposed SH 10 Shoulder Widening \& Resurfacing
- SH 10 Safety Study

State Highway 12: Between US 160 (La Veta) and I-25 (Trinidad)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 12: Between US 160 (La Veta) and I-25 (Trinidad)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 12, US 160 (La Veta) and I-25 (Trinidad), corridor is primarily to improve safety and multimodal connections.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 12 traverses the Spanish Peaks area via the Highway of Legends Scenic Byway and the Cucharas Pass area. The communities along the corridor depend on the tourism, mining, and agriculture industries. Current and future multimodal travel needs include transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. State Highway 12 primarily connects local towns, cities, and destinations along the corridor to more major highways like US 160 and I-25. Increasing multimodal connectivity is important for this corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R2-11)
- Scenic Byway (Highway of Legends)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 22 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for greater walking and biking connectivity, parallel trail
- Desire for a safer corridor (add shoulders and signage to increase awareness of active transportation)
- Interest in adding tourism wayfinding and information



| Corridor Needs |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations | (i) Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor |
| Improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreation (consider addition of passing lanes and turn lanes) | Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas) |
| © Mitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes) | $\triangle$ Improve bicycle accommodation |
| ( Eliminate shoulder deficiencies | ( Provide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs) |


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expanded Regional <br> Transit Service between Walsenburg- <br> La Veta-Gardner- <br> Cuchara | New Vans (3) to expand Walsenburg Service to La Veta, Gardner, and Cuchara w/ operating expenses | 1038 | (-) | (iil) $\theta$ (n) | $\theta$ | \$1.40 |
| Bike/Pedestrian: <br> Southern Mountain Loop Trail | This trail project will complete the Southern Mountain Loop of the Colorado Front Range Trail. <br> This portion of the Southern Mountain Loop will run approximately 85 miles with segments that are both on the road and segments that are separated from the road, providing a bicycle and pedestrian trail connecting Interstate 25 in Walsenburg with Interstate 25 in Trinidad. | 1039 |  |  |  | \$33.00 |
| Expanded Regional <br> Transit Service between Trinidad and SH 12 Communities | New Vans (6) to expand Trinidad Transit service on Highway 12 to Segundo, Weston, Stonewall Gap, and Monument Lake w/operating expenses. | 1267 | (-) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$3.14 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADA ramps \& Sidewalk Improvements in La Veta and Trinidad | Upgrade ADA Ramps to meet current standard, and improve sidewalk at selected locations (La Veta, Trinidad). | 1493 | $N$ |  |  | \$1.00 |
| Junction US 160 South | Rural road surface treatment. | 2619 | (3) | (1) | 5 | \$2.81 |
| East of Valdez to Trinidad | Rural road surface treatment. | 2620 | $P$ | (1) | 3 | \$6.26 |
| Bridge Preventative <br> Maintenance: CO 12 <br> and CO 194 | Repairs three bridges in Southeastern Colorado. Two of the bridges date back to the 1930's and the other one to the 1950's. | 19 |  | (1) | 13 | \$2.50 |

## Project Types



Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits





Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## (3) Asset <br> Management

- Junction US 160 South
- East of Valdez to Trinidad
- Bridge Preventative Maintenance: CO 12 and CO 194

- Expanded Regional Transit Service between Walsenburg-La Veta-GardnerCuchara
- Expanded Regional Transit Service between Trinidad and SH 12 Communities
- Bike/Pedestrian: Southern Mountain Loop Trail


## ! Safety

- ADA ramps \& Sidewalk Improvements in La Veta and Trinidad



## Corridor Name

Interstate 25A: Between New Mexico and the Pueblo County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the I-25, New Mexico state line to Pueblo County Line, corridor is to increase mobility as well as to maintain system quality and improve safety.

## Corridor Description

Interstate 25 is the primary corridor providing connectivity and mobility to South Central Colorado. The Interstate 25 corridor serves as one of the state's highest volume corridors and is a key gateway of statewide significance for passenger vehicles, freight, and transit vehicles. Many visitors to Colorado enter on this gateway corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Section of Scenic Byway, Trinidad to New Mexico state line (Santa Fe Trail)
- Priority 1 Fiber Corridor (Colorado City to TPR 4 Pueblo)
- Tier 1 CNG and EV Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 42 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for more travel options such as bus transit and passenger rail
- Concerns about the amount of traffic and heavy vehicles passing through region
- Desire for better signage and realtime communications (incident management and road closures)
- Acknowledgement of the corridor as the most important route in the region

Key Data Findings: Interstate I-25A: Between New Mexico and the Pueblo

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+, disabled, minority, and low-income <br> populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Short segments of shoulders $<^{\prime}$ <br> Multiple locations with elevated crash patterns (LOSS <br> 3 or 4), concentrated on I-25 south of Trinidad <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Segment of low drivability life north of the Huerfano <br> River to the TPR border; two bridges in poor <br> condition |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | SCCOG operates on corridor <br> Trinidad Multi-modal Center (SCCOG) |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | High criticality; maj ority of the corridor has very low <br> redundancy |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Trinidad and <br> Walsenburg |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic (greater than 20\%) |



Corridor Needs: Interstate I-25A: Between New Mexico and the Pueblo

## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobsEliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress pavement conditions where drivability life is poorAddress bridges in poor conditionMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesIntegrate technologies (EV, CNG, Fiber, ITS,Communication)


Corridor Projects: Interstate I-25A: Between New Mexico and the
Pueblo County Line (PSC7003)(Page 1/ 4)

| Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reconstruction of I-25/SH 10/US 160 Interchange (MP 50). | 1036 | (1) 8 | - | 1) | \$50.00 |
| Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 |  | (12) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$5.02 |
| Add fiber on l-25. | 1042 | (8) | - | $91$ | \$9.00 |
| Multimodal center to serve Amtrak, Greyhound and SCCOG transit services. | 1269 | (-) | (x) $\Rightarrow$ |  | \$2.00 |
| Garage and maintenance facility and offices to serve SCCOG and City of Trinidad transit services (with expanded services) This will hold 7 buses and 7 vans. | 1270 | (-) |  | s | \$2.63 |
| New buses (2) to expand Trinidad Transit service to Pueblo w/ operating expenses. | 1271 | (-) | (n) * | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.15 |
| Garage and offices to serve SCCOG Walsenburg, La Veta, Cuchara, and Gardner transit services (with expanded services). This will hold 1 bus and 3 vans. | 1272 | (-) | $5$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.67 |

## Project Types



Safety
 Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits


Pedestrian

ity

## SWP Goal Area



Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Trinidad and Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service from Trinidad to Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1273 |  | (n) $\Rightarrow$ |  | \$2.16 |
| I-25 A (MP 5.583-5.600) Repair Structure P-18-BP to allow over weight load utilization | Repair structure P-18-BP by injecting epoxy resin and fiber wrapping the appropriate areas in order to bring this structure's weight rating to a white rating and therefore allowing over weight (OW) loads to utilize this route once again. This will significantly reduce miles driven by OSOW in our state as well as ease stresses that over size/over weight OSOW loads are causing on US 287/ US 385. | 1276 | $(1)$ | $3$ |  | \$1.20 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits


Mobility Options
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

Corridor Projects: Interstate I-25A: Between New Mexico and the

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-25 Raised Pavement Markings | I-25 Raised Pavement Markings. | 1495 | $!$ | - | (1) | \$1.50 |
| Create or expand chainup and parking facilities (La Veta, CO) | Partner with NMDOT to improve signing \& open existing rest area / truck parking area on northbound I25 at the state line. Also may be able to use existing temporary northbound weigh station as a chain-up area. | 1496 |  |  |  | \$0.05 |
| Increase Truck Parking (I25 El Moro) | Existing CDOT rest area; could be expanded within existing CDOT ROW but would require access and circulation changes. | 1497 |  | $3$ | $\theta 3$ | \$0.15 |
| Create or expand chainup and parking facilities (Walsenburg, CO) | Expansion of the existing TA travel center could be possible on land already owned by the existing TA. This land is a dirt lot already used for overflow truck parking. CDOT could partner with TA to pave this area to make it usable year-round. | 1498 |  |  |  | \$0.32 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits



Mo
As
M Mobilit
Management
Freight
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SWP Goal Area


Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

Corridor Projects: Interstate I-25A: Between New Mexico and the

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-25 Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Fixed Objects, Wild Animal, and Overturning. | 2343 | (-) |  | (1) | \$0.05 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 3 locations: Colorado City Corners, Walsenburg, and Aguilar. | 2497 | (1) | (a) $\rightarrow$ (ill | $\theta$ | \$0.20 |
| South Central Storage and Maintenance Facility (Construction) | Construction of new bus storage and maintenance facility in Trinidad to serve SCCOG Transit and CDOT's Outrider service. Funding will be determined at a later date. | 2743 | (-) | $3$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | TBD |
| I-25 Raton Pass Safety and Interchange Improvements (Part 1) Exit 11 | At Exit 11, the project constructs a new, wider bridge over I-25 which connects to existing roundabouts. The project will assess other safety improvements from MP 0-12 including rockfall mitigation or improved access to the future Fisher's Peak State Park. | 13 | (1) | (8) -5 is -6 |  | \$12.00 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Asset Management

- I-25 A (MP 5.583-5.600) Repair Structure P-18-BP to allow overweight load utilization
- Create or expand chain-up and parking facilities (La Veta, CO)
- Increase Truck Parking (I-25 El Moro)
- Create or expand chain-up and parking facilities (Walsenburg, CO)


## Mobility

- Expanded Regional Transit Service between Trinidad and Pueblo
- ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on I-25 and US 160
- Walsenburg Transit Garage
- Essential Bus Service between Trinidad and Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Trinidad Multimodal Center
- Essential Bus Service between Durango-South Fork-Alamosa-Walsenburg-Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- South Central (Trinidad) Bus Storage, Maintenance Facility, and Admin Offices (Design + Construction)
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements
- I-25: SH 10/ US 160 Interchange Reconstruction at Walsenburg
- South Central Storage and Maintenance Facility (Construction)


## (1) Safety

- I-25 Raton Pass Safety and Interchange Improvements (Part 1) - Exit 11
- I-25 Safety Study
- I-25 Raised Pavement Markings


Interstate I-25B: Business Route (Aguilar) (PSC7004)


## Corridor Name

Interstate 25B: Business Route (Aguilar)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the I-25 Business Loop (Aguilar) is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

Interstate 25B makes a north-south connection between the Town of Aguilar and I-25. The corridor primarily provides local access.

Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments specifically about this corridor


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$, disabled, minority, and low-income <br> populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Aguilar |



## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

Corridor Projects: Interstate I-25B: Business Route (Aguilar) (PSC7004)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this corridor | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Project Types



Project Benefits



Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilienc
Pedestrian
Pedestrian


Mobility Options
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit

## (1) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


Interstate I-25C: Business Loop (Walsenburg) (PSC7005)


## Corridor Name

Interstate 25C: Business Loop (Walsenburg)

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the I-25 Business Loop (Walsenburg) is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase multimodal connectivity.

## Corridor Description

Interstate 25C serves as a main street in Walsenburg and makes multimodal north-south connections within the downtown area. The corridor primarily serves Walsenburg while also supporting the movement of freight in and through the area. Maintaining the downtown character of the corridor is important while also providing freight movement and supporting local access and connectivity.

## Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- 9 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns with traffic congestion from heavy vehicles
- Desire for better road conditions
- Desire for crosswalk improvements
- Concerns about environmental impacts from trucks

|  | Key Data Findings: |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\substack{\text { Demographics } \\ \text { Transit }}_{\text {den }}$ | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+, disabled, minority, and low-income populations |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Walsenburg |

Key Data Findings:

## Transit

Passes through census tract with higher percentage populations

Bicycling
High concentration of jobs in Walsenburg


## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)Improve access to jobsAddress environmental impacts (air pollution)Address roadway conditionAddress congestion caused by slow moving vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I25C \& US160 <br> Intersection Improvements | Roundabout or other mitigation to address intersection operation \& drainage issues (The intersection of I-25C and US 160). | 1502 | (1) 8 | (3) |  | \$4.00 |
| I-25 Business Route through Walsenburg | Rural road surface treatment. | 2616 | $3$ | (1) | $8$ | \$2.83 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


- I-25 Business Route through Walsenburg
- I25C \& US160 Intersection Improvements




## Corridor Name

State Highway 69: Between US 160 (Walsenburg) and the Custer County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for State Highway 69, (Walsenburg) to Custer County Line, corridor is to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 69 provides north-south connectivity between Walsenburg and US 50. The corridor serves as main street for smaller local communities like Gardner and also provides freight connections between South Central Colorado and Northwest Colorado. The corridor's safety and operations are impacted by the increase in freight.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 7 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about the increase in truck traffic
- Curves and lack of shoulders create unsafe conditions
- Desire for shoulders



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+, disabled, minority, and <br> low-income (near Walsenburg) populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' <br> One segment with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Asset <br> Management | One bridge in poor condition (west of <br> Gardner) |


| Transit | SCCOG operates on corridor |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Very low redundancy |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Wal senburg |

Asset
Management

One bridge in poor condition (west of Gardner)


## Corridor Needs

$\rightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Improve access to jobsEliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress bridge in poor conditionAccommodate seasonal increases in truck activity and associated congestion

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 69 Improvements | Shoulder widening, safety improvements, and passing lanes on SH 69 (MP 0-42). | 1037 | (1) | 63 |  | \$21.00 |
| Expanded Regional <br> Transit Service between Walsenburg- <br> La Veta-Gardner- <br> Cuchara | New Vans (3) to expand Walsenburg Service to La Veta, Gardner, and Cuchara w/ operating expenses. | 1038 | (-) | (x) $\Rightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$1.40 |
| Improve M-16-Q on $\text { SH } 69$ | Replace M-16-Q (MP 27.50). | 1505 | $8$ | ( | 9 | \$5.00 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits




Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilience
Pedestrian
Pedestria


Mobility Options
Asset
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



- Improve M-16-Q on SH 69

(1) Safety
- SH 69 Improvements



## Corridor Name

State Highway 109: Between US 160 and the Bent County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 109, from US 160 north to Bent County Line, corridor is primarily to maintain system quality while improving safety.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 109 provides local access between Kim and La J unta and makes north-south connections within South Central Colorado. The corridor primarily serves local properties, small towns, and destinations like the Comanche National Grassland along the corridor. The communities along the corridor place a high value on system preservation and safety.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 6 comments specifically about this corridor
- Significant concerns about the pavement condition and low drivability life
- Concerns about the increase in truck traffic

Key Data Findings: State Highway 109: Between US 160 and the Bent

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ and disabled populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Entire corridor has shoulders $<^{\prime}$ <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Majority of the corridor has low drivability life |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Very low redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area (National <br> Forest) |
| Economics <br> Freight | High percentage of truck traffic (greater than 20\%) |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 109: Between US 160 and the Bent

## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove access to recreationImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles

Corridor Projects: State Highway 109: Between US 160 and the Bent
County Line (PSC7007)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 109A from SH 160 to south of County Rd E, MP 0 to MP 31 | Rural road surface treatment | 29 |  | (1) | $\theta$ | \$15.00 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits


Mobility Options
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area

Pedestrian

## ( Asset Management

- SH 109A from SH 160 to south of County Rd E, MP 0 to MP 31




## Corridor Name

US Highway 160A: Between La Veta Pass to the UPRR in Walsenburg

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160, La Veta Pass east to (Walsenburg) corridor, is primarily to increase mobility while maintaining system quality and improving safety.

## Corridor Description

US 160 is the primary east-west facility in South Central Colorado. US 160 is a multimodal facility, connecting the South Central region to places outside the region. The corridor will continue to serve as a major freight and tourism route connecting to other major corridors such as $\mathrm{I}-25$ and US 50 . The corridor is important to commuters and tourists as it provides access to jobs and recreation in the region.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R2-11)
- Section of Scenic Byway, La Veta (SH 12) to Walsenburg (Highway of Legends)
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 11 comments specifically about this corridor
- Acknowledgement of route's significance to the region
- Desire for more passing lanes; appreciation for recent additions
- Desire for bicycle facilities
- Concerns about flooding and the criticality of US 160 as an evacuation route


| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Transit | SCCOG operates on corridor Walsenburg Transit Garage (SCCOG) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+, disabled, and low-income (near Walsenburg) populations |  |  |
|  |  | Bicycling | Sections with high bicyclist activity |
| Freight Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4); Dense wildlife crashes near between TPR border and Walsenburg; Hazmat route |  | Medium to high stress for bicycling |
|  |  | Economics Resiliency | Very low redundancy |
|  |  | Economics Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells |
| Freight Asset Management | Segments of low drivability life | Freight | High percentage of truck traffic (greater than 20\%) |



## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)
Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress unsafe passing conditions
$\triangle$ Improve bicycle accommodationImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesProvide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expanded Regional <br> Transit Service between WalsenburgLa Veta-GardnerCuchara | New Vans (3) to expand Walsenburg Service to La Veta, Gardner, and Cuchara w/ operating expenses. | 1038 | (-) | (x) $\sim 0$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.40 |
| Bike/Pedestrian: <br> Southern Mountain Loop Trail | This trail project will complete the Southern Mountain Loop of the Colorado Front Range Trail. This portion of the Southern Mountain Loop will run approximately 85 miles with segments that are both on the road and segments that are separated from the road, providing a bicycle and pedestrian trail connecting Interstate 25 in Walsenburg with Interstate 25 in Trinidad. | 1039 |  |  |  | \$33.00 |
| Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-Walsenburg-Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 | (-) | $(x) \Rightarrow$ (in) | $\theta$ | \$5.02 |
| US 160 by CR 504 West of Walsenburg (Wildlife safety improvements) | Install wildlife safety improvements such as fencing and/or overpass | 1507 | (1) | (1) | (1) | \$1.40 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits

Din) Quality of Life
Resilience
(1) Pedestrian


Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Corridor Projects: US Highway 160A: Between La Veta Pass to the UPRR in
Walsenburg (PSC7008)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 160 Freight and Safety Improvements | Increase truck park, improve existing pull-offs, and install passing lanes at selected locations between La Veta Pass and Walsenburg. | 1508 | (1) - | $3$ |  | \$18.00 |
| Walsenburg West | Rural road surface treatment. | 2617 | 3 | (1) | 5 | \$1.92 |
| Between North La Veta Pass \& Junction SH 12 | Rural road surface treatment. | 2621 | (3) | (1) | 5 | \$3.54 |

## Project Types

 Operations
Bicycle


## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



## () Asset <br> Management

- Walsenburg West
- Between North La Veta Pass \& Junction SH 12


## Mobility

- Expanded Regional Transit Service between Walsenburg-La Veta-GardnerCuchara
- Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-WalsenburgPueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Bike/Pedestrian: Southern Mountain Loop Trail


## ! Safety

- US 160 Freight and Safety Improvements
- US 160 by CR 504 West of Walsenburg (Wildlife safety improvements)



## Corridor Name

US Highway 160B: Business Loop in Walsenburg

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160, I-25 Business Loop (Walsenburg), corridor is primarily to improve safety, but also includes maintaining system quality and increasing multimodal mobility.

## Corridor Description

US 160 is the primary east-west facility in South Central Colorado. This corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility, acts as a main street for Walsenburg, and makes east-west connections within the downtown area Maintaining the downtown character of the corridor is important while also providing freight movement and supporting local access and connectivity.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 13 comments specifically about this corridor
- Acknowledgement of the corridor's role as main street in Walsenburg
- Desire for walking improvements in downtown Walsenburg
- Concerns about travel reliability and signal timing in downtown
Walsenburg
- Desire for crosswalk and sidewalk improvements



## Key Data Findings:

$\left.\begin{array}{l|l}\text { Demographics } \\ \text { Transit }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l}\text { Passes through census tract with higher } \\ \text { percentage of 65+, disabled, minority, and } \\ \text { low-income populations }\end{array}\right]$


[^14]| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-25: SH 10/ US 160 <br> Interchange <br> Reconstruction at Walsenburg | Reconstruction of I-25/SH 10/US 160 Interchange (MP 50). | 1036 | (8) ! | - | (1) | \$50.00 |
| Bike/Pedestrian: <br> Southern Mountain Loop Trail | This trail project will complete the Southern Mountain Loop of the Colorado Front Range Trail. This portion of the Southern Mountain Loop will run approximately 85 miles with segments that are both on the road and segments that are separated from the road, providing a bicycle and pedestrian trail connecting Interstate 25 in Walsenburg with Interstate 25 in Trinidad. | 1039 |  |  |  | \$33.00 |
| Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-Walsenburg-Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 | (-) | (n) (in) |  | \$5.02 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

Corridor Projects: US Highway 160B: Business Loop in Walsenburg (PSC7009)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Walsenburg Stop Sign Gap Assist Project | Alerts drivers when it is not safe to enter a stop sign-controlled intersection. This is intended to improve safety at non-signalized intersections where only the minor road has posted stop signs. It includes both onboard (for connected vehicles) and roadside signage warning systems (for non-equipped vehicles). | 1277 |  | - |  | \$0.01 |
| I-25C/US 160 Ped/Bike Improvements | Improve ADA ramps, sidewalks along I25C and US160 at selected locations (I-25C \& US 160). | 1509 | 60 | (12) 0 |  | \$2.45 |
| Between I-25 BR (Walsenburg) \& Junction I-25 | Rural road surface treatment. | 2622 | $3$ | (1) | 3 | \$0.64 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits



Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilience
Pedestrian


Mobility Options
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

Project Based Strategies: US Highway 160B: Business Loop in


- Between I-25 BR (Walsenburg) \& Junction I-25

- I-25: SH 10/ US 160

Interchange Reconstruction at Walsenburg

- Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-WalsenburgPueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Bike/Pedestrian: Southern Mountain Loop Trail

- Walsenburg Stop Sign Gap Assist Project
- I-25C/US 160 Ped/Bike Improvements



## Corridor Name

US Highway 160C: Between I-25 in Trinidad and the Baca County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160, I-25 (Trinidad) east to Baca County Line, corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

US 160 is the primary east-west facility in South Central Colorado. This corridor provides local access in Trinidad, and makes east-west connections between communities within South Central Colorado. This corridor is a designated a hazardous material route and is experiencing increased agricultural, energy, and bicycle use. Increasing mobility to support the movement of freight and tourism is important for the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Section of Scenic Byway, Trinidad to SH 350 (Santa Fe Trail)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for better road conditions
- Concerns about increasing truck congestion
- Concerns about trucks using Main Street in Trinidad instead of the truck bypass
- Desire for shoulders



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ and disabled populations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' <br> One segment with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4); Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Segments of low drivability life between <br> Trinidad and SH 389 |
| Transit | SCCOG operates on corridor <br> Seasonal trolley service operated by City of <br> Trinidad |


| Bicycling | Section with high bicyclist activity (next to <br> Trinidad) <br> High stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main street through Trinidad (DOLA affiliated Main <br> Street) |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Very low redundancy |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Trinidad segment |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area (National <br> Forest in Kim) |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic (greater than 20\%) |




| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost <br> (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kim Transit Garage | Garage and offices for expanded transit services by SCCOG to Kim, Branson and Baca County. This will hold 2 vans. | 1044 | \%) | 3 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.50 |
| Expanded Regional <br> Transit Service between Kim-BransonBaca County | New Vans (2) to expand Transit Service to Kim, Branson, and Baca County w/ operating expenses. | 1045 | (2) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.60 |
| Proposed US160C shoulder widening | Widen shoulders on both sides along the corridor at selected areas (selected areas between MP 344.61 to MP 431.69). | 1510 | (1) | $610$ | (1) $)_{0}$ | \$20.00 |
| US 160 Curve Alignment | Soften Curve on US 160 near MP $412.8$ | 1628 | (1) | -2 2 |  | \$1.00 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits


Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilience
Pedestrian


Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

Project Based Strategies: US Highway 160C: Between I-25 in Trinidad


- US 160 Curve Alignment


- Proposed US 160C shoulder widening

State Highway 239: Between US 160 in Trinidad and Road E (PSC7011)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 239: Between US 160 in Trinidad and Road E

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 239, US 160 (Trinidad) to Rd. E (El Mora Rd.), corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 239 provides local access and makes north-south connections between Trinidad and El Mora. The corridor serves local land uses, and agriculture along the corridor. Maintain the rural character of the corridor is important for this corridor.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments specifically about this corridor


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ population. Passes through census tract with <br> higher percentage of disabled population. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Entire corridor has shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ |
| Transit | Seasonal Trolley service operated by City of Trinidad |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |



## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this corridor | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Project Types



Project Benefits


Mobility Options
Asset
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area

Pedestrian

## ( Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## (!) Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area




## Corridor Name

US Highway 350: Between US 160 and the Otero County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US Highway 350, US 160 (Beshoar Jct) north to Otero County Line, corridor is primarily to maintain system quality and improve safety.

## Corridor Description

US Highway 350 provides local access and makes north-east connections from Trinidad to La Junta in South Central Colorado. Preserving the rural and agricultural character of the corridor while supporting the movement of agricultural products and freight along the corridor is important.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Santa Fe Trail)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 comment specifically about this corridor
- Desire for wider shoulders

|  | Key Data Findings: US Highway |
| :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population. Passes through census tract with <br> higher percentage of disabled population. |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' <br> Hazmat route |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Very low redundancy |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic (greater than 20\%) |

## Key Data Findings:



Corridor Needs: US Highway 350: Between US 160 and the Otero County

## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed US 350 shoulder widening | Widen shoulders on both sides along the corridor at selected areas (selected areas between MP 0.0 to MP 73). | 1511 |  |  |  | \$20.00 |
| Southwest Chief Track Improvements - BUILD Grant Match | CDOT portion of Southwest Chief track improvements - Rail replacement, turnouts and grade crossing replacements on La Junta Subdivision between Kansas and Colorado. | 2735 | (9) |  |  | \$0.30 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits


Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## ( Asset Management

- See project: Proposed US 350 shoulder widening


## Mobility

- Southwest Chief Track Improvements - BUILD Grant Match

Proposed US 350 shoulder widening


State Highway 389: Between New Mexico and US 160 (PSC7013)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 389: Between New Mexico and US 160

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 389, CO/ NM state line north to US 160, corridor is primarily to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 389 provides local access and makes north-south connections within South Central Colorado between US 160 and into New Mexico. The transportation system in the area primarily serves local land uses and small towns along the corridor. Maintaining the rural and agricultural character of the corridor while supporting multimodal transportation like bicycling and transit is important.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments specifically about this corridor

Key Data Findings: State Highway 389: Between New Mexico and US 160

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ population. Passes through census tract with <br> higher percentage of disabled population. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Entire corridor has shoulders <2' |
| Bicycling | Section with very high bicyclist activity <br> (South of Branson) <br> High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Very low redundancy |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic (greater than 20\%) |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 389: Between New Mexico and US 160

## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove bicycle accommodationImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles

Corridor Projects: State Highway 389: Between New Mexico and US
160 (PSC7013)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expanded Regional <br> Transit Service between Kim-BransonBaca County | New Vans (2) to expand Transit Service to Kim, Branson, and Baca County w/ operating expenses. | 1045 | (9) | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.60 |
| Resurfacing SH 389 to improve drivability | MP 0.0 to MP 12.903. | 1512 | 3 | (1) | 19 | \$8.00 |
| Between CO/NM State Line \& Junction US 160 | Rural road surface treatment. | 2623 | $3$ | (1) | $(8)$ | \$5.28 |

## Project Types



Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## (1) Asset Management

- Between CO/NM State Line \& Junction US 160
- Expanded Regional Transit Service between Kim-Branson-Baca County


## (!) Safety

- Resurfacing SH 389 to improve drivability



## Southeast Transportation Planning Region - Final

## CDOT Region 2

## Counties:

Baca, Bent, Crowley, Kiowa, Otero, Prowers

## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Provide additional travel options
- Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
- Address unsafe passing conditions
- Eliminate shoulder deficiencies
- Address mowing operations


## * Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback

## What We've Heard about the Southeast TPR

- 905 public and stakeholder comments specifically about the SE TPR
- 75 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the Southeast TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" public survey respondents in the SE TPR, combined with stakeholder input selected:
- Road Condition and Safety
- Lack of Travel Options
- Moving Goods
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the Southeast TPR (in order of frequency) include: Safety, Trucking/ Freight, Road Condition, Bus Service/ Transit, Roadway Capacity

IT The vision for the Southeast TPR will provide a safe, convenient, reliable, and efficient transportation network to support the region's multimodal needs.


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics | 2015 Population: 41,240 <br> 2045 Forecasted Population: 39, 831 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | 2015 J obs: 19,854 <br> 2045 Forecasted J obs: 19,542 |
| Economics | Top Industries: Agriculture, Manufacturing, Energy and <br> Natural Resources, Tourism, Hunting |


| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 1.2 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 1.4 Million |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asset <br> Management | 152 Miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 418 Miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 179 Miles of highway with low drivability life |

## Corridor Name

US Highway 287: Colorado/ Oklahoma State Line to Kiowa/ Cheyenne Co. Line

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is primarily to increase the north-south mobility from Laredo, Texas to the Denver metropolitan area and the various communities and facilities along the route as part of the National Ports to Plains Trade Route. The vision is also to improve safety, reliability and to maintain system quality on the corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility and is a critical link in the Ports to Plains Corridor which will facilitate interstate and international trade commerce between Mexico and the United States. In addition, this corridor will provide a critical link in the nationwide system of routes which are essential to the nation's economy, defense and overall mobility.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R2-9 (Eads to US 287)
- Tier 1 CNG Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 103 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Pavement condition is poor
- Desire for roadway expansion
- Desire for passing lanes
- Frustration with congestion
- Concerns about safety
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents



Corridor Needs: US Highway 287: Colorado/ Oklahoma State Line to

## Corridor Needs

Address unsafe passing conditionsAddress safety concernsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress roadway conditionAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 50, US 287 (north of US 50), and US 350 | Add fiber network on US 50, US 287, and US 350 | 1046 | (8) | (1) -2 | (1) 0 | \$16.00 |
| Kiowa County Bus Storage Facility | Metal storage facility; heated; 2-4 vehicles | 1281 | (9) | 3 | 0 | \$0.20 |
| US 287: Lamar Reliever Route | Phase I and II of the Lamar Reliever Route. Realignment of US 50 to the South - needed for future US 50/US 287 Interchange. (US 50: MP 433-435). Phase II is the construction of the new two lane reliever route. (US 287: MP 73-81) | 1282 | (1) | (5) - 1 | (1) \% | \$211.07 |
| US 287 - Freight Truck Parking | Smart Truck Parking | 1283 | (2) | - | 0 | \$0.05 |
| Stop Sign Gap Assist | Alerts drivers when it is not safe to enter a stop signcontrolled intersection. This is intended to improve safety at non-signalized intersections where only the minor road has posted stop signs. It includes both onboard (for connected vehicles) and roadside signage warning systems (for nonequipped vehicles). | 1284 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.01 |
| US287 Passing Lane | Install four passing lanes (At 8 locations between the State line and Kit Carson) | 1607 | (1) | (5) 1 | (1) 0 | \$25.00 |
| US 287 Wiley North SB Pass Lane | $\square$ - | 1608 | (1) | (5) -2 | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$5.00 |
| US 287 Campo South SB Pass Lane | - | 1609 | (1) | (3) -1 | (1) 成 | \$5.00 |
| US 287 Passing Lanes (Lamar to Eads) | - | 1610 | - | - |  | \$5.70 |
| Springfield, CO | Address truck parking demand | 1612 | (-2) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.93 |
| Crosswalk improvement in Springfield | Install pedestrian crossing device in Springfield | 1613 | ( | $\text { (in) } \Leftrightarrow \frac{1 i n}{1 i n}$ | (1) E | \$0.02 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits





## SWP Goal Area

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 287 Bridge Preventative Maintenance Phases 1 \& 2 | Repairs nine bridges on the Ports to Plains freight corridor. The bridges are quite dated, with the oldest built in 1935. | 7 | $3$ | (1) | 13 | \$5.00 |
| US 287 (Park Street South) Lamar Downtown PCCP Phases 1 \& 2 | This project concrete paves US 287 through downtown Lamar. US 287 is part of the Ports to Plains corridor, which is used heavily by freight, and was last paved with asphalt in 2004. This rural paving project is a major priority for Prowers County. | 10 |  | (8) -6) |  | \$30.00 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
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Capacity
Transit
Asset
Management
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## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



## 3 <br> Asset Management

- US 287 Bridge Preventative Maintenance Phases 1 \& 2
- US 287 (Park Street South) Lamar Downtown PCCP Phases 1 \& 2


## Mobility

- ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 50, US 287 (north of US 50), and US 350
- Kiowa County Bus Storage Facility
- US 287: Lamar Reliever Route
- US 287 - Freight Truck Parking
- Springfield, CO



## Corridor Name

US Highway 50: I-25 in Pueblo to Colorado/ Kansas State Line

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is primarily to increase the east-west mobility from the Lower Arkansas Valley to the Pueblo metropolitan area and the various communities and facilities along the route, as well as to improve safety, reliability and maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility and makes the east-west connection within southeast Colorado including the making the connection to the Ports to Plains route (US 287) to I-25 in the City of Pueblo. This corridor will provide a southern east-west alternative to I-70 for region residents, tourists and freight movements by providing interstate level mobility for southern Colorado

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Scenic Byway (La J unta to Colorado/ Kansas State Line)
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 212 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Desire for roadway expansion
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for regional transit
- Questions/ concerns about funding
- Concerns about economic vitality
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents
- Concerns for safety due to wildlife management
- Questions about technology/ data


Key Data Findings: US Highway 50: I-25 in Pueblo to Colorado/ Kansas


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of <br> $65+$ and disabled populations, and a higher rate of <br> poverty |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Three segments of elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Freight <br> Safety | Segments with shoulders less than 2' in Lamar <br> Dense wildlife crashes <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (two segments) |
| Bicycling | High to very high bicycle activity near Lamar |


|  | Greyhound operates on corridor; Beeline operates on <br> corridor; Bustang Outrider stops in Fowler, Manzanola, <br> Rocky Ford, Wink, La J unta, Las Animas, Hasty, and Lamar <br> Pedestrian <br> Iransit |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lamar and Holly; Amtrak operates on corridor- stations in La <br> Junta and Lamar; Golden Age Transportation Services <br> operates along corridor in Bent county; Publicly operated <br> transit services in La J unta |  |
| Economics <br> Pedestrian | Main Street through Holly, Granada, Las Animas, Rocky <br> Ford and DOLA affiliated Main Street through La J unta |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | High criticality west of Rocky Ford; Low redundancy |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of jobs in Springfield; Concentration of oil and <br> gas wells; Agricultural corridor; High truck traffic |

Corridor Needs: US Highway 50: I-25 in Pueblo to Colorado/ Kansas State


## Corridor Needs

Address unsafe passing conditionsAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4 ) (including wildlife crashes)$\rightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies
© Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain, dust storms)
$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 50, US 287 (north of US 50), and US 350 | Add fiber network on US 50, US 287, and US 350 | 1046 | (8) | (-) ! | (1) | \$16.00 |
| Expanded RSVP Program to Serve Rocky Ford and Ordway | Expand RSVP program to include transportation to Rocky Ford and Ordway. 2 trips per week, estimated annual hours 500 | 1050 | (-) | (n) 5 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.37 |
| La Junta Multimodal Transit Center | New facility build, Santa Fe \& San Juan \& 1st St., La Junta; including Park-n-Ride facility | 1285 | (9) |  | $\theta$ | \$4.00 |
| Lamar Depot Multimodal Improvements | New Park-n-Ride facility adjacent to existing depot, 70 spaces, $\$ 560$; Bus access improvements $\$ 50$ k;pedestrian access improvements to new lot and to existing depot site \$100k; bus shelter \$30 | 1286 | (-) |  |  | \$0.84 |
| La Junta to Fowler Fixed-Route Service | Fixed route service, 2 R/T routes/day; Purchase of one 15passenger bus | 1287 | (-) | (a) An | $\theta$ | \$0.60 |
| City of La Junta Bus Barn Rehabilitation | Rehabilitate existing facility, 5th St \& Gardner, La Junta; increase size; electrical rehab; adding restrooms | 1288 | (2) | . | \% 8 | \$0.20 |
| Expand Deviated Fixed Route Services in La Junta | Expanded service hours throughout the day; requires one add'l 15-passenger bus | 1289 | (9) | (-1) 4 (3) | 5 | \$0.40 |
| US 50B: East Widening | Implement Tier II project along the US 50 Corridor from Pueblo to Holly (MP 318-467) per the Tier I FEIS/ROD. Likely project includes widening US 50 to four lanes. Location and length of project TBD. | 1291 | (1) |  |  | \$100.00 |
| US 50 La Junta to Holly Freight Congestion, Signals, Passing Lanes, Some Signals | Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems (FRATIS) | 1292 | (-) | (1) | (1) | \$20.00 |
| US 50 Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS Intelligent Transportation Systems devices between Pueblo and Lamar | 1293 | (8) | (1) | (1) | \$27.00 |

## Project Types



11 Capacity
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Asset
Management
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## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area

Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

Corridor Projects: I-25 in Pueblo to Colorado/ Kansas State
Line (PSE7002)(Page 2/2)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| More US50B Passing Lanes | Install a few more passing lanes before significant funding is available for the 4 lane project | 1614 | D |  |  | \$15.00 |
| Realign US50B as a part of US287 Relieve Route project | Realign US50B as a part of US287 Relieve Route project | 1617 | $D$ | (4) -2.3 |  | \$34.20 |
| Increase Truck Parking. Additional parking could be provided through CDOT investment in Holly Rest Area. | - | 1618 | $\theta$ | $3$ | $\theta$ | \$0.31 |
| US 50B West of Las Animas East (Passing Lanes + Overlay <br> + Strc Repair) | - | 1619 | (1) 3 |  |  | \$1.50 |
| Corridor drainage improvements | Design and construct drainage facilities | 1620 | 3 | $0$ | 5 | \$10.00 |
| Prowers Area Transit Bus Barn Expansion | Add a transit office on the east side of the existing bus storage barn | 2485 | (-) | ( | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.15 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 8 locations: Lamar, Fort Lyon, Las Animas, La Junta, Swink, Rocky Ford, Manzanola, and Fowler | 2495 | (-) | (x) $\Rightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.60 |

## Project Types
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## Project Benefits
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## SWP Goal Area

Project Based Strategies: I-25 in Pueblo to Colorado/ Kansas State


## (1) Asset <br> Management

- City of La Junta Bus Barn Rehabilitation
- Realign US50B as a part of US287 Relieve Route project
- Increase Truck Parking. Additional parking could be provided through CDOT investment in Holly Rest Area.
- Corridor drainage improvements
- Prowers Area Transit Bus Barn Expansion


## Mobility

- ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 50, US 287 (north of US 50), and US 350
- Expanded RSVP Program to Serve Rocky Ford and Ordway
- La Junta Multimodal Transit Center
- Lamar Depot Multimodal Improvements
- La Junta to Fowler Fixed-Route Service
- Expand Deviated Fixed Route Services in La Junta
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements

- US 50B: East Widening
- US 50 La Junta to Holly - Freight Congestion, Signals, Passing Lanes, Some Signals
- US 50 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure
- More US50B Passing Lanes
- US 50B West of Las Animas East (Passing Lanes + Overlay + Strc Repair)


## in Toonerville (PSE7003)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 101: J unction US 50 to J unction at Bent County Road K in Toonerville

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to bring it up to a 2-lane paved facility for the entire length as part of the State Highway System to provide this alternative route for intra-regional travel and farm-to-market use.

## Corridor Description

This corridor currently serves as a north-south connection between Pritchett to its junction to US 50 as an alternative route to US 287 in southeast Colorado.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 4 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents
- Frustration with lack of maintenance


Key Data Findings: State Highway 101: Junction US 50 to J unction at
Bent County Road K in Toonerville (PSE7003)

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ and disabled populations, and a higher rate of <br> poverty |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than 2' |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Golden Age Transportation Services operates on <br> corridor in Bent County <br> Inter-city bus station in Las Animas and Springfield |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in Los Animas |
| Economics <br> Freight | High truck traffic in Toonerville |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain, avalanche, rockfalls)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 101: Junction US 50 to J unction at
Bent County Road K in Toonerville (PSE7003)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RRST 101A - MP 0-21.4 | Rural road surface treatment | 2625 | $(3)$ | - | 3 | \$9.83 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits
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## SWP Goal Area



Safety Safety

Aviation

Project Based Strategies: Junction US 50 to J unction at Bent County

## 0 <br> Asset Management <br> - RRST 101A - MP 0-21.4



## Corridor Name

State Highway 96: Pueblo/ Crowley County Line to Colorado/ Kansas State Line

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to maintain the system quality and safety as well as the future mobility of this corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the Region and serves as a northern east-west alternative for US 50 within the Region.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System (Eads to US 287)
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R2-9


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 42 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Pavement condition is poor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Frustration with congestion



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Transit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+and disabled populations, and a higher rate of poverty |  | Kiowa County Transit operates on corridor |
|  |  | Bicycling | High bicycle activity High stress for bicycling |
| Freight Safety | Multiple segments of corridor have shoulders less than 2' (east of Chivington) Hazmat route | Economics Pedestrian | Main Street through Olney Springs and Eads |
|  |  | Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Freight Asset Management | Low drivability life (multiple segments) | Economics Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells Agricultural corridor |
|  |  | Economics | High truck traffic |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 96: Pueblo/ Crowley County Line to
Colorado/ Kansas State Line (PSE7004)


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, restEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (busstops/ truck parking stops, downtown areas)Eliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicycles

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expanded RSVP <br> Program to Serve <br> Rocky Ford and <br> Ordway | Expand RSVP program to include transportation to Rocky Ford and Ordway. 2 trips per week, estimated annual hours 500 | 1050 | - | (12) 4 O | $\theta$ | \$0.37 |
| Expand Crowley <br> County Transit Service <br> in Crowley County and <br> Sugar City | Expand Crowley County transit service including in Sugar City (US 96). 4 additional hours daily, estimated annual hours 1,040 in both Crowley County and Sugar City | 1294 | - | (12) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$0.40 |
| CO 96 shoulder widening | Widen CO 96 6' to each side (From Sugar City to Arlington) | 1621 | (1) | (12) 6 | (1) 0 | \$20.00 |
| Construct Rest Area for Bicyclist | Construct a rest area for bicyclists between Haswell and Sugar City | 1623 | 68 | (1) $\Leftrightarrow 1$ | (1) 今 | \$0.10 |
| Intersection Improvements at SH 96/SH 167 | Add turning lanes at the intersection | 1624 | (1) 3 | - | (1) 0 | \$0.20 |
| Intersection <br> Improvements at SH <br> 96/SH 71 \& SH96/SH <br> 71/CR G | Add turning lanes at these two intersections | 1625 | (1) | (3) | 90 (1) | \$0.80 |
| SH 96 Ordway to Arlington from MP 106 to 131.75 | Rural road surface treatment | 24 | 9 | (1) | 9 | \$10.00 |
| SH 96D from MP 168.99 to 193.7 near Eads to Sheridan Lake | Rural road surface treatment | 25 | (9) | (1) | 9 | \$11.60 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits
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## (3) Asset <br> Management

- Construct Rest Area for Bicyclists
- Intersection Improvements at SH 96/SH 167
- Intersection Improvements at SH 96/SH 71 \& SH 96/SH 71/CR G
- SH 96 Ordway to Arlington from MP 106 to 131.75
- SH 96D from MP 168.99 to 193.7 near Eads to Sheridan Lake


## Mobility

- Expanded RSVP Program to Serve Rocky Ford and Ordway
- Expand Crowley County Transit Service in Crowley County and Sugar City

- CO 96 shoulder widening
$\qquad$

State Highway 109: Bent/ Las Animas County Line to J unction at 3rd

## Corridor Name

State Highway 109: Bent/ Las Animas County Line to J unction at 3rd Street in Cheraw

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to maintain the system quality and safety as well as the future mobility of this corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor primarily connects the airport to the city of La Junta as well as intra-regional travel for the area around the city of La Junta.

## Corridor Designations

- None
- 17 comments specifically about this corridor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Concerns for safety due to wildlife management
- Desire for better bicycle facilities
- Desire for better pedestrian facilities
- Desire for regional transit
- Desire for multimodal design


Key Data Findings: State Highway 109: Bent/ Las Animas County Line to

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population, disabled population, and rate of <br> poverty |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | One segment of elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Freight <br> Safety | Maj ority of corridor has shoulders less than 2' |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one segment) |
| Mobility Hub <br> Transit | Public transit service in La J unta <br> Inter-city bus station in La J unta <br> Amtrak station in La J unta <br> Bustang Outrider stop in La J unta |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Economics | Concentration of jobs in La J unta |
| Economics <br> Freight | High truck traffic |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsProvide additional travel optionsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 109 Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Fixed Objects, Wild Animal, Overturning | 2346 | (1) | (1) | (1) | \$0.02 |
| M-22-AY Bridge Repair on CO 109 over US 50B in La Junta | Repairs a bridge in an important freight region in La Junta. The bridge was built in 1967. | 12 | (3) | (-1) | (1) 3 | \$3.00 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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## SWP Goal Area




## Corridor Name

State Highway 10: Pueblo/ Otero County Line to J unction US 50

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to maintain the system quality and safety as well as the future mobility of this corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the Region and serves as a corridor to connect the Region, along with US 350, to the southern portion of the State and areas south.

## Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Pavement condition is poor


Key Data Findings: State Highway 10: Pueblo/ Otero County Line to


| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+and disabled populations, and a higher rate of poverty |  |  |
|  |  | Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Freight Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than $2^{\prime}$ Hazmat route | Economics | Concentration of jobs in La J unta |
|  |  | Economics |  |
| Freight Asset Management | Low drivability life | Freight | Agricultural corridor |
|  |  | Freight | High truck traffic |
| Mobility Hub Transit | Public transit service in La J unta Inter-city bus station in La Junta Amtrak station in La J unta Bustang Outrider stop in La J unta |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 10: Pueblo/ Otero County Line to J unction (


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles
$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand
(bus stops)Address safety concernsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposed SH 10 Shoulder Widening project | Widen SH 10 at select areas (SH 10 from county line to La Junta) | 1626 | (1) |  |  | \$20.00 |
| SH 10 Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Fixed Objects, Overturning, Domestic Animal | 2347 | (1) | (1) -2) | (1) | \$0.05 |
| RRST 10A - MP 43-46.5 | Rural road surface treatment | 2624 | $(3)$ | - | $8$ | \$1.56 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits
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## SWP Goal Area



Safety

Project Based Strategies: Pueblo/ Otero County Line to J unction US 50


- RRST 10A - MP 43-46.5

(!) Safety
- SH 10 Safety Study

State Highway 71: J unction US 350 to Crowley/ Lincoln County Line

## Corridor Name

State Highway 71: Junction US 350 to Crowley/ Lincoln County Line

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to maintain the system quality and safety as well as the future mobility of this corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the Region and serves as a north-south alternative for the Region and the State mid-way between I-25 and US 287.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System (Rocky Ford to US 50)
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R2-9 (Ordway)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 11 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Pavement condition is poor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance


Key Data Findings: State Highway 71: J unction US 350 to
Crowley/ Lincoln County Line (PSE7007)


Corridor Needs: State Highway 71: Junction US 350 to Crowley/ Lincoln

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress unsafe passing conditions

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection Improvement at SH 71/US 50 | Install a signal at US 50/SH 71 | 1632 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.80 |
| SH 71 Passing Lanes | Passing Lanes on SH 71 between Rocky Ford and Lincoln County Line | 1633 | $D$ |  |  | \$4.00 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits
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## SWP Goal Area



Project Based Strategies: Junction US 350 to Crowley/ Lincoln County

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- No projects have been identified for this strategy

Mobility

- Intersection Improvement at SH 71/US 50
- SH 71 Passing Lanes


State Highway 89: J unction SH 116 to J unction US 50 (PSE7008)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 89: J unction SH 116 to J unction US 50

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to maintain system quality, reliability and to improve the overall safety of the corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor currently serves as a north-south connection between Lycan and Holly with a primary function as a facility for intra-region, farm-to-market and energy travel.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Concerns about safety


Key Data Findings: State Highway 89: Junction SH 116 to J unction US

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+and disabled populations, and a higher rate of <br> poverty |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Entire corridor has shoulders less than 2' |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Two segments of low drivability life |
| Mobility Hub <br> Transit | Inter-city transit station in Holly |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Economics <br> Freight |
| Freight | Agricultural corridor |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this corridor |  | - | - | - | - | - |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



Project Based Strategies: Junction SH 116 to J unction US 50 (PSE7008)

## Asset Management

- No projects have been identified for this corridor


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this corridor


State Highway 196: J unction US 50 to J unction US 385 (PSE7009)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 196: J unction US 50 to J unction US 385

## Corridor Vision

The vision of this corridor is to maintain system quality with a focus on improving the overall safety and mobility of this corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor currently serves as an east-west corridor with a primary function of intraregional transportation serving the communities along the corridor and their access to US 50 and US 287.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 10 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Concerns about economic vitality



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Transit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with a higher percentage disabled population and a higher rate of poverty |  | Golden Age Transportation Services operates on corridor |
|  |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ | Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Freight <br> Asset Management | Low drivability life (one segment) | Economics Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells Agricultural corridor High truck traffic |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate seasonal increases in truck activity and associated congestionAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

Corridor Projects: J unction US 50 to J unction US 385 (PSE7009)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this corridor |  | - | - | - | - | - |

Project Types


## Project Benefits





Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area




## B Asset <br> Management

- No projects have been identified for this corridor

- No projects have been identified for this corridor

- No projects have been identified for this corridor

State Highway 202: J unction US 50 to J unction Otero County Road 16

## Corridor Name

State Highway 202: J unction US 50 to J unction Otero County Road 16

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve the overall mobility of the corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an extension of a primary multilane county road in the northeast corner of Otero County connecting this area of the County to US 50 and primarily serves agricultural activity in this limited area.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher |  |  |
|  | percentage of $65+$ and disabled populations, and a higher rate of poverty | Economics | Agricultural corridor |
| Safety | Entire corridor with shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Inter-city bus station in Rocky Ford Bustang Outrider stop in Rocky Ford |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 202: J unction US 50 to J unction Otero


## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles$\rightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (busAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drainage issues at US $\text { 50/SH } 202$ | Fix flooding issue at Junction of US 50/SH 202 | 1627 | $(3)$ | $0$ | $9$ | \$0.75 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

(P) Asset

Management

- Drainage issues at US 50/SH 202


- No projects have been identified for this strategy

State Highway 266: J unction US 50 to J unction SH 109 (PSE7011)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 266: J unction US 50 to J unction SH 109

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to improve safety as well as maintain the system quality and future mobility of this corridor.

## Corridor Description

This east - west corridor (in addition to SH 109) primarily connects the airport to the city of La J unta as well as intra-regional travel for the area around the city of La Junta and Rocky Ford.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Mobility Hub Transit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+and disabled populations, and a higher rate of poverty |  | Inter-city bus station in Rocky Ford Bustang Outrider stop in Rocky Ford |
|  |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders $<21$ | Freight | Agricultural corridor |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one segment) |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 266: Junction US 50 to J unction SH 109


## Corridor Needs

(i) Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)

Corridor Projects: J unction US 50 to J unction SH 109 (PSE7011)

| Name | Description |  | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this corridor |  | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits





Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area




## (1) Asset <br> Management

- No projects have been identified for this corridor

- No projects have been identified for this corridor
(1) Safety
- No projects have been identified for this corridor


## Corridor Name

US Highway 350: Otero/ Las Animas County Line to J unction US 50

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to maintain the system safety as well as the future mobility and reliability of this corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the Region and serves as a corridor to connect the Region, along with SH 10, to the southern portion of the State and areas south.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Santa Fe Trail)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 4 comments specifically about this corridor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Desire for regional transit


Key Data Findings: US Highway 350: Otero/ Las Animas County Line to

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+and disabled populations, and a higher rate of <br> poverty |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Several segments with shoulders < ' ' <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one segment) <br> Three bridges in poor condition |
| Mobility Hub <br> Transit | Amtrak operates on corridor- stops in La J unta <br> Inter-city bus station in La Junta <br> Bustang Outrider stop in La J unta <br> Publicly Operated Transit Services in La J unta |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy west of Timpas |
| Freight | High truck traffic west of Timpas |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 50, US 287 (north of US 50 ), and US 350 | Add fiber network on US 50, US 287, and US 350 | 1046 | (8) | (-2) | (1) 0 | \$16.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { RRST 350A - MP 46.7- } \\ & 63.3 \end{aligned}$ | Rural road surface treatment | 2627 | 13 | - | 8 | \$7.55 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



## 0 <br> Asset Management

- RRST 350A - MP 46.7-63.3



## Corridor Name

US Highway 385: J unction US 50 to Kiowa/ Cheyenne County Line

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to improve safety as well as maintain the system quality and future mobility of this corridor.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the Region and serves as an eastern north-south alternative to US 287 in and outside the Region.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System (From Lamar to Oklahoma State Line)
- Tier 1 CNG Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 17 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Frustration with lack of maintenance
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Questions/ concerns about funding



## Key Data Findings: US Highway 385: J unction US 50 to Kiowa/ Cheyenne

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ and disabled populations, and a higher rate of <br> poverty |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders $<^{\prime}$ <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one segment) |
| Transit | Kiowa County Transit Services operates on corridor |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Granada |
| Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy <br> Crosses 100-year floodplain |
| Economics <br> Freight | Agricultural corridor <br> High truck traffic |

Corridor Needs: US Highway 385: J unction US 50 to Kiowa/ Cheyenne

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)Address safety concerns (Arkansas River bridge)Address unsafe passing conditions

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additiona I Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L-27-N Bridge Replacement | Replace Bridge L-27-N and realign roadway | 1630 | $8$ | (1) | 48 | \$3.00 |
| Passing lanes on US 385 | Passing lanes on US 385 between Granada and Sheridan lake | 1631 |  | (1) | 1 \% 5 | \$5.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { RRST } 385 \text { - MP 127.7- } \\ & 135.4 \end{aligned}$ | Rural road surface treatment | 2628 | $(3)$ | - | 1 | \$4.96 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { RRST 385A - MP 95- } \\ & 122.9 \end{aligned}$ | Rural road surface treatment | 2629 | ( 3 | - | 3 | \$13.19 |

Project Types

(1) Safety

FreightOperations
60 Bicycle

## Project Benefits



Economic Vitality
Public Health
Tourism
I Environmental


Quality of Life
Bicycle
Resilience
Pedestrian


Mob
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area

Project Based Strategies: Junction US 50 to Kiowa/ Cheyenne County

Asset Management

- RRST 385 - MP 127.7-135.4
- RRST 385A - MP 95-122.9


## Mobility

- Passing lanes on US 385


## (1) Safety

- L-27-N Bridge Replacement

State Highway 100: J unction US 160 to J unction at Main Street in Vilas

State Highway 100: J unction US 160 to J unction at Main Street in Vilas

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to maintain the existing system quality and safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an access point to Vilas.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments specifically about this corridor


|  | Key Data Findings: State Highw |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Key Data Findings: |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+and disabled populations, and a higher rate of <br> poverty |
| Freight <br> Safety | Entire corridor with shoulders <2' |
| Freight <br> Economics | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor <br> High truck traffic |

Key Data Findings:
hrough census tract of $65+$ and disabled populations, and a higher rate of

Concentration of oil and gas wells rid


## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 100A from MP 0 to MP 0.42 and SH 160C from MP 464.4 to 473.7 | Rural road surface treatment | 30 | C | (1) | 3 | \$6.60 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



## Asset Management

- SH 100A from MP 0 to MP 0.42 and SH 160C from MP 464.4 to 473.7

Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this strategy
- No projects have been identified for this strategy



# State Highway 116: Junction US 287 to Colorado/ Kansas State Line 

## Corridor Name

State Highway 116: J unction US 287 to Colorado/ Kansas State Line

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the region and makes east-west connections within the Region. This corridor primarily serves as a primary farm-to-market, bicycle and freight route for the Region.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 7 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor
- Concerns about safety


Key Data Findings: State Highway 116: J unction US 287 to
Colorado/ Kansas State Line (PSE7015)


|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of $65+$ and disabled populations, <br> and a higher rate of poverty |  | Freight <br> Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders <2" |  | Economics <br> Freight | Agricultural corridor <br> High truck traffic |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (multiple segments) |  |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor( $\triangle$ Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles
$\leftrightarrow$
Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 116 from US 287A MP 0 to MP 32.3 at Kansas Border | Rural road surface treatment | 23 | 3 | (1) | 9 | \$13.80 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits





Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



Project Based Strategies: Junction US 287 to Colorado/

(P) Asset

Management

- SH 116 from US 287A MP 0 to MP 32.3 at Kansas Border

- No projects have been identified for this strategy

- No projects have been identified for this strategy


## Corridor Name

US Highway 160: Baca/ Las Animas County Line to Colorado/ Kansas State Line

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the region and makes east-west connections within the Region as a southern east-west corridor to US 50 . This corridor not only serves the towns and cities along the route but also destinations within and outside the corridor for tourism and as a primary farm-to-market route.

## Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 7 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about safety
- Questions about technology/ data



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Pedestrian <br> Transit | Inter-city bus station in Springfield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+and disabled populations and a higher rate of poverty |  |  |
|  |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling west of SH 287 |
| Freight Safety | Multiple segments of corridor with shoulders <2' Hazmat route | Pedestrian Economics | Main Street through Pritchett |
|  |  | Freight Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Freight Asset Management | Low drivability life (multiple segments) | Economics Freight | Concentration of jobs in Springfield Agricultural corridor High truck traffic |

Corridor Needs: US Highway 160: Baca/ Las Animas County Line to
........................................................


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baca County Bus Facility | Metal storage facility; heated; 2-4 vehicles | 1048 | (9) | 3 | $\theta$ | \$0.40 |
| US 160 Curve Alignment | Soften Curve on US 160 near MP 412.8 | 1628 | (1) | (-3) |  | \$1.00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { RRST 160C - MP 423.3- } \\ & 450.6 \end{aligned}$ | Rural road surface treatment | 2626 | 3 | - | $9$ | \$11.72 |
| SH 100A from MP 0 to MP 0.42 and SH 160C from MP 464.4 to 473.7 | Rural road surface treatment | 30 | 3 | (1) | 3 | \$6.60 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Safety


- RRST 160C - MP 423.3-450.6
- SH 100A from MP 0 to MP 0.42 and SH 160C from MP 464.4 to 473.7



## Corridor Name

State Highway 167: J unction SH 96 to J unction Otero County Road JJ

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is primarily to improve the overall safety of the corridor as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an extension of a primary multilane county road which runs across Otero County connecting SH 10 to US 50. It serves as an intermediate north-south route for the eastern part of the County only.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comment specifically about this corridor
- Frustration with lack of maintenance



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ and disabled populations, and a higher rate of <br> poverty |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Multiple segments of corridor with shoulders <2' <br> One segment with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or <br> 4)- Olney springs |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life |
| Transit <br> Pedestrian | Inter-city bus station in Fowler <br> Bustang Outrider stop in Fowler |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Fowler |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of jobs in Fowler <br> Agricultural corridor |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 167 Safety Study |  | 2348 | (1) |  | (1) | \$0.01 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## Asset Management

- No projects have been identified for this strategy


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this strategy
- SH 167 Safety Study



# State Highway 183: Junction US 50 to J unction Bent County Road HH 

(PSE7018)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 183: J unction US 50 to J unction Bent County Road HH

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an access point to Fort Lyon and the J ohn Martin Reservoir and is a potential Regional Bus route. The safety and preservation of this corridor will become more critical as tourism and recreational travel continues to grow in this Region.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments specifically about this corridor




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+and disabled populations, and a higher rate of <br> poverty |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Entire corridor with shoulders $<2^{\prime}$ |
| Transit | Golden Age Transportation Services operates on <br> corridor |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this corridor |  | - | - | - | - | - |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



## Asset Management

- No projects have been identified for this corridor


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this corridor
- No projects have been identified for this corridor


State Highway 194: J unction SH 109 to J unction US 50 (PSE7019)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 194: J unction SH 109 to J unction US 50

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as an alternate east-west route to US 50 between SH 109 and it's junction with US 50 just north of Las Animas. The travel of this corridor serves local intra-regional, freight and tourism travel.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 11 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about weather and natural incidents
- Desire for regional transit



|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ and disabled populations, and a higher rate of poverty | Mobility Hub <br> Transit | Golden Age Transportation Services operates on corridor Inter-city bus station in La J unta |
| Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders <2' |  | Amtrak station in La Junta Publicly Operated Transit Services in La J unta |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one segment | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
|  |  | Freight | Agricultural corridor |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 194: J unction SH 109 to J unction US 50


## Corridor Needs

Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Eliminate shoulder deficiencies$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorProvide additional travel options

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drainage issues along SH 194 | Fix drainage issues near junction of US 50/SH 194, near Bents Fort and junction of SH 194 and SH 109. | 1629 | $3$ | $0$ |  | \$2.50 |
| Bridge Preventative <br> Maintenance: CO 12 <br> and CO 194 | Repairs three bridges in Southeastern Colorado. Two of the bridges date back to the 1930's and the other one to the 1950's. | 19 |  | $!$ | 93 | \$2.50 |
| SH 194A from MP 10.2 to MP 20.3 between US 50 and SH 109 | Rural road surface treatment | 28 | $(3)$ | (1) | 3 | \$5.80 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area



Safety


- Drainage issues along SH 194
- SH 194A from MP 10.2 to MP 20.3 between US 50 and SH 109



## (1) Safety

- Bridge Preventative Maintenance: CO 12 and CO 194

State Highway 207 : J unction US 50 to J unction SH 96 (PSE7020)

## Corridor Name

State Highway 207: J unction US 50 to Junction SH 96

## Corridor Vision

The vision for this corridor is primarily to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor primarily serves as a local mobility facility and makes a north-south connection between Manzanola (US 50) and Crowley (SH 96).

## Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns of safety


Key Data Findings: State Highway 207 : J unction US 50 to Junction SH 96

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ and disabled populations, and a higher rate of <br> poverty |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Entire corridor with shoulders <2' |
| Pedestrian <br> Transit | Bustang Outrider stop in Manzanola |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Manzanola |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics <br> Freight | Agricultural corridor |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 207 : J unction US 50 to J unction SH 96

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

Corridor Projects: State Highway 207: J unction US 50 to J unction SH

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this corridor |  | - | - | - | - | - |

Project Types


## Project Benefits




Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area
Asset Management

Project Based Strategies: State Highway 207: Junction US 50 to J unction

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- No projects have been identified for this corridor


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this corridor
- No projects have been identified for this corridor


Non-Corridor Specific Projects

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expanded Regional Kiowa County Transit Service | purchase 15 passenger bus; operate service 7 days/week requires operating and capital | 1047 | (9) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.40 |
| New Regional Transit Service between Campo and Lamar; Expanded Baca County Demand Response Services | Provide transit service along US 287 from Campo to Lamar. 2 days per week, approximately 310 annual hours; requires one additional 15 passenger bus; 7 days/week | 1049 | () | - |  | \$0.50 |
| Expand Non- <br> Emergency Transit <br> Service Operations and <br> Vehicle Expansion | 15 passenger bus; 7 days/week Demand Response | 1278 | (-) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.38 |
| Southeast Colorado Maintenance Facility | Design of new maintenance facility | 1279 | (-) | (3) | $\theta$ | \$3.00 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits





Asse
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area

Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

## $\square$ <br> Asset Management

- See corridor project lists


## Mobility

- Expanded Regional Kiowa County Transit Service
- New Regional Transit Service between Campo and Lamar; Expanded Baca County Demand Response Services
- Expand Non-Emergency Transit Service Operations and Vehicle Expansion
- Southeast Colorado Maintenance Facility


## ! Safety

- See corridor project lists



## San Luis Valley TPR Corridor Profiles - Final

## CDOT Region 5

## Counties:

Chaffee, Saguache, Mineral, Rio Grande, Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla

## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Provide additional travel options
- Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
- Address environmental impacts
* Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback

What We've Heard about the San Luis Valley TPR

- 408 public and stakeholders' comments specifically about the San Luis V. TPR
- 131 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the San Luis Valley TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" public survey respondents in the SLV TPR, combined with stakeholders' input, selected:
- Road condition and safety
- Lack of travel options
- Growth and congestion
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the San Luis Valley TPR (in order of frequency) include safety, public info / Communication, road condition, congestion, passing lanes, bike / ped connectivity, transit, trucking / freight.


【. The San Luis Valley envisions a transportation system that supports the region's agricultural and tourism-based economies through a combination of capacity improvements in congested corridors, safety and traffic management improvements elsewhere on the state highway system, and the provision of local and regional public transportation. Transportation development will accommodate and enhance the region's high quality of life, while preserving the cultural and the natural environment that make the TPR a great place to live, work, and visit. The transportation system supports economic development by providing mobility for people and goods, as well as multimodal access to services. The 2040 RTP envisions a systematic approach to implementing the transportation plan that is understood and supported by the people of the San Luis Valley TPR.

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics | 2015 Population: 61,960 <br> 2045 Forecasted Population: 71,612 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | 2015 J obs: 32,580 <br> 2045 Forecasted J obs: 38,751 |
| Economics | Top Industries: agriculture, health and wellness, <br> transportation and logistics, tourism, and outdoor recreation |


| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 2.1 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 3.0 Million |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asset <br> Management | 87 Miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 537 Miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 60 Miles of highway with low drivability life |

## Corridor Name

State Highway 15A: Between Monte Vista and Conejos County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 15 A - Monte Vista to Conejos County line corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, provides local access, and makes north-south connections within the central San Luis Valley area, including the Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge and Alamosa Canyon area. Future travel modes include passenger vehicle, truck freight, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The transportation system in the area primarily serves tourist destinations, the movement of farm-to-market production and local Amish communities.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Passes through National Wetland Refuge
- Vulnerable Amish population



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ population, minority and disabled population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders <2' |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | In proximity of 100-year floodplain <br> Low redundancy |
| Freight <br> Economics | Agricultural corridor |

MONTE VISTA

## Corridor Needs: State Highway 15A: Between Monte Vista and Conejos

## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this goal area | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management \& Aviation
Management
Freight
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SWP Goal Area


Pedestrian

Project Based Strategies: State Highway 15A: Between Monte Vista and

## ( Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## (!) Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area



## Corridor Name

State Highway 15B: West of Capulin to La J ara

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 15 B - West of Capulin to Jct . US 285 at La J ara corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides local access and makes east-west connections south of the Monte Vista area. Future travel modes include passenger vehicle and truck freight. The transportation system in the area primarily serves tourist destinations, the movement of farm-to-market production and local Amish communities.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments
- Concerns about high number of crashes
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Poor pavement condition
- Vulnerable Amish population



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher |  |  |
|  | percentage of 65+ population, minority and disabled population | Freight <br> Economics | Agricultural corridor |
| Freight Safety | Two sections with shoulders <2' |  |  |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicyclist |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 15B: West of Capulin to La J ara (PSL7002)


Corridor Needs
$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

Corridor Projects: State Highway 15B: West of Capulin to La J ara

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southern SLV Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for southern portion of the SLV. | 2035 |  | (12) 0 | $\theta$ | \$0.82 |
| SH 15 La Jara West | Rural road surface treatment | 2636 |  | $!$ |  | \$6.00 |

## Project Types
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(P) Asset

Management

- SH 15 La Jara West


- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## Corridor Name

State Highway 17A: New Mexico State line to Antonito

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 17 A - New Mexico state line to Antonito corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the southern San Luis Valley area via Cumbres Pass. The portion from the New Mexico line to the Forest Boundary 12 miles west of Antonito is also designated Forest Highway 5. The entire corridor is part of Los Caminos Antiguos Scenic and Historic Byway.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Los Caminos Antiguos)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for better maintenance




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population, minority and <br> disabled population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Several sections with shoulders <2' <br> 3 sections with elevated crash patterns (LOSS <br> 3 or 4) (west of junction 250) |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |


| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |

sections with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) (west of junction 250) h

Corridor Needs: State Highway 17A: New Mexico State line to Antonito


## Corridor Needs

© Mitigate elevated crash patternsEliminate shoulder deficiencies
$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
© Improve bicycle accommodation

Corridor Projects: State Highway 17A: New Mexico State line to Antonito

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southern SLV Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for southern portion of the SLV. | 2035 | (-) | (-1) | $\theta$ | \$0.82 |
| US 285 and SH 17 Intersection Improvements | - | 2036 | (1) 8 | - | (1) | \$5.00 |
| SH 17 West of Antonito | Rural road surface treatment | 2634 | $3$ | (1) | 3 | \$10.38 |

## Project Types
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- SH 17 West of Antonito

- Southern SLV Demand Response
(1) Safety
- US 285 and SH 17 Intersection Improvements


## Corridor Name

State Highway 17B: From Alamosa to US 285 to Villa Grove

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 17 B - Alamosa to Jct. US 285 at Villa Grove corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor makes north-south connections within the San Luis Valley north of Alamosa. Additionally, the corridor serves as an important interregional bus and freight corridor. Communities along the corridor depend on tourism and agriculture for economic activity in the area. The southern part of the corridor is part of Los Caminos Antiguos Scenic Byway and provides access to the Great Sand Dunes National Park.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Section of Scenic Byway, Alamosa to Mosca (Los Caminos Antiguos)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 12 comments
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for transit
- Desire for rest stops/ truck parking
- Concerns about safety
- Likely funding by SB 267



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+population, disabled population, low income <br> population, and minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route <br> Majority of corridor with shoulders <2' |
| Transit | Black Hills Stage Lines and Bustang Outrider <br> operates on corridor <br> Bustang Outrider stops in Alamosa and Moffat |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | Low redundancy |
| Economics <br> Freight | Agricultural corridor <br> Provides access to recreational area |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 17B: From Alamosa to US 285 at Villa

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove bicycle accommodation

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 17: Safety and Mobility Improvements North of Mosca (Widen shoulders) | This project will widen the shoulders of CO 17 just north of the community of Mosca. | 1296 | (1) | (i) ( $-(1)$ 6 $\qquad$ | (1) | \$37.50 |
| US 160 Rio Grande River Bridge to SH 17 | Highway and multimodal improvements | 2038 | 614 |  |  | \$8.80 |
| Northeast San Luis Valley Transit Service | Fixed route/demand response hybrid service to Villa Grove, KV, Moffat (Crestone), Hooper, Mosca, Alamosa - Assumes weekday service and two new vehicles at $\$ 80 \mathrm{k}$ each. | 2532 | (-) | (n) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.16 |
| MP 84.5 to MP 118.5 | Rural Road Surface Treatment | 80 | $3$ | (1) | 3 | \$12.00 |

## Project Types
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## Corridor Name

US Highway 24A (i): Between Granite and Johnson Village

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 24 A - Granite to Johnson Village corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the region. It also provides local access, is a commercial corridor in Buena Vista, and provides commuter access in Chaffee County and to Lake and Summit Counties. Additionally, this corridor comprises a significant portion of the Collegiate Peaks Scenic Byway.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Collegiate Peaks)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 43 comments
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for roadway expansion
- Concerns about congestion
- Desire for improved traffic control
- Desire for bike/ ped improvements
- Desire for transit
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+population, disabled population, and minority <br> population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Hazmat route <br> 1 section with shoulders < 2' (Buena Vista) <br> 1 section with elevated crash pattern (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> (north of Buena Vista) <br> Dense wildlife crashes |
| Transit | Bustang Outrider and Chaffee Shuttle operates on a <br> small section of corridor (J ohnson Village to Buena <br> Vista) <br> Bustang Outrider stop in Buena Vista |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Buena Vista (DOLA affiliated <br> Main Street) |
| Resiliency | High criticality (Buena Vista) <br> Crosses 100-year flood plains (South of Granite) <br> Low redundancy |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Buena Vista <br> Provides access to recreational area |
| Freight |  |



Corridor Needs: US Highway 24A (i): Between Granite and J ohnson

## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtowns)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove bicycle accommodationMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Reduce travel delays and improve travel time reliability

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Salida and Leadville (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Salida and Leadville. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1034 | (-) | (i) $\Rightarrow 0$ |  | \$1.75 |
| Buena Vista Intersection Improvements | US 24 \& Steele-\$4M; US24 DePaul-Baylor- \$4M | 2039 | (1) 8 | $6.8(11)$ |  | \$8.00 |
| CR 384/US 24 Lighting | Overhead lighting at intersection | 2042 | (1) | - | ! | - |
| US 24 Buena Vista to R3 | Rural road surface treatment | 2631 | $(3)$ | (1) | $8$ | \$10.38 |
| Chaffee County <br> Multimodal <br> Transportation Plan | Multimodal plan covering bicycle, pedestrian, transit, highways/roads, airports, freight, rail, and telecommunications; assessment of safety, mobility, economic vitality, system maintenance, and strategic policies for the County's multimodal system | 2711 | (1) 8 | (i.) $60 \%-1$ (a) |  | \$0.25 |

## Project Types
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 24 pedestrian crossing improvements in Buena Vista | Relocation of "stop here" signs, add concrete median on southernmost crossing, ensure lights/buttons function, educational signage | 2712 | d |  | (1) | - |
| US 24 bike lane improvements from Mill Street to Baylor Drive in Buena Vista | Bike lane extensions, improved transition to sidewalks along US 24 between Mill Street and Baylor Drive | 2713 | 60 | $\Leftrightarrow$ ! | (1) 5 | - |

## Project Types
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## $\square$ <br> Asset Management

- US 24 Buena Vista to R3
- Chaffee County Multimodal Transportation Plan


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Salida and Leadville (Proposed Outrider Service)


## (1) Safety

- Buena Vista Intersection Improvements
- CR 384/US 24 Lighting
- US 24 pedestrian crossing improvements in Buena Vista
- US 24 bike lane improvements from Mill Street to Baylor Drive in Buena Vista



## Corridor Name

US Highway 24A (ii): Between J ohnson Village and Antero J unction

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 24 A - J ohnson Village to Antero J unction corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to increase mobility and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the Buena Vista area. It is a tourism and intercity bus link to the Front Range area. This segment overlays a portion of US 285 and is considered a unique portion of the corridor for its transit of Trout Creek Pass. It also crosses the popular Four Mile Recreation Area.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Tier 2 EV Corridor
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 9 comments
- Concerns about safety
- High traffic volumes
- Concerns about road condition
- Concerns about travel time reliability




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+population, disabled population, and minority population | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Resiliency | High criticality (section at J ohnson Village) Parallels and crosses 100-year floodplain Low redundancy |
| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route <br> 1 section with shoulders <2' (J ohnson Village) Majority of corridor with elevated crash pattern (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> Dense wildlife crashes |  |  |
| Transit | Black Hills Stage Lines and Bustang Outrider operates on corridor |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Accommodate seasonal increases in tourism activity and associated congestionEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Mitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, reststops/ truck parking

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Beneffts | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 285: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure (Fairplay to Monte Vista) | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Fairplay and Monte Vista | 1012 | (8) |  | (1) | \$45.00 |
| US 24: Safety and Mobility Improvements on Trout Creek Pass Phase II | Shoulder widening/bike facilities, wildlife mitigation and addition of passing lanes and bike facilities on Trout Creek Pass. | 1298 |  |  |  | \$7.74 |
| New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver | Essential bus service between Durango, Bayfield, Pagosa Springs, South Fork, Monte Vista, Center, Saguache, Villa Grove, Salida, Buena Vista, Fairplay, Denver (Potential Bustang Outrider). Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. (350 miles, 700 roundtrip) | 2535 | (9) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$11.55 |
| Essential Bus Service between <br> Salida/Buena Vista and <br> Colorado <br> Springs | Essential bus service between Salida/Buena Vista and Colorado Springs. Assumes one roundtrip per day, 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20 / \mathrm{mi}$ | 2707 | (-) | (.) $\Rightarrow$ (iil) |  | \$1.30 |

## Project Types
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chaffee County <br> Multimodal <br> Transportation Plan | Multimodal plan covering bicycle, pedestrian, transit, highways/roads, airports, freight, rail, and telecommunications; assessment of safety, mobility, economic vitality, system maintenance, and strategic policies for the County's multimodal system | 2711 |  | (i) 60 (2) 1 |  | \$0.25 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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- Chaffee County Multimodal Transportation Plan


## Mobility

- US 285: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure (Fairplay to Monte Vista)
- New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver


## (1.) Safety

- US 24: Safety and Mobility Improvements on Trout Creek Pass Phase II


## Corridor Name

US Highway 50A (i): Between West of Parlin and Poncha Springs

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 50 A - West of Parlin to Poncha Springs corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, makes east-west connections via Monarch Pass and provides access to Monarch Ski Area and other recreational opportunities. Monarch Pass serves as an important gateway to western Colorado.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R5-7)
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 22 comments
- Frustration with congestion
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for improved traffic control
- Desire for passing/ turn lanes




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population, disabled <br> population, low income population, and <br> minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight | Hazmat route <br> Safety |
| 2 sections with shoulders < 2' (between <br> Garfield and Poncha Springs) <br> 2 sections with elevated crash pattern (LOSS <br> 3 or 4) (west of Sargents and Maysville) |  |
| Transit | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor <br> Bustang Outrider stop at Monarch ski area |


| Freight <br> Safety | Low drivability life in short section west of <br> Poncha Springs <br> One bridge in poor condition north of Sargents |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | High bicycle activity |
| Resiliency | Parallels and crosses 100-year floodplain <br> Avalanche path in Monarch <br> Low redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area (Monarch <br> Mountain) |



## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patternsAccommodate seasonal increases in tourism activity and associated congestionAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (avalanches)Address bridge in poor condition| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements | Chain Station improvements to provide adequate lighting and space for trucks to pull over and for drivers to chain up safely including LED lighting, signing and striping, VMS signs, and paving as needed. | 1025 | $\theta$ |  |  | \$4.50 |
| Consider Speed Limit Reduction in the Town of Sargents | - | 2043 | (1) | - |  | - |
| Construct multimodal, streetscaping, and wayfinding improvements in Poncha Springs | - | 2456 | ( 60 |  |  | \$2.00 |
| US 50 pedestrian crossing in Poncha Springs | - | 2459 |  | (1) 3 | 1 $¢$ | - |
| Essential Bus Service between Montrose/Gunnison and Salida | Essential bus service between Montrose/Gunnison and Salida. Assumes one roundtrip per day, 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20 / \mathrm{mi}$ | 2708 | $\theta$ | (.) $\Leftrightarrow$ | ® | \$1.75 |

## Project Types
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chaffee County <br> Multimodal <br> Transportation Plan | Multimodal plan covering bicycle, pedestrian, transit, highways/roads, airports, freight, rail, and telecommunications; assessment of safety, mobility, economic vitality, system maintenance, and strategic policies for the County's multimodal system | 2711 | (1) | 808 0 |  | \$0.25 |
| US 50 and US 285 Intersection Reconstruction | Replaces a severely congested three-legged intersection with a signalized intersection to improve congestion, mobility, and safety | 73 | (1) | 61 |  | \$3.90 |
| North of US 285 from MP 211 to MP 217 | Rural road surface treatment | 77 | 3 | (1) | (1) | \$3.50 |

## Project Types
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## (1) Asset Management

- FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements
- Chaffee County Multimodal Transportation Plan
- North of US 285 from MP 211 to MP 217


## Mobility

- Construct multi-modal, street scaping, and wayfinding improvements in Poncha Springs
- Essential Bus Service between Montrose/Gunnison and Salida
- US 50 and US 285 Intersection Reconstruction


## (1) Safety

- Consider Speed Limit Reduction in the Town of Sargents
- US 50 Pedestrian crossing in Poncha Springs


## Corridor Name

US Highway 50A (ii): Between Poncha Springs and Salida

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 50 A - Poncha Springs to Salida corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

The transportation system in the area serves towns and recreational destinations within the corridor as well as forms a critical link in the interregional corridor, connecting to US 285 and the Monarch Pass gateway to western Colorado. A significant portion of this corridor is in commercial development as it passes through the City of Salida. Additionally, this corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility and is designated scenic byway: Collegiate Peaks Scenic Byway.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R5-7)
- Scenic Byway (Collegiate Peaks)
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 12 comments
- Desire for better bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Desire for traffic calming
- Desire for intersection improvements




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population, disabled <br> population, and minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route <br> 2 small sections with shoulders <2' (Poncha <br> Springs and Salida) |
| Transit | Bustang Outrider operates on corridor <br> Bustang Outrider stop in Salida |


| Bicycling | High bicycle activity section at Salida <br> High stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- |
| Resiliency | Parallels and crosses 100-year floodplain <br> Low redundancy |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Salida <br> Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

$\leftarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, restAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
stops/ truck parking
Eliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Salida and Leadville (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Salida and Leadville. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1034 | (-) | (12) (iil) |  | \$1.75 |
| US 50/285 Intersection | Intersection improvements | 1052 | (1) 8 | - | (1) | \$8.90 |
| Essential Bus Service between Alamosa and Salida (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Alamosa and Salida. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1054 | (-) | (i) 3 |  | \$2.09 |
| Salida Bus Storage Facility | Salida - bus storage facility | 1299 | (e) | - | 5 | \$2.00 |
| Salida Park-n-Ride and Bus Pullouts | Establish Park-n-Ride, bus pull-out in Salida | 1300 | (-) | (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.60 |
| Intersection Improvements | US 50 and SH 291- \$5M | 2041 | (1) | - | (1) | \$5.00 |
| US50 Ped Crossings Salida | Ped and striping improvements. RRFB with medians and crosswalks. | 2044 | $N$ | $( \pm)$ |  | \$0.60 |
| Construct multi-modal, street scaping, and wayfinding improvements in Poncha Springs | - | 2456 | ( 60 |  | (1) | \$2.00 |
| US 50 pedestrian crossing in Poncha Springs | - | 2459 | (i) |  | (1) | - |
| Essential Bus Service between Montrose/Gunnison and Salida | Essential bus service between <br> Montrose/Gunnison and Salida. Assumes one roundtrip per day, 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20 / \mathrm{mi}$ | 2708 | (-) | (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$1.75 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits


Resilience
(1) Pedestrian

$\begin{array}{lrl}\text { Mobility Options } \\ \text { Asset } & \text { Safety } \\ \text { Management } & \text { Aviation }\end{array}$

SWP Goal Area


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chaffee County Multimodal Transportation Plan | Multimodal plan covering bicycle, pedestrian, transit, highways/roads, airports, freight, rail, and telecommunications; assessment of safety, mobility, economic vitality, system maintenance, and strategic policies for the County's multimodal system | 2711 | (1) |  |  | \$0.25 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



- US50 Ped Crossings Salida
- Chaffee County Multimodal Transportation Plan

- Essential Bus Service between Salida and Leadville (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Essential Bus Service between Alamosa and Salida (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Salida Bus Storage Facility
- Salida Park-n-Ride and Bus Pullouts
- Essential Bus Service between Montrose/Gunnison and Salida

- US 50/285 Intersection
- Intersection Improvements
- Construct multimodal, streetscaping, and wayfinding improvements in Poncha Springs
- US 50 Pedestrian crossing in Poncha Springs


## Corridor Name

US Highway 50A (iii): Between Salida and Coaldale

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 50 A - Salida to Coaldale corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the Arkansas River Canyon area.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for roadway condition improvements




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+population, disabled <br> population, and minority population |  | Bicycling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$ Section of high stress for bicycling near Salida | Resiliency |
| :--- |$\quad$| High criticality |
| :--- |
| Parallels and crosses 100-year floodplain |
| Low redundancy |



## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patternsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Improve travel time reliability| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Salida to Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Salida and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1008 | (-) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.34 |
| Chaffee County <br> Multimodal <br> Transportation Plan | Multimodal plan covering bicycle, pedestrian, transit, highways/roads, airports, freight, rail, and telecommunications; assessment of safety, mobility, economic vitality, system maintenance, and strategic policies for the County's multimodal system | 2711 |  |  |  | \$0.25 |

## Project Types
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## (3) Asset Management

- Chaffee County Multimodal Transportation Plan


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Salida to Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)


## ! Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## Corridor Name

State Highway 112A (i): Between Del Norte and Junction with US 285

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 112 A - Del Norte to US 285 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, provides local access, and makes east-west connections within the central San Luis Valley. Many local residents commute to Del Norte, Monte Vista, or agriculture-based employment throughout the Valley.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments received so far



|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of: $65+$ population, minority and <br> disabled population |  | Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Bridge in poor condition east of Del Norte |
| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Transit | Eagle Line operates on corridor <br> (Center - Del Norte - Monte Vista) | Resiliency | Low redundancy |  |



## Corridor Needs

i) Address bridge in poor condition
$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 112 Bridge Projects | Four bridges need widening from Del Norte to Center. | 2045 | (3) | (1) | (1) 5 2 | \$3.00 |
| SH 112 Passing Lane | Del Norte to Center | 2046 | (1) | (1) | (1) E) | \$3.00 |
| SH 112 Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for Central SLV. Connect with other sections of TPR and Bustang Outrider. Operating cost of $\$ 200,000$ per year plus 2 new cutaway vehicles at $\$ 80,000$ each. | 2047 | (2) | (12) (ii) | $\theta$ | \$3.60 |
| Construct Intersection Improvements at SH 112/Road 10 North (Rio Grande County) | - | 2048 | (1) (8) | (3) | (1) 0 | \$2.50 |
| New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver | Essential bus service between Durango, Bayfield, Pagosa Springs, South Fork, Monte Vista, Center, Saguache, Villa Grove, Salida, Buena Vista, Fairplay, Denver (Potential Bustang Outrider). Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. ( 350 miles, 700 roundtrip) | 2535 | (-) | (A) $\Leftrightarrow 13$ (I) | $\theta$ | \$11.55 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits
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- SH 112 Bridge Projects

- SH 112 Demand Response
- New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver
- SH 112 Passing Lane

- Construct Intersection Improvements at SH 112/Road 10 North (Rio Grande County)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 112A (ii): From US 285 to SH 17

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 112 A - US 285 to SH 17 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, acts as Main Street in the Town of Center, and provides a link between Center and Hooper. Many local residents commute to Alamosa or agriculture based employment throughout the Valley

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for safe routes to schools
- Desire for pedestrian improvements (Center)



|  | Key Data FindingS: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65 population, minority and <br> disabled population |  | Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life |
| Freight <br> Safety | 5 sections with shoulders <2' (near Hooper) |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Transit | Eagle Line operates on corridor <br> (Center - Del Norte - Monte Vista) |  | Resiliency | Crosses 100-year floodplain <br> Low redundancy |
|  |  | Economics | High concentration of jobs in Center |  |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsCorridor Projects: State Highway 112A (ii):From US 285 to SH 17 (PSL7011)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 112 Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for Central SLV. Connect with other sections of TPR and Bustang Outrider. Operating cost of $\$ 200,000$ per year plus 2 new cutaway vehicles at $\$ 80,000$ each. | 2047 | (-) | (1) 4 | $\theta$ | \$3.60 |
| Consider Speed Limit Reduction in the Town of Center | - | 2049 | (1) | - | $!$ | \$0.10 |
| Pedestrian Crossing on SH 112 | Install a Pedestrian Crossing on SH 112 in the Town of Center at the School | 2050 | ( | $\Leftrightarrow \text { ! }$ | (1) | \$0.75 |
| Center Park-n-Ride | Park-n-Ride and Bus Pullouts (Eagle Shuttle) in Center | 2538 | (-) | (12) $\Rightarrow$ |  | \$0.75 |

## Project Types
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 Management

- Pedestrian Crossing on SH 112


- Consider Speed Limit Reduction in the Town of Center


## Corridor Name

State Highway 114A: Between Gunnison and Saguache

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 114 A - East of Gunnison to Jct. US 285 (Saguache) corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections via Cochetopa Pass, connecting the San Luis Valley to the US 50 corridor west of Monarch Pass. Communities along the corridor depend on tourism, access to recreation, forestry and agriculture.

## Corridor Designations

- None (In the process of being identified by Parks as part of Old Spanish Trails)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 8 comments
- Desire for reduced speeds/ traffic calming
- Desire for multimodal improvements and designations for economic revitalization
- Interest on signage improvements
- Concerns about safety (lots of wildlife, loggers, cattle and hunting)
- Desire for intersection improvements (114/ 285)
- Desire for better recreational access




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+ population, disabled population and low income population. | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders <2' 4 sections with elevated crash pattern (LOSS 3 or 4) (near TPR border and West of Saguache) |  |  |
| Asset Management | Sections of low drivability life west of Saguache Creek |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability is poorImprove safety concernsMitigate elevated crash patternsImprove access to recreationEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsCorridor Projects: State Highway 114A:Between Gunnison and Saguache

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 114 Demand Response | New Limited local demand response service 2 days per week connecting to service In Gunnison County. Operating cost of $\$ 75,000$ per year, requires 1 new cutaway vehicle at $\$ 80,000$ | 2051 |  | (n) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$1.55 |
| MP 8.5 to MP 42.5 | Rural Road Surface Treatment | 84 | $(3)$ | (1) | 3 | \$12.00 |

## Project Types
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- MP 8.5 to MP 42.5



## (1) Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## Corridor Name

State Highway 136A: Between La J ara and Sanford

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 136 A - La J ara to Sanford corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides local access and makes east-west connections within the northeast Conejos County area.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 4 comments
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for safe turn lane
- Desire for bicycle/ pedestrian facilities



|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population, minority and <br> disabled population |  | Resiliency <br> Freight |



## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
$\rightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus
stops, downtowns)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 136A:Between La J ara and Sanford

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southern SLV Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for southern portion of the SLV. | 2035 | (2) | (4) $\Leftrightarrow 0$ | E(1) | \$0.82 |
| Construct Safety Improvements on SH 136 between La Jara and Sanford | - | 2052 | (1) | - | (1) | - |
| SH 136 La Jara East | Rural road surface treatment | 2630 | 8 | (1) | 9 | \$2.00 |

## Project Types
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## Project Based Strategies: State Highway 136A:Between La J ara and


(P) Asset

Management

- SH 136 La Jara East


- Construct Safety Improvements on SH 136 between La Jara and Sanford


## Corridor Name

State Highway 142A: Between Romeo and San Luis

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 142 A - Romeo to SH 159 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves local access needs and makes eastwest connections within the lower San Luis Valley area. The entire corridor is part of Los Caminos Antiguos Scenic and Historic Byway.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Los Caminos Antiguos)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Concerns about pavement condition




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+population, disabled <br> population, low income population, and <br> minority population |  | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders <2' |  | Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Manassa |
| Freight <br> Aset <br> Management | Bridge in poor condition east of Manassa | Freight <br> Economics | Agricultural corridor <br> Provides access to recreational area |  |



## Corridor Needs

Address bridge in poor condition$\leftrightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demandEliminate shoulder deficiencies
$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable population
(bus stops, downtown)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 142A:Between Romeo and San Luis

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southern SLV Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for southern portion of the SLV. | 2035 | (-) | (1) © (iil) | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.82 |
| Timber bridge replacement. P-13-D. Structurally Def. | - | 2053 | $3$ | (1) | 13 | \$3.25 |
| Manassa Safe Route To School (SRTS) Project. SA\# 22531. | Bike lanes and ped improvements to improve access to Manassa Elementary. | 2073 | ( 0 6 | $(n) \Rightarrow$ |  | \$0.35 |

## Project Types
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- Timber bridge replacement. P-13-D. Structurally Def.


- Manassa Safe Route To School (SRTS) Project. SA\# 22531.


## Corridor Name

State Highway 149A: Between South Fork to the Mineral and Hinsdale County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 149 A - South Fork to Mineral/ Hinsdale County Line corridor is primarily improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the region and makes north-south connections on the Silver Thread Scenic Byway, between South Fork and Lake City via Slumgullion Pass. The transportation system provides access to recreational facilities, mining, freight, and forestry for economic activity in the area.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Silver Thread)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 14 comments
- Poor pavement condition
- Interest in signage improvements
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for more transit
- Concerns about rock falls
- Desire for bicycle facilities
- Concerns about resilience




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ population and disabled population | Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders < $\mathbf{2}^{\prime}$ | Economics | Provides access to recreational area |
| Asset Management | Low drivability life west of Creede. Main Street through Creede (DOLA affiliated Main Street) |  |  |

$\underset{C D O T}{ }$


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poor
Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 149 Passing and Pull-out Project | Topographic constraints. Will need walls or cuts. No crash hot spots. | 2054 | (1) | (1) ! | (1) | \$4.00 |
| Install Intersection Signing at SH 149/Airport Road in Creede | - | 2056 | (1) | (i) | (1) | \$1.00 |
| Creede Eagle Intersect | Fixed route/demand response hybrid service to Creede, South Fork, Del Norte, Monte Vista, Alamosa (connects with Eagle to Salida on Tuesdays and Alamosa on Wednesday) Assumes service 5 days/week and two new vehicles \$80k each. | 2537 |  | (12) (iil) | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.16 |
| North of Creede from MP 0 to MP 42.3 | Rural Road Surface Treatment | 81 | $(3)$ | (1) | 5 | \$16.00 |

## Project Types
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## (P) Asset <br> Management

- North of Creede from MP 0 to MP 42.3


## Mobility

- Creede Eagle Intersect
- SH 149 Passing and Pull-out Project


## (1) Safety

- Install Intersection Signing at SH 149/Airport Road in Creede


## Corridor Name

State Highway 150A: US 160 to Great Sand Dunes National Park and Reserve

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 150 A - US 160 to Great Sand Dunes National Park and Reserve corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal local facility, provides local access, and connects to the Great Sand Dunes National Park. The entire corridor is part of Los Caminos Antiguos Scenic and Historic Byway.

## Corridor Designations

- Section of Scenic Byway, US 160 to J CT Ln 6 (Los Caminos Antiguos)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 4 Comments
- Desire for bicycle facilities
- Concerns about tourism congestion
- Concerns about crash patterns


National Park and Reserve (PSL7016)

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population and disabled population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders <2' <br> 1 section with elevated crash pattern (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area (Sand Dunes <br> National Park) |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 150A: US 160 to Great Sand Dunes

## Corridor Needs

Improve bicycle accommodationMitigate elevated crash patternsEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAccommodate seasonal increases in tourism activity and associated congestion

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this goal area | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Project Types
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Pedestrian

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## Corridor Name

State Highway 159A: New Mexico state line to Fort Garland

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 159 A - New Mexico state line to Fort Garland corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor connects to places outside the region, making north-south connections from the lower San Luis Valley to Taos, New Mexico. The entire corridor is part of Los Caminos Antiguos Scenic and Historic Byway.

## Corridor Designations

- Section of Scenic Byway, SH 160 to SH 142 (Los Caminos Antiguos)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 8 comments
- Poor pavement condition
- Safety concerns
- Concerns about wildlife mitigation
- Desire for reduced speeds/ traffic calming
- Desire for pedestrian improvements (Fort Garland)


Key Data Findings: State Highway 159A: New Mexico state line to Fort
Garland (PSL7017)

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ population, disabled population, low income <br> population, and minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | 2 sections with shoulders <2' (Garcia and San Luis) |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through San Luis (DOLA affiliated Main <br> Street) |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | Low redundancy |
| Freight <br> Economics | Agricultural corridor |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 159A: New Mexico state line to Fort

## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)Eliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Regional FixedRoute Service between Alamosa and Costilla, NM | Establish fixed services from Alamosa to Costilla, NM to interchange with Blue Bus services; two round trips weekly | 1053 | (-) | (i) $\Rightarrow$ ii | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.19 |
| New Regional FixedRoute Service between Alamosa and Saguache | Establish fixed services Saguache to Alamosa via Monte Vista \& US 285; two round trips daily, 5 days/week; one bus | 1055 | (9) | $\text { (n) } \Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.62 |
| Perform Pavement Maintenance Along SH 159 in the Town of San Luis | - | 2057 | 8 | (1) |  | \$1.50 |

## Project Types
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## (1) Asset Management

- Perform Pavement Maintenance Along SH 159 in the Town of San Luis


## Mobility

- New Regional Fixed-Route Service between Alamosa and Costilla, NM
- New Regional Fixed-Route Service between Alamosa and Saguache


## (1) Safety

- See project: Perform Pavement Maintenance Along SH 159 in the Town of San Luis



## Corridor Name

US Highway 160A(i): SH 84 to west of South Fork

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160 A - J ct with SH 84 to west of South Fork corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality. Continued safety and system quality improvements will have the effect of increasing mobility to a degree without constructing new through traffic lanes.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, making east-west connections via Wolf Creek Pass. It supports the movement of freight and provides access to recreational areas as Wolf Creek Ski Area.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R5-3)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 15 comments
- Safety concerns (including trucks)
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Desire for public transit



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population and disabled population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route <br> 2 sections with shoulders <2' (around the Wolf Creek <br> Pass Overlook and North of Fun Valley Family Resort) <br> 3 sections with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life near South Fork |
| Bicycling | High bicycle activity <br> Medium to high stress for bicyclist with a section of <br> high stress |
| Resiliency | Avalanche path (West of South Fork to Southwest <br> TPR boundary) <br> Low redundancy |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area <br> (Wolf Creek Ski Area) |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (avalanches)Accommodate seasonal increases in tourism activity and associated congestionMitigate elevated crash patternsEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove bicycle accommodation

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project <br> Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements | Chain Station improvements to provide adequate lighting and space for trucks to pull over and for drivers to chain up safely including LED lighting, signing and striping, VMS signs, and paving as needed. | 1025 | $(1)$ | (1) |  | \$4.50 |
| Essential Bus Service between Durango-South Fork-Alamosa-WalsenburgPueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 |  |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$5.02 |
| US 160: Wolf Creek Pass East Mobility and Safety Improvements | Addition of passing opportunities, mobility and safety improvements including shoulder widening, curve corrections, rock excavation and rockfall protection, chain station reconstruction, and fiber optic ITS. | 1302 | (1) |  |  | \$91.98 |
| US 160 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Infrastructure (La Plata, Archuletta, and Mineral counties) | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Durango and Wolf Creek Tunnel | 1303 | (8) | - ! |  | \$30.56 |
| Wolf Creek Pass - Wildlife Priority | Dynamic Wildlife Warning Signs | 1304 | (1) | ( 1 | 4 | \$10.55 |
| US 160 and Sherman Avenue in Monte Vista Intersection Improvements | - | 2058 | (1) 8 | (3) -2 | (1) | \$0.75 |
| Coordination with CDOT on Expansion of Outrider Services | Coordination with CDOT on implementation of Outrider services (no cost associated with this project) | 2542 | (-) |  | ¢ | \$0.00 |
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| Planning | Primary |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project | Project |
| ID | Types |


| Additional | SWP | Project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project | Goal | Cost (In <br> Benefits |
| Areas | millions) |  |


| New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver | Essential bus service between Durango, Bayfield, Pagosa Springs, South Fork, Monte Vista, Center, Saguache, Villa Grove, Salida, Buena Vista, Fairplay, Denver (Potential Bustang Outrider). Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. (350 miles, 700 roundtrip) | 2535 |  |  | $\theta$ | \$11.55 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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## 0 <br> Asset Management

- FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements
- US 160 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Infrastructure (La Plata, Archuletta, and Mineral counties)



## Corridor Name

US Highway 160A(ii): Between South Fork and Monte Vista

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160 A -West of South Fork to West of Monte Vista corridor is primarily to maintain system quality and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections through southwest Colorado.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R5-3)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments
- Desire for roadway expansion
- Desire for passing lanes


Key Data Findings: US Highway 160A(ii): Between South Fork and Monte


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population, disabled <br> population, minority and low-income population |  | Bicycling | Segments with high bicycle activity (South Fork, Del <br> Norte, and between Del Norte and Monte Vista); <br> medium to high stress for bicycling (between South <br> Fork and Del Norte) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route <br> 2 section with shoulders <2' (Del Norte) <br> 2 sections with elevated crash pattern (LOSS 3 <br> or 4) (Jct with Hanna Ln road and East of Del <br> Norte) <br> Dense wildlife crashes | Resiliency <br> Freight | High criticality <br> Parallels and crosses 100-year floodplain <br> Low redundancy |  |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Del Norte | Freight <br> Economics | High concentration of jobs in South Fork, Del <br> Norte, and Monte Vista |  |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, reststops/ truck parkingEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)


Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Improve bicycle accommodationEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Durango-South Fork-Alamosa-WalsenburgPueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 | (-) | (x) $\Rightarrow$ (iin |  | \$5.02 |
| Del Norte Park-n-Ride and Bus Pullout | Establish Park-n-Ride, bus pull-out in Del Norte | 1305 | (-) | (x) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.75 |
| US 160 Monte Vista HAWK | Installation of High-Intensity Activated crosswalk beacon (HAWK) between Franklin and Lyells St. | 2059 | ( | (x) $\leqslant$ ! | (1) | \$0.50 |
| Del Norte Multimodal streetscape | ADA (American with Disabilities Act) Sidewalks | 2458 | ( ${ }^{20}$ | (i) $\rightarrow$ ! |  | - |
| Coordination with CDOT on Expansion of Outrider Services | Coordination with CDOT on implementation of Outrider services (no cost associated with this project) | 2542 | (-) |  | $\theta$ | \$0.00 |
| New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver | Essential bus service between Durango, Bayfield, Pagosa Springs, South Fork, Monte Vista, Center, Saguache, Villa Grove, Salida, Buena Vista, Fairplay, Denver (Potential Bustang Outrider). Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. ( 350 miles, 700 roundtrip) | 2535 | (-) |  | $\theta$ | \$11.55 |
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## (9) Asset <br> Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-WalsenburgPueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Del Norte Park-n-Ride and Bus Pullout
- Coordination with CDOT on Expansion of Outrider Services
- New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver

- US 160 Monte Vista HAWK
- Del Norte Multi-modal streetscape


## Corridor Name

US Highway 160A (iii): Between Monte Vista and Alamosa

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160 A - West of Monte Vista to East of Alamosa corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, acts as Main Street in Alamosa, and makes east-west connections between Monte Vista and Alamosa. The transportation system supports the movement of tourists, commuters, freight, local residents and farm-tomarket products in and through the corridor

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R5-3)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 32 comments
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for pedestrian improvements
- Concerns about traffic control
- Desire for roadway expansion
- Desire for public transit



|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ population, disabled population, minority and low-income | Bicycling | 1 section with high bicycle activity (Monte Vista). Small sections of high stress for bicycling (Monte Vista and Alamosa) |
|  | population | Pedestrian Economics | Main Street through Monte Vista and Alamosa |
| Freight Safety | Hazmat route 2 sections with shoulders <2' (Monte Vista and Alamosa) | Resiliency | High criticality <br> Parallels 100-year floodplain <br> Low redundancy |
| Transit | Eagle Line operates on corridor (Center - Del Norte - Monte Vista) | Economics | High concentration of jobs in Monte Vista and Alamosa |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Short segment of low drivability life east of Monte Vista | Freight Economics | Agricultural corridor |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingImprove bicycle accommodationEliminate shoulder deficiencies© Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Durango-South <br> Fork-Alamosa- <br> Walsenburg-Pueblo <br> (Proposed Outrider <br> Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 | (-) | (1) $\Rightarrow$ (iil |  | \$5.02 |
| Essential Bus Service between Alamosa and Salida (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Alamosa and Salida. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1054 | (-) | (n) (iil) | $\theta$ | \$2.09 |
| New Regional FixedRoute Service between Alamosa and Saguache | Establish fixed services Saguache to Alamosa via Monte Vista \& US285; two round trips daily, 5 days/week; one bus | 1055 | (-) | (n) 0 (iil | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.62 |
| Park-n-Ride at Loaf-n-Jug in Alamosa | Establish Park-n-Ride at Loaf-n-Jug site; 50 spaces | 1306 | (-) | (1) 3 | 0 | \$0.75 |
| Monte Vista Park-n-Ride and Bus Pullout | Establish Park-n-Ride, bus pull-out in Monte Vista | 1307 | (9) | $\text { (n) } \Leftrightarrow$ | 5 | \$0.75 |
| New Alamosa General Public Demand Response Service | Develop a demand response service available to the general public focused on Alamosa with connections to adjacent counties; 7 days/week; 1 bus | 1308 | (-) | (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ |  | \$2.18 |
| Alamosa Transit Center | Establish centrally located transit center for expanded local, regional and intercity services in the Valley; incl Admin office space, bus storage, restrooms, ticketing and 50-space Parking facility | 1309 | (9) | $\text { (n) } \Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$2.80 |
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 160: Rio Grande River Bridge to SH 17 | Improvements to Rio Grande bridge, realignment of roadway, and addition of bike and pedestrian facilities in Alamosa (4th Street to SH 17). | 1310 | (3) | (1) 0 |  | \$8.74 |
| Head on Detection Warning | Forward Collision Warning (FCW) | 1311 | (1) | - | (1) | - |
| US 160 and SH 17 <br> Intersection <br> Improvement Project | This project is located at the intersection of US Hwy 160 and State Hwy 17 on the east side of Alamosa (public meeting, spring 2016). It includes: signalization of the congested intersection to accommodate freight mobility from SH 17 to US 160 east, widening SH 17 (for more truck storage before the right turn lane is blocked by traffic), reconfiguring the existing traffic islands to improve the turning radius for freight, reconstruction with concrete pavement to prevent rutting due to the high volume of heavy freight, installation of concrete curb and gutter will provide access control to improve safety and mobility. | 1312 | (1) (8) | -2. |  | \$4.50 |
| US160-285 Alamosa ADA | Provide ADA (American with Disabilities Act) access | 2060 | N | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ cin | (1) Et | \$1.08 |
| US 160 / Pike Avenue Intersection | Road Diet. Project prioritized in 2019 Safety Study. | 2061 | (1) 8 | (1) 60.8 |  | \$3.00 |
| Increase in Eagle Line's Service Hours and/or Days | Increase service of Eagle line by 2 days a week for a total of 4 days of operation each week. | 2541 | ) | (12) 0 | $\theta$ | \$0.40 |
| Coordination with CDOT on Expansion of Outrider Services | Coordination with CDOT on implementation of Outrider services (no cost associated with this project) | 2542 | (2) |  | 0 | \$0.00 |
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## (3) Asset Management

- US 160 and SH 17 Intersection Improvement Project

- Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-WalsenburgPueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Essential Bus Service between Alamosa and Salida (Proposed Outrider Service)
- New Regional Fixed-Route Service between Alamosa and Saguache
- Park-n-Ride at Loaf-n-Jug in Alamosa

- US 160: Rio Grande River Bridge to SH 17
- Head on Detection Warning



## (1) Asset <br> Management

- US 160 / Pike Avenue Intersection


## Mobility

- Monte Vista Park-n-Ride and Bus Pullout
- New Alamosa General Public Demand Response Service
- Alamosa Transit Center
- Increase in Eagle Line's Service Hours and/or Days
- Coordination with CDOT on Expansion of Outrider Services


## Corridor Name

US Highway 160A(iv): Between Alamosa and Blanca

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160 A - East of Alamosa to J ct SH 150 (Blanca) corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes east-west connections within the San Luis Valley. The corridor connects to SH 150, the gateway to the Great Sand Dunes National Park and Reserve. It provides commuter access to Alamosa and acts like a Main Street through several smaller towns, including Blanca and Ft. Garland.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 12 comments
- Desire for passing lanes/turn lanes
- Concerns about bridge conditions
- Desire for bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements
- Desire for intersection improvements
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement (bypass Alamosa)




## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population, minority and <br> disabled population |  | Resiliency |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$| Low redundancy |
| :--- |
| Preight <br> Safestrian |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate unsafe passing conditionsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest$\rightarrow$
Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus
stops/ truck parkingAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-Walsenburg-Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 | (-) | (4) $\rightarrow 0$ |  | \$5.02 |
| New Regional FixedRoute Service between Alamosa and Costilla, NM | Establish fixed services from Alamosa to Costilla, NM to interchange with Blue Bus services; two round trips weekly | 1053 | (-) | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ |  | \$0.19 |
| Passing between <br> Alamosa and Sand Dunes National Park. Cost for 2 miles. | Passing between Alamosa and Sand Dunes National Park. Cost for 2 miles. | 2062 | (1) | (8) (-) | (1) | \$3.00 |
| Highway widening at Juniper and US160. | Highway widening at Juniper and US160. | 2063 | (1) | (8) (-) 1 | (1) | \$0.75 |
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## (3) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

- Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-WalsenburgPueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- New Regional Fixed-Route Service between Alamosa and Costilla, NM
- Passing between Alamosa and Sand Dunes National Park. Cost for 2 miles.

- Highway widening at Juniper and US160.


## Corridor Name

US Highway 160A(v): Between Blanca and east of La Veta Pass

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160 A - J ct SH 150 (Blanca) to east of La Veta Pass corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region via La Veta Pass, and makes east-west connections within the southcentral Colorado area.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Scenic Byway, SH 150 to SH 159 (Los Caminos Antiguos)
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 14 comments
- Concerns about safety
- Desire for improved passing conditions
- Concerns about wildlife mitigation
- Desire for passing lanes/ turn lanes
- Concerns with flooding




## Key Data Findings:

## Demographics <br> Transit

Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+ population, disabled population, minority and low-income population

Hazmat route
Majority of corridor with elevated crash pattern (LOSS 3 or 4) Dense wildlife crashes

Medium to high stress for bicyclist with


## Corridor Needs

Eliminate unsafe passing conditionsMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements | Chain Station improvements to provide adequate lighting and space for trucks to pull over and for drivers to chain up safely including LED lighting, signing and striping, VMS signs, and paving as needed. | 1025 |  |  |  | \$4.50 |
| Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-Walsenburg-Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 | (-) | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$5.02 |
| New Regional FixedRoute Service between Alamosa and Costilla, NM | Establish fixed services from Alamosa to Costilla, NM to interchange with Blue Bus services; two round trips weekly | 1053 | (-) | (1) $\Rightarrow$ |  | \$0.19 |
| Blanca Park-n-Ride | Establish Park-n-Ride in Blanca | 1313 | (-) | (1) $\rightarrow$ | 5 | \$0.75 |
| Fort Garland Park-nRide | Establish Park-n-Ride in Fort Garland | 1314 | (-) | (12) 5 | $\theta$ | \$0.75 |
| US 160: Trinchera Safety Mitigation | This project will improve two intersections and install two wildlife crossing structures, along with wildlife fencing. | 1315 | (1) 8 |  |  | \$15.95 |
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- FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-WalsenburgPueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- New Regional Fixed-Route Service between Alamosa and Costilla, NM
- Blanca Park-n-Ride
- Fort Garland Park-n-Ride

- US 160: Trinchera Safety Mitigation


## Corridor Name

US Highway 285A(i): Between New Mexico state line to Alamosa

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 285 A - NM state line to 2 miles south of Alamosa corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes north-south connections on this major route to New Mexico. The section between Antonito and Romeo is part of Los Caminos Antiguos Scenic and Historic Byway.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Scenic Byway, SH 17 to SH 142 (Los Caminos Antiguos)
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 16 comments
- Concerns about congestion
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for rest stops/ truck parking
- Poor pavement condition



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+population, disabled population, minority and <br> low-income population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route <br> Majority of corridor with shoulders <2' |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Bridge in poor condition north of Antonito |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity <br> Medium to low stress with small sections of high <br> stress for bicycling |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through La J ara and Antonito |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Freight <br> Economics | High concentration of jobs in corridor <br> Agricultural corridor <br> Provides access to recreational area |



Corridor Needs: US Highway 285A(i): Between New Mexico state line to

## Corridor Needs

Address bridge in poor conditionImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingEliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southern SLV Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for southern portion of the SLV. | 2035 | (-) | (1) * | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.82 |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT <br> Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on US 285 | Addition of Fiber on US 285. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) / Connected and Automated Vehicles (CAV) plan - | 1056 | (8) | $!$ | (1) | - |
| Conejos Park-n-Ride | Establish Park-n-Ride, bus pullout in Conejos | 1316 | (-) | (4) 2 (ill | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.75 |
| Head-on Detection Warning | Forward Collision Warning (FCW) | 1317 | (1) |  | 4 | - |
| Bridge replacements on US 285. P-12-A and P-12-B replacements. | two bridge replacements | 2065 | $(3)$ | (1) | 31 | \$6.20 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 3 locations: Alamosa, Moffat, and Buena Vista | 2492 | (-) | (1) H | $\bigcirc$ | \$0.25 |
| Service Along Southern Portion of US 285 | Combination of fixed route and demand response service along the southern portion of 285. Assumes weekday service and two new vehicles at \$80k each. | 2533 |  |  | $\theta$ | \$2.16 |

## Project Types
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## 0 <br> Asset Management

- Bridge replacements on US 285. P-12-A and P-12-B replacements.


## Mobility

- Southern SLV Demand Response
- Conejos Park-n-Ride
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements
- Service Along Southern Portion of US 285


## (1) Safety

- ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 285
- Head on Detection Warning



## Corridor Name

US Highway 285A(ii): 2 miles south of Alamosa to Alamosa

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 285 A - 2 miles south of Alamosa to US 160 corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multi-modal National Highway System facility, provides access Alamosa San Luis Valley regional airport and makes north-south connections within the Alamosa urban area.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R5-3)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments
- Desire for passing lanes
- Desire for better road conditions (train crossing)



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population, disabled population, minority and <br> low-income population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route |
| Bicycling | Medium to high stress for bicyclist with small <br> sections of high stress for bicyclist |
| Freight <br> Economics | High concentration of jobs in Alamosa |
| Airport | Access to Alamosa-San Luis Valley Airport |



Corridor Needs: US Highway 285A(ii): 2 miles south of Alamosa to

## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsIncrease connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (airport)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southern SLV Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for southern portion of the SLV. | 2035 | (2) | (12) (in | $\theta$ | \$0.82 |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT <br> Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on US 285 | Addition of Fiber on US 285. - <br> Intelligent Transportation <br> Systems (ITS) / Connected and <br> Automated Vehicles (CAV) plan - | 1056 | (3) | (1) | (1) | - |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 3 locations: Alamosa, Moffat, and Buena Vista | 2492 | ) | (4) 3 | 5 | \$0.25 |
| US285 Passing Lane | Passing between Alamosa and Antonito | 2066 | (1) | (-) | (1) | \$3.00 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

## Project Benefits





Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## ( Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- Southern SLV Demand Response
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements
- US285 Passing Lane



## Corridor Name

US Highway 285B/ C: Between Monte Vista and J ohnson Village

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 285 B/ C - Monte Vista to J ohnson Village corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to increase mobility and to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

A section of the corridor is designated as part of the Collegiate Peaks Scenic Byway. It also serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes north-south connections from the central San Luis Valley via Poncha Pass into Chaffee County. Additionally it serves as an important intercity bus route between the San Luis Valley TPR and the Front Range.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor, Poncha Springs to Mears J unction (R5-8)
- Scenic Byway, Poncha Springs to J ohnson Village (Collegiate Peaks)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 34 comments
- Interest in improved signage
- Desire for transit capital improvements
- Desire for having transit (Bustang not on corridor)
- Desire for passing lanes/ turn lanes
- Desire for wider shoulders
- Concerns about congestion
- Poor pavement condition
- Concerns about safety



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population, disabled population, low-income <br> population, and minority population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Hazmat route <br> 4 sections with shoulders <2' (Monte Vista, La <br> Garita, Poncha Springs and J ct 291) <br> 3 sections with elevated crash pattern (LOSS 3 or 4) <br> (Monte Vista, Alder and Nathrop) |
| Transit | Black Hills Stage Lines, Eagle line and Bustang <br> Outrider operates on corridor; Outrider stops in <br> Poncha Springs and Johnson Village (Buena Vista) |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity <br> Medium to high stress for bicyclists with small <br> sections of high stress for bicyclists (Monte Vista / <br> 112 / Saguache / Nathrop) |
| Pedestrian | Main Street through Saguache |
| Economics | High criticality (section North of Monte Vista and <br> North of Poncha Springs) <br> Crosses 100-year floodplains <br> Low redundancy |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Monte Vista <br> Provides access to recreational area |
| Freight |  |
| Economics | Agricultural corridor <br> Small cluster of oil and gas North of Nathrop |
| Ser |  |
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## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patternsEliminate shoulder deficienciesProvide additional travel optionsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingImprove bicycle accommodationAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 285: Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure (Fairplay to Monte Vista) | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Fairplay and Monte Vista | 1012 | (8) |  |  | \$45.00 |
| Essential Bus Service between Salida and Leadville (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Salida and Leadville. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1034 | (-) | (-1) A | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.75 |
| US 285: Safety and Mobility Improvements between Center to Saguache (Widen Shoulders) | Shoulder widening from Center to Saguache. | 1051 | 4 |  |  | \$33.68 |
| US 50/285 Intersection | Intersection improvements | 1052 | (1) 8 | - | (1) | \$8.90 |
| Essential Bus Service between Alamosa and Salida (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Alamosa and Salida. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1054 | (-) | (1) \% |  | \$2.09 |
| New Regional Fixed-Route Service between Alamosa and Saguache | Establish fixed services Saguache to Alamosa via Monte Vista \& US285; two round trips daily, 5 days/week; one bus | 1055 | (9) | (1) 0 | $\theta$ | \$0.62 |
| ITS/CAV: CDOT Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 285 | Addition of Fiber on US 285. - Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) / Connected and Automated Vehicles (CAV) plan - | 1056 | (8) | (1) | (1) | - |
| Head-on Detection Warning | Forward Collision Warning (FCW) | 1318 | (1) | - | (1) | - |
| Poncha Springs Transit hub | Existing, Creation of transit hub at Highways 50/285 junction. | 1319 | (9) | (12) $\Rightarrow$ 60 | $\theta$ | \$0.75 |

## Project Types

 Operations Bicycle

## Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset Management Freight Transit

SWP Goal Area


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH285/SH 136 Intersection Improvements | Construct southbound turn lane. | 2067 | (1) | (5) -2 | (1) | \$0.75 |
| US 285 and CR X Intersection Improvements | - | 2068 | (1) | (8) -6 | 0 ¢ | \$0.75 |
| Construct Multi-Modal, <br> Streetscaping, and Wayfinding Improvements in the Town of Saguache | - | 2069 | ( 60 | (n) ! 1. 3 |  | \$0.75 |
| US 285 Pedestrian crossing in Poncha springs | - | 2460 | ( 1 | (n) | (1) | - |
| Chaffee Shuttle <br> Operational Costs for <br> Service between Salida and <br> Buena Vista | - | 2484 | (-) | (-1) $\Leftrightarrow$ |  | \$0.01 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 3 locations: Alamosa, Moffat, and Buena Vista | 2492 | (9) | (4) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$0.25 |
| Saguache Park-n-Ride | Park-n-Ride and Bus Pullouts (Eagle Shuttle) in Saguache | 2539 | (9) | (12) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\theta$ | \$0.75 |
| Saguache Transit Center | Transit center for expanding Eagle Shuttle services in Saguache | 2540 | (-) | (x) $\rightarrow$ | \% | \$6.50 |
| Increase in Eagle Line's Service Hours and/or Days | Increase service of Eagle line by 2 days a week for a total of 4 days of operation each week. | 2541 | (9) | (x) $\Leftrightarrow$ | \% | \$0.40 |

## Project Types




## Project Benefits



SWP Goal Area


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project <br> Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver | Essential bus service between Durango, Bayfield, Pagosa Springs, South Fork, Monte Vista, Center, Saguache, Villa Grove, Salida, Buena Vista, Fairplay, Denver (Potential Bustang Outrider). Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. ( 350 miles, 700 roundtrip) | 2535 |  |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$11.55 |
| Chaffee County Multimodal Transportation Plan | Multimodal plan covering bicycle, pedestrian, transit, highways/roads, airports, freight, rail, and telecommunications; assessment of safety, mobility, economic vitality, system maintenance, and strategic policies for the County's multimodal system | 2711 | (1) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | \$0.25 |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle

Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## 3 <br> Asset Management

- Construct Multi-Modal, Streetscaping, and Wayfinding Improvements in the Town of Saguache
- US 285: Safety and Mobility Improvements between Center to Saguache (Widen Shoulders)


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Salida and Leadville (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Essential Bus Service between Alamosa and Salida (Proposed Outrider Service)
- New Regional Fixed-Route Service between Alamosa and Saguache
- Poncha Springs Transit hub
- New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver


0

## Asset Management

- Chaffee County Multimodal Transportation Plan


## Mobility

- Chaffee Shuttle Operational Costs for Service between Salida and Buena Vista
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements
- Saguache Park-n-Ride
- Saguache Transit Center
- Increase in Eagle Line's Service Hours and/or Days


## ! Safety

- SH285/SH 136 Intersection Improvements
- US 285 and CR X Intersection Improvements
- US 285 Pedestrian crossing in Poncha springs



## Corridor Name

State Highway 291A: Between Salida and junction with 285B/ C

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 291 A - Jct. US 50 southeast of Salida to J ct. US 285 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor is a designated scenic byway, the Collegiate Peaks Scenic Byway, and serves as a multimodal local facility, acts similar to a Main Street, and makes northsouth connections within the Upper Arkansas Valley area.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R5-9)
- Scenic Byway (Collegiate Peaks)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 16 comments
- Desire for reduced speeds
- Desire for bike / ped improvements
- Interest in multimodal improvements
- Desired improvements for freight and truck movement
- Concerns about safety



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population and disabled population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | 2 sections with shoulders <2' (Salida and US 285) |
| Transit | Local Chaffee shuttle on corridor |
| Bicycling | 1 section of high bicycle activity in Salida <br> Medium to low stress for bicyclists with small section <br> of high stress for bicyclists (Salida) |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Salida |
| Resiliency | Parallels and crosses 100-year floodplain <br> Low redundancy |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Salida <br> Provides access to recreational area |
| Freight <br> Economics | Agricultural corridor <br> Mining activity |



## Corridor Needs

Improve bicycle accommodationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 291 Intersection and Ped Improvements | Phased Improvements | 2070 | ( 8 |  |  | \$2.50 |
| Salida ADA | Provide ADA (American with Disabilities Act) access | 2071 | d |  |  | \$0.40 |
| Chaffee County <br> Multimodal <br> Transportation Plan | Multimodal plan covering bicycle, pedestrian, transit, highways/roads, airports, freight, rail, and telecommunications; assessment of safety, mobility, economic vitality, system maintenance, and strategic policies for the County's multimodal system | 2711 | (1) | (i) $6 \%$ (1) 80 |  | \$0.25 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits



Mobility Options Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area


## $\square$ <br> Asset Management

- Chaffee County Multimodal Transportation Plan


## Mobility

- SH291 Intersection and Ped Improvements



## Corridor Name

State Highway 368A: From J ct SH 370 to Jct US 285

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 368 A - J ct. SH 370 to J ct. US 285 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides local access, and makes east-west connections south of Alamosa. Future travel modes include passenger vehicle. The transportation system in the area primarily serves towns, cities, and destinations within the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 Comment
- Vulnerable (Amish) population
- Desire for more road improvements


Key Data Findings: State Highway 368A: From J ct. SH 370 to J ct. US


|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of $65+$ population, minority and <br> disabled population |  | Resiliency |  |
| Freight <br> Economics | Low redundancy |  |  |  |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders <2' |  |  |  |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |  |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 368A: From J ct. SH 370 to J ct. US 285


Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southern SLV Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for southern portion of the SLV. | 2035 |  |  |  | \$0.82 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management Aviation
Management
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area

Pedestrian


- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## Corridor Name

State Highway 370A: From J ct SH 15 to J ct US 285

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 370 A - J ct. SH 15 to J ct. US 285 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides local access, and makes east-west connections south of Alamosa. Future travel modes include passenger vehicle. The transportation system in the area primarily serves local communities and the movement of farm-to-market products.

## Corridor Designations

- None

What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 comment
- Vulnerable (Amish) population



| Demographics Transit | Key Data Findings: | Bicycling | High stress for bicyclist |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+ population, minority and disabled population |  |  |
|  |  | Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Freight Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders < $2^{\prime}$ | Freight Economics | Agricultural corridor |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Section of low drivability life east of SH 15A |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 370A: From J ct. SH 15 to J ct. US 285


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southern SLV Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for southern portion of the SLV. | 2035 | (9) | (i) A |  | \$0.82 |
| MP 0 to MP 4 | Rural Road Surface Treatment | 79 | $8$ | (1) | 9 | \$2.00 |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit
Transit

SWP Goal Area


Pedestrian

(P) Asset

Management

- MP 0 to MP 4


- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## Corridor Name

State Highway 371A: From J ct SH 15 to SH 370

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 371 A - J ct SH 15 to SH 370 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides local access, and makes north-south connections between Conejos and Alamosa Counties. The transportation system in the area primarily serves local communities and the movement of farm-to-market products.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comments
- Vulnerable (Amish) population
- Support farm to market production



## Key Data Findings:

|  | Key Data Findings: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population, minority and disabled population |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor with shoulders <2' |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Resiliency | Low redundancy |
| Freight <br> Economics | Agricultural corridor |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 371A: From J ct. SH 15 to SH 370

## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

Corridor Projects: State Highway 371A: From J ct SH 15 to SH 370 (PSL7029)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southern SLV Demand Response | Daily local demand response service and assist with development of service plan for southern portion of the SLV. | 2035 | (9) | (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.82 |
| SH 371 Entire Length | Rural road surface treatment | 2637 | T | (1) | 5 | \$2.38 |

## Project Types



[^19]
## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
Transit

SWP Goal Area



| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region will hire independent consultant to identify the best location for limited shouldering funds. | Region will hire independent consultant to identify the best location for limited shouldering funds. | 1490 | (1) |  | (1) | - |
| One-Stop Shop for Transportation for San Luis Valley (One-Call/One-Click - call center/website/app) | Planning for and implementation of a one-stop shop for transportation (e.g., call center, website, app) and creation of a call center. Includes \$250,000 for planning study and $\$ 75 \mathrm{~K} /$ year for staffing. | 2531 | (-) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.00 |
| San Luis Valley Transit Needs Study | Conduct planning effort for entire valley. | 2534 | (9) | 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.05 |
| Formalize Regional Coordinating Council | Conduct planning study to determine needs and develop action plan. Hire staff to serve as mobility manager and RCC lead at \$75k/year. | 2536 | (9) |  |  | \$0.80 |
| Regional Transit Route Plan | Coordinate planning and implementation of regional transit routes, stops, etc., connecting within Chaffee County with all parties | 2705 | (9) | (i) (0) | $\theta$ | \$0.05 |
| Local Route Circulators in Buena Vista, Poncha Springs, Salida | Develop and implement local circulating routes for each community | 2706 | (9) | (3) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits


$\begin{array}{ll}\text { (8) Economic Vitality } & \text { Quality of Life } \\ \text { (a) Public Health } & \text { Ricycle } \\ \text { (y) Tourism } & \text { Resilience } \\ \text { (d) Environmental } & \text { Pedestrian }\end{array}$


Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chaffee Shuttle Additional buses and replacement buses | Addition of buses to fleet; replacement of vehicles for Chaffee Shuttle | 2709 | (2) | (3) 0 (in) | 0 | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Mobility Options
Asset
Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area

## $\square$ <br> Asset Management

- See corridor specific projects


## Mobility

- One-Stop Shop for Transportation for San Luis Valley (One-Call/OneClick - call center/website/app)
- San Luis Valley Transit Needs Study
- Formalize Regional Coordinating Council
- Regional Transit Route Plan
- Local Route Circulators in Buena Vista, Pncha Springs, Salida
- Chaffee Shuttle Additional buses and replacement buses


## Safety

- Region will hire independent consultant to identify the best location for limited shouldering funds.



## CDOT Region 5

Counties:
Archuleta, Dolores, La Plata, Montezuma, San Juan

## /I

> The Southwest TPR will provide a balanced transportation system that accommodates the movements of residents, employees, visitors, and goods in the region by offering travel options and preserving the rural character, quality of life, and environment.


## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Provide additional travel options like bus and rail transit to serve the aging population and tourists
- Off-highway bicycle and pedestrian facilities and connectivity
* Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback


## What We've Heard about the Southwest TPR

- 518 public and stakeholder comments specifically about the Southwest TPR
- 211 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the Southwest TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" public survey respondents in the Southwest TPR, combined with stakeholder input, selected: Road condition and safety, Lack of travel options, Growth and congestion
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the Southwest TPR (in order of frequency) include: Safety, congestion, bicycle and pedestrian connectivity, bus service/ transit, roadway capacity, passing lanes, bike lanes, road maintenance and trucking/ freight.


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics | 2015 Population: 93, 743 <br> 2045 Forecasted Population: 145, 484 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | 2015 J obs: 53,917 <br> 2045 Forecasted J obs: 78,962 |
| Economics | Top Industries: Health and wellness, agriculture, energy, <br> tourism, and outdoor recreation |
| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 3.0 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 5.1 Million |
| Asset |  |
| Management | 132 Miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 344 Miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 19 Miles of highway with low drivability life |

State Highway 3: Between US 160 and 8th Street in Durango (PSW7001)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 3: Between US 160 and 8th Street in Durango

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 3, US 160 to 8th Street in Durango, corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and multimodal connectivity.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 3 functions as a local connection from US 160 to downtown Durango. The route serves as a bypass for US 550, which runs parallel to SH 3. Maintaining safety for all users, including cyclists, is important.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R5-3


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about road condition and potholes
- Concerns about travel options
- Desire for transit

Key Data Findings: State Highway 3: Between US 160 and 8th Street in

## Key Data Findings:

| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity; high stress for bicycling |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 3: Between US 160 and 8th Street in

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove bicycle accommodation

Corridor Projects: State Highway 3: Between US 160 and 8th Street in

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this goal area | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits



Bicycle
Resilience
$\square$

Pedestria

Management
Freight
Aviation

Transit


Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

Transit

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## (!) Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


State Highway 41: Between the Utah border and US 160 (PSW7002)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 41: Between the Utah border and US 160

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 41 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 41 is located within the Ute Mountain Ute tribal Iands and provides local access, as well as connections to Utah. The corridor primarily serves commuter traffic between Towaoc, Colorado and White Mesa, Utah, as well as tourists traveling to/ from the Canyonlands, Monument Valley, Natural Bridges National Monument, and the north end of Lake Powell. Maintaining the rural character and high levels of mobility is important.

What we heard about the Corridor

- No comments specifically about this corridor


## Corridor Designations

- Scenic byway

Key Data Findings: State Highway 41: Between the Utah border and US

## Key Data Findings:

## Demographics

 TransitOn Ute Mountain Tribal Lands. Passes through census tract with high percentage of people living in poverty. Passes through census tract with higher percentage of minority population residents.

| Safety | Two segments with $<2$ feet shoulders |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 41: Between the Utah border and US

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsProvide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 41: Between the Utah

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No projects have been identified for this goal area | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Project Types


Project Benefits


Project Based Strategies: State Highway 41: Between the Utah

## (P) Asset <br> Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## ! Safety

- No projects have been identified for this goal area




## Corridor Name

US 84: Between the New Mexico border and Pagosa Springs

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 84 corridor is primarily to improve safety and maintain mobility.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 84 makes north-south connections between Pagosa Springs and Utah. The corridor serves as an alternative route for Wolf Creek Pass. The communities along the corridor value safety and system preservation. The corridor supports tourism and freight movements for economic activity in the area. Improving safety and maintaining system preservation is important for this corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments specifically about this corridor
- Safety concerns near Pagosa Springs
- Desire for better pedestrian and bike connectivity
- Desire for better signage

Key Data Findings: US 84: Between the New Mexico border and Pagosa

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with high percentage of <br> people living in poverty. Passes through census tract <br> with higher percentage of 65+ population. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Majority of corridor has less than 2-foot shoulders. <br> Two segments with elevated crash rates. <br> Dense wildlife crashes. |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | One bridge in poor condition |
| Bicycling | Southern portion is high stress for biking |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells. Provides access <br> to recreational areas. |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic |



Corridor Needs: US 84: Between the New Mexico border and Pagosa

## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Address bridge in poor conditionAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficiencies

| Name |  | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MP: 0-4. Other crashes- MP: 20-27. <br> Wildlife Fence\$130k/mi. <br> Underpass=\$1m | - | 2074 | $!$ |  | 5! | \$5.00 |
| Two bridges, Truss and Timber Structure. K-01-C, | - | 2075 |  | - | B | \$4.50 |
| US160/SH84 <br> Intersection | Possible roundabout or signal | 2076 | (1) 8 | - | $\approx!$ | \$5.00 |
| SH 84 Resurfacing | Resurfacing/repaving of US 84 in Archuleta County. Repair the caved away road at milepost 7.5 due to wet weather and moisture. | 2077 | $3$ | - |  | \$30.00 |

## Project Types
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## Asset Management

- US 84 Resurfacing


State Highway 140: Between the New Mexico border and Hesperus


## Corridor Name

State Highway 140: Between the New Mexico border and Hesperus

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 140 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality and to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

The State Highway 140 corridor provides north-south connections from New Mexico to the western Durango area. Portions of this corridor are located within Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Ute tribal lands. The communities along the corridor value connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. Maintaining the rural and mountain character of the corridor while supporting the movement of tourists, commuters, and freight in and through the corridor is important.

Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 3 comments specifically about this corridor
- Specific concerns about the CR 125 and SH 140 intersection (difficulty navigating)
- Desire for wider shoulders

Key Data Findings: State Highway 140: Between the New Mexico border

## Key Data Findings:

| Freight <br> Safety | A few short segments with less than 2 ft shoulders. <br> Three locations with elevated crash patterns. <br> Dense wildlife crashes. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | High bicycle activity between Hesperus and Kline. <br> High stress for bicycling. |
| Resiliency | Parallels the 100-year floodplain. |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells. |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic near Redmesa |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 140: Between the New Mexico border

## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove bicycle accommodation

Corridor Projects: State Highway 140: Between the New Mexico border

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 140: New Mexico State Line to Hesperus | Widen shoulders and rehab/reconstruct three bridges. | 1322 |  | 60 | $\Leftrightarrow$ <br> $(3$ | \$10.00 |
| Mitigate elevated crash patterns (MP: 1.5-6.5) | - | 2078 | $!$ | - | (1) | \$3.50 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits



## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


State Highway 141: Between US 491 and Gunnison Valley TPR (PSW7006)


## Corridor Name

State Highway 141: Between US 491 and Gunnison Valley TPR

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the SH 141 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 141 provides north-south connections from US 491 to SH 145. The communities along the corridor value connections to other areas, safety, and system preservation. They depend on tourism, agriculture, and energy for economic activity in the area. Preserving the rural character of the corridor while supporting the movement of tourists and freight in and through the corridor are important.

Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 comment specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about the pavement condition
- Concerns about seasonal truck traffic

Key Data Findings: State Highway 141: Between US 491 and Gunnison

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | of 65+ population. Passes through census tract with <br> higher percentage of disabled population. Passes <br> through census tract with high percentage of people <br> living in poverty. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Two segments with less than 2 ft . shoulders. <br> Hazmat Route. |
| Bicycling | High stress for biking |
| Freight <br> Economics | Agricultural corridor |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 141: Between US 491 and Gunnison

## Corridor Needs

Accommodate seasonal increases in truck activity and associated congestionImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies

Corridor Projects: State Highway 141: Between US 491 and Gunnison

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Repaving of SH 141 | Repair dips and settling and overall poor pavement condition | 2079 | $3$ | $\theta$ | \% ! | \$9.50 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits


Project Based Strategies: State Highway 141: Between US 491 and

## ( Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this goal area
- Repaving of SH 141


State Highway 145: Between Cortez and the Dolores/ San Miguel County


## Corridor Name

State Highway 145: Between Cortez and the Dolores/ San Miguel County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 145 corridor is primarily to maintain safety as well as to increase multimodal mobility.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 145 is a multimodal local facility, connecting the mountainous area northeast of Cortez to the southern boundary of San Miguel County near Telluride. The highway is part of the San J uan Skyway, which has been designated an All-American Road. Cortez to Dolores is part of the Trail of the Ancients. The communities along the corridor value connections to other areas, safety, and multimodal connections. Preserving the mountainous character of the corridor while supporting the movement of tourists in and through the corridor are important.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R5-1 (Between Cortez and Dolores)
- Scenic Byway


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 7 comment specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and safety along the corridor
- Concerns about increasing congestion
- Concerns about slope stabilization and blasting work along the river
- Concerns about pavement condition from Dolores to Rico



## Key Data Findings:

## Demographics Transit

Safety

Passes through census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ population. Passes through census tract with higher percentage of disabled population.

Several segments with less than 2 ft . shoulders. Two segments with elevated crash patterns. Dense wildlife crashes.

Outrider Intercity bus route (Cortez to Rico and on to Telluride, Grand J unction); Existing Bustang Outrider stops in Dolores and Rico. SMART operates service from Telluride to Rico and the Mountain Village Commuter Shuttle program.

| Bicycling | High stress for biking |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pedestrian | Main street through Dolores and Rico |
| Resiliency | SH 145 from north of Cortez to south of Rico has high <br> criticality; SH 145 from Dolores to south of Rico parallels <br> the 100-year floodplain; SH 145 from Rico to Dunton has <br> been impacted by avalanche paths; SH 145 near Dolores <br> had recent major rock fall resulting in a closure |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational areas |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 145: Between Cortez and the Dolores/ San


## Corridor Needs

Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain, avalanche, rockfalls)Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress congestion caused by slow moving vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expanded Interregional Transit Service between Telluride and Rico | 2 full size expansion buses | 1030 | (2) | (n) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iin | $\theta$ | \$2.70 |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide <br> Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491 | - | 1057 | (3) | (1) | (1) 0 | - |
| Dolores Bus/Vehicle Shelter | Improve bus/vehicle shelter with concrete floor and doors | 1323 | (9) | 8 | $\theta$ | \$0.15 |
| Dolores Park-n-Ride | Establish Park-n-Ride utilizing existing parking infrastructure where possible | 1324 | (9) | (12) (in | $\theta$ | \$0.50 |
| Curvy sections of SH 145 north of Cortez | Curve Speed Warning | 1325 | 4 | - | 0 | - |
| SH145 Rockfall 28.1- $28.5$ | - | 2080 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.30 |
| SH145 Keystone to Placerville | - | 2081 | (1) | - | (1) | \$6.40 |

## Project Types
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Corridor Projects: State Highway 145: Between Cortez and the Dolores/ San

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Highway 145 \& Fairway Drive | Turn lanes | 2082 | (\%) | - | $\Leftrightarrow!$ | - |
| Widening from CR L to CR M | Widening SH 145 from Cortez to Dolores | 2083 | (1) | - | \&! | \$10.00 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 5 locations: Durango, Mancos, Cortez, Dolores, and Rico | 2493 | (-) | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ |  | \$0.40 |

## Project Types



[^20]
## Project Benefits


SWP Goal Area



- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- Expanded Inter-regional Transit Service between Telluride and Rico
- Dolores Bus/Vehicle Shelter
- Dolores Park-n-Ride
- Curvy sections of SH 145 north of Cortez
- Highway 145 \& Fairway Drive
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements


## (1) Safety

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491
- SH145 Rockfall 28.1-28.5
- SH145 Keystone to Placerville
- Widening from CR L to CR M



## Corridor Name

State Highway 151: Between Ignacio and US 160

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 151 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and mobility.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 151 provides local access to communities between SH 172 and US 160. The communities along the corridor prioritize safety and system preservation. Improving the safety and preserving the rural character of the area while supporting the movement of local commuters and tourists along the corridor is important.

Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 4 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about the wildlife
collisions
- Desire for rest stops/ truck parking and passing lanes
- Concerns about the limited redundancy and long detour when route is closed



## Key Data Findings:



On Southern Ute Tribal Lands. Passes through census tract with higher percentage of minority population residents. Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+ population. Passes through census tract with higher percentage of disabled population.

Majority of corridor has less than 2 ft .
Freight
Safety shoulders. Two segments with elevated crash patterns.

| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main street through Ignacio |
| :--- | :--- |
| Resiliency | Parallels the 100-year floodplain. |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic near Allison |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 151: Between Ignacio and US 160


## Corridor Needs

Mitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown area)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsCorridor Projects: State Highway 151: Between Ignacio and US 160

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mitigate elevated crash patterns (MP: 17-19.5) | - | 2084 | (1) | - |  | \$2.70 |
| SH151 and CR521, Buck Hwy Intersection Improvement | - | 2085 | (1) 8 | - | (1) | \$1.00 |
| SH 151 Ignacio to Arboles | Rural road surface treatment | 2635 | $3$ | (1) | 3 | \$10.38 |

## Project Types
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Project Based Strategies: State Highway 151: Between Ignacio and


- SH 151 Ignacio to Arboles



## (!) Safety

- Mitigate elevated crash patterns (MP: 17-19.5)



## Corridor Name

US 160: Between Four Corners and Cortez

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160 corridor is primarily to improve mobility and safety.

## Corridor Description

US 160 is the primary northeast route serving Southwestern Colorado and providing connections between Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico to Cortez. High levels of mobility are critical to the communities along US 160. Maintaining mobility for commuters, tourists, and freight vehicles while also improving safety is important for this portion of US 160.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway
- On National Highway System (Segment of STRAHNET Route - Four Corners to 491 Junction)
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 120 comment specifically about this corridor (the entirety of US 160)
- Desire for increased roadway capacity (four-lanes) to support the region's growth and the increasing congestion on the corridor
- Acknowledgement of the corridor's importance to the region's vitality
- Desire for better road conditions

Key Data Findings: US 160: Between Four Corners and Cortez

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Portion on Ute Mountain Tribal Lands. Passes <br> through census tracts with high percentage of <br> people living in poverty, with higher percentage <br> of minority population residents, and with higher <br> percentage of disabled population. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate congestion near Cortez in 2045 |
| Freight <br> Safety | Wildlife crashes between Towaoc and Cortez <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Poor drivability life segments near Four Corners |
| Resiliency | High criticality from Four Corners to almost <br> Cortez |
| Bicycling | Sections of high stress for biking from Towaoc to <br> Cortez |
| Economics <br> Freight | High concentrations of jobs near Cortez |
| Airport | Airport access to the Cortez Municipal Airport |
| Economics | High percentage of truck traffic from US 491A to |
| Freight |  |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress congestion caused by slow moving vehiclesProvide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsIncrease connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (airport)Accommodate seasonal increases in truck activity and associated congestion

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements | Chain Station improvements to provide adequate lighting and space for trucks to pull over and for drivers to chain up safely including LED lighting, signing and striping, VMS signs, and paving as needed. | 1025 |  |  |  | \$4.50 |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide <br> Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on <br> US 160, US 550, SH <br> 145/184, and US 491 | - | 1057 | (8) | (1) | (1) | - |
| US 160:Reconstruction and Shoulder Widening MP 0 to MP 8 | Full depth reconstruction of the existing paved surface and shoulder widening. | 1336 | (1) | (1) 6) - |  | \$25.65 |
| Dynamic route assignment | Dynamic Route Assignment | 1347 | (-) | (x) $\rightarrow$ | (1) | - |
| Freight safety warnings | Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems (FRATIS) | 1354 | $-1$ | - | (1) | - |
| US 160: Towaoc Passing Lanes | Addition of passing lanes and vehicle turnouts. | 1337 | (1) |  | (1) | \$11.22 |
| Designated Truck Parking | Addition of designated truck parking in Montezuma County | 2095 | (-) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| MP 0 to MP 8 near Aztec Creek | Rural road surface treatment | 78 |  | (1) | 5 | \$4.00 |

## Project Types
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## 0 <br> Asset Management

- FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements
- US 160: Reconstruction and Shoulder Widening MP 0 to MP 8
- MP 0 to MP 8 near Aztec Creek


## Mobility

- Dynamic route assignment
- Designated Truck Parking
- US 160: Towaoc Passing Lanes




## Corridor Name

US 160: Between Cortez and Durango

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160 corridor is primarily to improve mobility and safety.

## Corridor Description

US 160 is the primary east-west route serving Southwestern Colorado and connecting Cortez and Durango. High levels of mobility are critical to the communities along US 160. Maintaining mobility for commuters, tourists, transit service, and freight vehicles while also improving safety is important for this portion of US 160.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R5-3 (Cortez to Archuleta/ Mineral CL, and Animas River Trail)
- Scenic Byway
- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 120 comment specifically about this corridor (the entirety of US 160)
- Concerns about bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and safety along the corridor
- Desire for increased roadway capacity (four-lanes) to support the region's growth and the increasing congestion on the corridor
- Acknowledgement of the corridor's importance to the region's vitality
- Desire for better connectivity and transit options between local communities, Front Range
- Desire for better road conditions



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tracts with high percentage of people living in poverty, higher percentage of minority population, and with higher percentage of disabled population. | Transit Pedestrian | Existing Outrider intercity bus route Bustang Outrider stops in Durango, Mancos, Cortez Local transit operates on corridor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity Hesperus to Durango Clusters of bike crashes in Cortez High stress for biking in Cortez and near the SH 184 intersection |
| Growth | Moderate to high congestion from SH 184 to Durango |  |  |
| Freight | Segment of Iow drivability life in Cortez |  |  |
| Freight Safety | Segments with less than 2 ft . shoulders, mostly in Cortez and near the intersection of SH 184; two spots of elevated crash patterns east of Cortez. Dense wildlife crashes entire section Hazmat route | Pedestrian Economics | Main Street through Cortez and Mancos |
|  |  | Resiliency | High criticality east of Cortez to SH 140 |
|  |  | Economics Freight | High concentrations of jobs near Cortez Provides access to recreational areas |



## Corridor Needs

Improve bicycle accommodationImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles
Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress congestion caused by slow moving vehiclesProvide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)Improve access and parking for intercity transitAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas). Accommodate seasonal increases in truck activity and associated congestion

Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Cortez and Durango (PSW7009B)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements | Chain Station improvements to provide adequate lighting and space for trucks to pull over and for drivers to chain up safely including LED lighting, signing and striping, VMS signs, and paving as needed. | 1025 | $B$ | 13 |  | \$4.50 |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491 | - | 1057 | ( | $!$ |  | - |
| Essential Bus Service between Durango and Dove Creek (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Dove Creek. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1058 | (-) | (1) $\rightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.05 |
| Cortez Park-n-Ride | Establish Park-n-Ride utilizing existing parking infrastructure where possible | 1328 | (-) | (x) $\Rightarrow$ |  | \$0.30 |
| US 160 Improvements Cortez Partnership | Improvements to US 160 in Cortez that may include medians, access improvements, mobility improvements and surface treatment | 1340 | $13$ |  |  | \$4.00 |

## Project Types
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Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Cortez and Durango (PSW7009B)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID |  | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost <br> (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rest Areas - 160 Cortez to Durango | Smart Truck Parking | 1343 | (-) | - | 5 | - |
| 160 Cortez to Durango | Freight-Specific Dynamic Travel Planning and Performance | 1344 | (-) | - |  | - |
| Dynamic route assignment | Dynamic Route Assignment | 1347 | (9) | (-) $\Leftrightarrow$ | (1) | - |
| Road Weather information systems in Cortez | Road Weather Information Systems (RWIS) | 1350 | (1) | (I) | (1) | - |
| Freight safety warnings | Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems (FRATIS) | 1354 | (-) |  | (1) | - |
| US160 Wildlife Mitigation | Wildlife fencing and underpass, brush removal, sight distance improvements between Cortez and Durango (near CR 30.1) | 2089 | (1) | (2) 3 |  | \$2.88 |
| Designated Truck Parking | Addition of designated truck parking in Montezuma County | 2095 | (6) | - | 3 | - |
| US 160 between Durango and Mancos | Restricted truck parking. <br> Additional parking could be provided through CDOT investment in the Cortez Rest Area, or private investment in Cortez or Mancos. | 2096 | (6) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.18 |

## Project Types
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Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Cortez and Durango (PSW7009B)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R5 Cortez ADA | ADA Ramps and other improvements | 2101 | ( | $\begin{aligned} & (n) \\ & 60 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\Leftrightarrow!$ | \$0.27 |
| Paths to Mesa Verde | Multi-use pedestrian path Mancos to Mesa Verde | 2102 | ( 6 | $\begin{aligned} & 6+9 \\ & \Rightarrow! \end{aligned}$ | $\Leftrightarrow!$ | \$7.00 |
| SWCCOG New Service between Cortez and Durango | Service from Cortez to Durango, 4 round trips per day, weekdays. | 2472 | (-) | (n) $\Leftrightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.35 |
| Fixed Route Services | MoCo transportation would like to have a fixed route service | 2474 | (9) | (n) 4 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 5 locations: Durango, Mancos, Cortez, Dolores, and Rico | 2493 | (-) | (12) 5 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.40 |
| US160 and CR 30.1 <br> Intersection at Phil's <br> World | US 160 and Road 30.1 in Montezuma County; consider turn pockets, deceleration and acceleration lanes | 2087 | (1) 8 |  | $\sqrt{9}$ | \$1.50 |

## Project Types
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## 3 Asset Management

- FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements
- US160 Wildlife Mitigation


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Durango and Dove Creek (Proposed Outrider Service)
- US 160 Improvements Cortez Partnership
- Rest Areas - 160 Cortez to Durango
- 160 Cortez to Durango
- Cortez Park-n-Ride


## ! Safety

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491
- Dynamic route assignment
- Road Weather information systems in Cortez



## (1) Asset Management

- See previous page.


## Mobility

- Designated Truck Parking
- US 160 between Durango and Mancos
- SWCCOG New Service between Cortez and Durango
- Fixed Route Services
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements
- US 160 and CR 30.1 Intersection at Phil's World
! Safety
- Freight safety warnings
- R5 Cortez ADA
- Paths to Mesa Verde



## Corridor Name

US 160: Between Durango and Bayfield

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160 corridor is primarily to improve mobility and safety.

## Corridor Description

US 160 is the primary east-west route serving Southwestern Colorado and connecting Durango and Bayfield. High levels of mobility are critical to the communities along US 160. Maintaining mobility for commuters, tourists, transit service, and freight vehicles while also improving safety is important for this portion of US 160

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R5-3 (Cortez to Archuleta/ Mineral CL, and Animas River Trail)
- Scenic Byway (Four Corners to SH 172)
- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 120 comment specifically about this corridor (entirely of US 160)
- Concerns about bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and safety along the corridor
- Desire for increased roadway capacity to support the region's growth and the increasing congestion on the corridor
- Acknowledgement of the corridor's importance to the region's vitality
- Desire for better connectivity and transit options between local communities, Front Range
- Desire for better road conditions



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tracts with higher percentage of <br> $65+$ population, and with higher percentage of disabled <br> population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | High congestion from SH 172 to Durango in 2045; highest <br> congestion in the TPR in 2045 |
| Freight <br> Safety | Segments with less than 2 ft. shoulders, mostly <br> approaching the US 550 intersection; continuous section <br> of elevated crash patterns between Durango and Bayfield <br> Dense wildlife crashes entire section <br> Hazmat route |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | One bridge in poor condition |


| Transit <br> Pedestrian | Local transit operates on corridor <br> Potential Outrider service connecting Durango to Alamosa |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity Hesperus to Durango <br> Clusters of bike crashes in Durango <br> Sections of medium high stress for biking from Durango to <br> Bayfield |
| Resiliency | High criticality from US 550 to Bayfield <br> Crossing of 100-year floodplain west of Bayfield <br> (Los Pinos River) |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells (Durango to Bayfield) <br> Some logging activity between Bayfield and Chimney Rock <br> High concentrations of jobs surrounding Durango |



## Corridor Needs

Improve bicycle accommodationImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)
$\rightarrow$
Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Address bridge in poor conditionAddress congestion caused by slow moving vehiclesImprove access and parking for intercity transitAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)b. Accommodate seasonal increases in truck activity and associated congestion

Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Durango and Bayfield (PSW7009C)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements | Chain Station improvements to provide adequate lighting and space for trucks to pull over and for drivers to chain up safely including LED lighting, signing and striping, VMS signs, and paving as needed. | 1025 | $\theta$ | $(3)$ | 4.8 | \$4.50 |
| Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-Walsenburg-Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 | (9) | (12) 0 | 0 | \$5.02 |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491 | $\underline{-}$ | 1057 | (3) | (1) | (1) $\theta$ | - |
| Durango Zone 6 Transit Accessibility Upgrades (ADA Transition Plan) | Upgrade transit stops along Route 1 Main Avenue Trolley and along Route 4 Crestview/US Highway 160to include ADAcompliant curb ramps, sidewalk cross slopes, and landings. | 1059 | (2) | (14) (2) (1) (i) | (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$6.10 |
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Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Durango and Bayfield (PSW7009C)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Durango Zone 7 Transit Expansion | Durango Transit route expansion from City limits to Durango/La Plata County Airport. Durango Transit route expansion from City limits to Hermosa, Durango West, Hesperus and Edgemont. | 1060 | (-9) | $\begin{aligned} & \Leftrightarrow-\infty \\ & \Leftrightarrow \end{aligned}$ | $\theta$ | \$8.00 |
| US 160 Intelligent <br> Transportation <br> Systems (ITS) <br> Infrastructure (La <br> Plata, Archuletta, and <br> Mineral counties) | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Durango and Wolf Creek Tunnel | 1303 |  | $\theta$ | (1) | \$30.56 |
| Durango Zone 4 Transit Accessibility Upgrades (ADA Transition Plan) | Upgrade transit stops along Route 4 Crestview/US Highway 160 to include ADA-compliant curb ramps, sidewalk cross slopes, and landings. | 1330 | (9) | $n \Leftrightarrow(3)$ | (1) | \$3.20 |
| Durango Zone 5 Transit Accessibility Upgrades (ADA Transition Plan) | Expand transit service to Mercy Housing and Three Springs Development. Upgrade transit stops along Route 3 Walmart/Mercy to include ADAcompliant curb ramps, sidewalk cross slopes, and landings. | 1331 | (-) | $n \Rightarrow 3!$ |  | \$3.30 |
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Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Durango and Bayfield (PSW7009C)


Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Durango and Bayfield (PSW7009C)
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Name } & \text { Pescription } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Planning } \\ \text { Project ID }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Primary } \\ \text { Project } \\ \text { Types }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Additional } \\ \text { Project } \\ \text { Benefits }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { SWP } \\ \text { Goal } \\ \text { Areas }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Emergency vehicle } \\ \text { priority at signals in } \\ \text { Durango }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Emergency Vehicle Preemption } \\ \text { (PREEMPT) }\end{array} & 1346 & \text { Project Cost } \\ \text { (In millions) }\end{array}\right\}$
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Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Durango and Bayfield (PSW7009C)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 160/ CR225 <br> Intersection Improvements | Roundabout and Safety Improvements | 2091 | (1) | (1) 3 |  | \$5.00 |
| Durango Transit ITS | Intelligent Transit System upgrades and enhancements electronic farebox, enhanced mobile ticketing, enhanced APC, AVA, GPS, app, etc.; Ongoing implementation of emerging transportation technology | 2473 | ( | $!$ | (1) | \$1.00 |
| Pagosa Springs to Durango (not Outrider associated) | Assumes two roundtrip per day 260 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 2522 |  | (x) 0 | $\theta$ | \$0.44 |
| Pagosa Springs to Durango (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Pagosa Springs and Durango. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 2523 | (-) | (12) 4 |  | \$2.69 |
| New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver | Essential bus service between Durango, Bayfield, Pagosa Springs, South Fork, Monte Vista, Center, Saguache, Villa Grove, Salida, Buena Vista, Fairplay, Denver (Potential Bustang Outrider). Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. ( 350 miles, 700 roundtrip) | 2535 |  | (n) 3 |  | \$11.55 |
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## (1) Asset <br> Management

- FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements
- US 160 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Infrastructure (La Plata, Archuletta, and Mineral counties)
- US 160: Elmore's East


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-Walsenburg-Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Durango Zone 6 Transit Accessibility Upgrades (ADA Transition Plan)
- Durango Zone 7 Transit Expansion
- Pagosa Springs to Durango (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Intersection Improvements


## (1) Safety

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491
- Durango Zone 4 Transit Accessibility Upgrades (ADA Transition Plan)
- Durango safety
- Durango Transit ITS

- US 160/ CR225 Intersection Improvements

| Mobility <br> - Dynamic TSP at signals in Durango <br> - Durango weather info <br> - Durango signals <br> - Durango to Bayfield - Wildlife Priority <br> - Freight safety warnings <br> - Pagosa Springs to Durango (not Outrider associated) <br> - US160 Hawkins Signal and Curb Ramps <br> - New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver <br> - US 160 Durango | Safety <br> - US 160: Dry Creek Passing and Mobility Improvements <br> - US 160 Safety and Mobility Improvements CR 225 to Dry Creek <br> - Emergency vehicle priority at signals in Durango <br> - Durango Zone 5 Transit Accessibility Upgrades (ADA Transition Plan) |
| :---: | :---: |

US 160: Between Bayfield and the Archuleta/ Mineral County Line


## Corridor Name

US 160: Between Bayfield and the Archuleta/ Mineral County Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 160 corridor is primarily to improve mobility and safety.

## Corridor Description

US 160 is the primary east-west route serving Southwestern Colorado and connecting Bayfield to Pagosa Springs and other communities further east. High levels of mobility are critical to the communities along US 160. Maintaining mobility for commuters, tourists, transit service, and freight vehicles while also improving safety is important for this portion of US 160.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R5-3 (Cortez to Archuleta/ Mineral CL)
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- On National Highway System
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 120 comment specifically about this corridor (entirety of US 160)
- Desire for increased roadway capacity to support the region's growth and the increasing congestion on the corridor
- Acknowledgement of the corridor's
importance to the region's vitality
- Desire for better connectivity and transit options between local communities, Front Range
- Desire for better road conditions
- Section of US 160 west of Pagosa Springs is dangerous due to 2 lanes going up with multiple users trying to turn left without turn Ianes.



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tracts with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population, and with higher <br> percentage of disabled population. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate congestion east of Bayfield in 2045 |
| Freight <br> Safety | Multiple segments of elevated crash patterns, east <br> of Bayfield and near Chimney Rock <br> Dense wildlife crashes between Bayfield and <br> Pagosa Springs <br> Hazmat route |
| Transit <br> Pedestrian | Potential Outrider service connecting Durango to <br> Alamosa |


| Bicycling | High bicycle activity Pagosa Springs to <br> Archuleta/ Mineral CL <br> Sections of high stress for biking from Chimney Rock <br> to Pagosa Springs |
| :--- | :--- |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Pagosa Springs (DOLA affiliated <br> Main Street) |
| Resiliency | US 160 north of Pagosa Springs parallels 100-year flood <br> plain |
| Economics <br> Freight | High concentrations of jobs between Chimney Rock <br> and Pagosa Springs <br> Provides access to recreational areas |

Corridor Needs: US 160: Between Bayfield and the Archuleta/ Mineral


## Corridor Needs

Improve bicycle accommodationImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Address congestion caused by slow moving vehiclesProvide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)Improve access and parking for intercity transitAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)Accommodate seasonal increases in truck activity and associated

Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Bayfield and the

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements | Chain Station improvements to provide adequate lighting and space for trucks to pull over and for drivers to chain up safely including LED lighting, signing and striping, VMS signs, and paving as needed. | 1025 | $-2$ |  |  | \$4.50 |
| Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-Walsenburg-Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Pueblo. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1041 | (9) | (1) $\Rightarrow$ |  | \$5.02 |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491 | - | 1057 | (8) | $!$ |  | - |
| US 160 Intelligent <br> Transportation <br> Systems (ITS) <br> Infrastructure (La <br> Plata, Archuletta, and <br> Mineral counties) | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Durango and Wolf Creek Tunnel | 1303 | (8) 1 | (2) | (1) | \$30.56 |
| Pagosa Springs <br> Transportation Center | Build a Transportation Center in Pagosa Springs | 1326 | (9) | (n) $\geqslant$ |  | \$1.35 |
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Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Bayfield and the

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bayfield Park-n-Ride and Access Improvements | Establish Park-n-Ride facility, extend roadway access to Hwy160 and improve grading and drainage | 1327 | (-) | (a) $\Rightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.60 |
| Archuleta County Bus Stop Shelters | Building of 4 bus stop shelters | 1329 | (9) | (1) $\leftrightarrows$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.13 |
| Archuleta County Park-n-Ride | Establish Park-n-Ride utilizing existing parking infrastructure where possible | 1332 | (-) | (a) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.50 |
| US 160/SH 151 Safety Mitigation | Extension of the westbound passing lane in both directions and the installation of two wildlife crossing structures along with wildlife fencing. | 1335 | (1) | (i) (4) | ¢! | \$8.83 |
| US 160/Main Street Pagosa Reconstruction and Multi-Modal Improvements | This project will reconstruct the surface of US 160 and provide multimodal improvements along the highway corridor in Pagosa Springs (San Juan River Bridge/1st Street to McCabe); road diet from 3rd Street to 10th Street | 1339 | 60 | $\text { (i.) }-4 \Leftrightarrow$ |  | \$13.67 |
| 160 \& Piedra - <br> Advanced Signal Warnings | Intersection Movement Assist (IMA) | 1348 | (1) | $(-1)$ |  | - |
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Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Bayfield and the

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Freight safety warnings | Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems (FRATIS) | 1354 |  | - | \& | - |
| US 160 /Piedra Road | WB Lane Drop at 8th Street. | 2092 | (1) (8) | - | *! | \$0.30 |
| US 160 Pagosa 5 Lane | Pike to Piedra. 4 lanes with continuous left turn lane. ROW, Drainage, utilities, etc. Low end estimate. | 2094 | (8) |  |  | \$9.00 |
| Add shoulders east of Pagosa Springs | Desire for shoulders on the east end of Pagosa Springs to accommodate the high bicycle traffic | 2099 | (1) 60 | (n) |  |  |
| US 160 McCabe Creek <br> Major Structure Replacement | This project replaces a failing culvert crossing US 160 in Pagosa Springs with a concrete box culvert, as well as widens the roadway for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The culvert has a risk of severe flooding and US 160 is at risk of potential washout. | 75 |  | (3) 1010 | 30 | \$7.37 |
| Pagosa Springs to Durango (not Outrider associated) | Assumes two roundtrip per day 260 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 2522 | (-) | $\text { (i) } \Leftrightarrow(0)$ | $\theta$ | \$0.44 |
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Corridor Projects: US 160: Between Bayfield and the

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pagosa Springs to <br> Durango (Proposed <br> Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Pagosa Springs and Durango. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 2523 |  | (1) $\Rightarrow$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.69 |
| New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver | Essential bus service between Durango, Bayfield, Pagosa Springs, South Fork, Monte Vista, Center, Saguache, Villa Grove, Salida, Buena Vista, Fairplay, Denver (Potential Bustang Outrider). Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. (350 miles, 700 roundtrip) | 2535 |  | $(n) \Rightarrow(0)$ |  | \$11.55 |
| US 160 Pagosa Springs | Increase Truck Parking. Most likely through private investment in Pagosa Springs. | 2098 | (-) | - |  | \$0.93 |
| US 160 and East Bayfield Parkway | Intersection signalization with pedestrian improvements and a new roadway alignment to the north. | 2740 | ( ${ }^{8}$ | (1) | (1) | \$3.5 |
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## (3) Asset Management

- FY 19 and 20 Chain Station Improvements
- US 160 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Infrastructure (La Plata, Archuletta, and Mineral counties)
- US 160/Main Street Pagosa Reconstruction and Multi-Modal Improvements


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between DurangoSouth Fork-Alamosa-Walsenburg-Pueblo (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Pagosa Springs Transportation Center
- Bayfield Park-n-Ride and Access Improvements
- New Essential Bus Service from Durango to Denver
- US 160 Pagosa Springs


## (1) Safety

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491



## (a) Asset Management

- US 160 McCabe Creek Major Structure Replacement

- Archuleta County Bus Stop Shelters
- Archuleta County Park-n-Ride
- US 160 \& Piedra - Advanced Signal Warnings
- Pagosa Springs to Durango (not Outrider associated)
- Pagosa Springs to Durango (Proposed Outrider Service)


## ! Safety

- US 160/SH 151 Safety Mitigation
- Freight safety warnings
- US 160 /Piedra Road
- US 160 Pagosa 5 Lane
- Add shoulders east of Pagosa Springs

State Highway 172: Between the New Mexico border and US 160


## Corridor Name

State Highway 172: Between the New Mexico border and US 160

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 172 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

State Highway 172 is partially-located within the Southern Ute Indian Reservation and provides local access within the southern La Plata County area between US 160 and New Mexico. The corridor provides access between downtown Durango and the Durango-La Plata County airport, the primary airport in the Southwest region. The communities along the corridor value safety and system preservation. Preserving the rural character of the corridor while supporting the movement of commuters and tourists along the corridor is important.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor R5-5 (Durango to Durango Airport)
- Scenic Byway (US 160 to Ignacio)
- Segment from 160 to Airport is Intermodal Connector


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 5 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concerns about the pavement condition near Ignacio
- Concerns about the amount of traffic
- Concerns about safety at the Airport Road and SH 172 intersection and the US 160 and SH 172 intersection

Key Data Findings: State Highway 172: Between the New Mexico border

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Most of corridor on Southern Ute Tribal Lands. <br> Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of minority population residents. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate to high congested segment south of US 160 <br> to Airport in 2030 and 2045. |
| Freight <br> Safety | Several segments with less than 2 ft shoulders. <br> Dense wildlife crashes. |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Poor drivability life segment near Oxford. |
| Transit | Local transit operates on corridor (SoCoCaa) |
| Bicycling | High bicycle activity from US 160 to Oxford; Some <br> sections of high stress for biking |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Ignacio |
| Resiliency | High criticality from US 160 south to Oxford |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> High concentration of jobs from Durango to Oxford |
| Airport | Access to the Durango-La Plata County Airport |
| Transit | High percentage of truck traffic south of Ignacio |



Corridor Needs: State Highway 172: Between the New Mexico border

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinationsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsIncrease connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (airport)Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 172: Between the New Mexico border

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 172 at CR 318 | Priority Intersection Improvements | 2103 | (1) 8 | 60 |  | \$1.90 |
| SH 172 and Becker St. Signal | Ignacio signal and ADA | 2104 | $\theta!$ | (n) 0 |  | \$1.00 |
| SH 172 New Mexico to Ignacio | Rural road surface treatment | 2632 |  | (1) | $6$ | \$10.38 |
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Project Based Strategies: State Highway 172: Between the New

## $\square$ <br> Asset Management

- SH 172 New Mexico to Ignacio


## Mobility

- No projects have been identified for this goal area


## (!) Safety

- SH 172 at CR 318
- SH172 and Becker St. Signal




## Corridor Name

State Highway 184: Between Mancos and SH 491

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the State Highway 184 corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

The State Highway 184 corridor provides local and tourist access and makes eastwest connections within the rural Montezuma County area. Preserving the rural character of the corridor while supporting the movement of commuters, bicyclists, and tourists along the corridor is important.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Between US 491 and SH 145)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 6 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for bicycle facilities
- Concerns about safety and speeding
- Desire for wider shoulders and passing lanes



## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | of $65+$ population. Passes through census tract with <br> higher percentage of disabled population. Passes <br> through census tract with high percentage of <br> people living in poverty. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Several segments with less than 2 ft shoulders. <br> Dense wildlife crashes. |
| Bicycling | Cluster of bike crashes west of Dolores; <br> High stress for biking. |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 184: Between Mancos and SH 491


## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficiencies(A) Improve bicycle accommodation

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
© Provide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 184: Between Mancos and SH 491

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide <br> Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH <br> 145/184, and US 491 | - | 1057 | (8) | $!$ |  | - |

## Project Types
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## (3) Asset <br> Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- See project: ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491


## (1) Safety

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491



## Corridor Name

US 491A: Between the New Mexico border and US 160

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 491A corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

The US 491A corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes north-south connections within the major route through southwest Colorado, within the Ute Mountain Ute reservation area. It is designated a hazardous materials route and serves as a major truck route from Albuquerque to Salt Lake City. Maintaining mobility for commuters, tourists, transit service, and freight vehicles while also improving safety is important for this portion of US 491.

## What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 comment specifically about this section of the corridor
- Desire for additional roadway capacity (four lanes) and/ or passing lanes


## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System (Segment of STRAHNET Route - NM Borders to South US 160 J unction)
- Colorado Freight Corridor

Key Data Findings: US 491A: Between the New Mexico border and US 160

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | On Ute Mountain Tribal Lands. Passes through census <br> tract with high percentage of people living in <br> poverty. Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of minority population residents. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route |
| Bicycling | High stress for biking |
| Resiliency | High criticality |
| Economics <br> Freight | Agricultural corridor |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic |



Corridor Needs: US 491A: Between the New Mexico border and US 160

## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles$\Theta$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations


Corridor Projects: US 491A: Between the New Mexico border and US

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491 | - | 1057 | (8) | 4 | (1) | - |
| 3 Lane US 491 | NM to US 160 intersection | 2105 | (8) 1 | - | (1) | \$3.00 |
| US 491 and Mike Wash Intersection | Round About intersection improvement | 2106 | (8) | - | $!$ | \$5.00 |
| Freight Parking Need | - | 2107 | (-) | - | (1) | \$0.50 |
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Project Based Strategies: US 491A: Between the New Mexico border

## ( Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491
- US 491 and Mike Wash Intersection




## Corridor Name

US 491B: Between Cortez and the Utah border

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 491B corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

The US 491B corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility, connects to places outside the region, and makes north-south connections within the major route through southwest Colorado, within the Ute Mountain Ute reservation area. It is designated a hazardous materials route and serves as a major truck route from Albuquerque to Salt Lake City. Maintaining mobility for commuters, tourists, and freight vehicles while also improving safety is important for this portion of US 491.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (Trail of the Ancients to SH 184)
- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 17 comment specifically about this section of the corridor
- Desire for additional roadway capacity (four lanes)
- Desire for improvements such as passing lanes, turn lanes, and guardrails
- Concerns about increasing congestion, particularly heavy vehicles
- Emphasized as a priority corridor in the region
- Seasonal truck traffic concerns

Key Data Findings: US 491B: Between Cortez and the Utah border

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of $65+$ population. Passes through census tract with <br> higher percentage of disabled population. Passes <br> through census tract with high percentage of people <br> living in poverty. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Freight <br> Safety | Two segments with less than 2 ft. shoulders. Dense <br> wildlife crashes. Hazmat route. |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management | Two poor drivability life segments |
| Bicycling | Medium to high stress for biking |
| Resiliency | High criticality from north of Cortez to Pleasant <br> View |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic |



Corridor Needs: US 491B: Between Cortez and the Utah border

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAccommodate seasonal increases in truck activity and associated congestion

Corridor Projects: US 491B: Between Cortez and the Utah border

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491 | - | 1057 | (b) | (1) | \%! | - |
| Essential Bus Service between Durango and Dove Creek (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Durango and Dove Creek. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1058 |  | (n) 0 | $\theta$ | \$2.05 |
| Dolores County Senior Services Scheduling and Records Software | Scheduling and records software | 1357 | (5) |  | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.13 |
| Dolores County Senior Services Vehicle Maintenance Facility | Maintenance facility; 3600 square feet | 1358 | (-) | $(3$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.00 |
| US491 Dove Creek Safety | Wildlife fencing, brush removal, sight distance improvements. | 2108 | (1) | (1) (8) | \%! | \$0.75 |
| US 491 Truck Parking |  | 2109 | (2) |  | * | \$0.50 |
| OHV Crossing | Crossing for OHVs of US 491 in Dolores County | 2110 | (1) | I | $\Leftrightarrow(1$ | - |
| US 491 and CR N Intersection | - | 2111 | (1) 8 | - | *! | \$1.00 |
| Fiber in Dolores County | Installation of fiber in Dolores County, likely along US 491B | 2112 | (8) | (-) | * | - |
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## 3 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process




## Corridor Name

US 550A: Between the New Mexico border and US 160 in Durango

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 550 corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

US 550 is the primary route providing north-south connections to places within and outside the Southwestern Colorado region, specifically between New Mexico and Durango. The southern portion of US 550 is located within the Southern Ute Reservation and provides access to tribal lands. This corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility and a Colorado Freight Corridor. Preserving the rural character of the corridor while supporting the movement of commuters, tourists, transit service, and freight along the corridor is important.

## Corridor Designations

- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) and Electric Vehicle (EV) Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 103 comment specifically about this corridor (entirety of US 550)
- Desire for a safer roadway design (shoulders, lower speed)
- Interest in more roadway capacity to support region's growth and the increasing congestion on the corridor
- Acknowledgement of the corridor's importance to the region's vitality
- Concerns about seasonal truck traffic congestion
- Desire for better transit options

Key Data Findings: US 550A: Between the New Mexico border and US 160
..................

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics Transit | Portion on Southern Ute Tribal Lands. Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+ population. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Growth | Moderate congestion segments immediately south of Durango in 2045 |
| Freight Safety | Two segments with less than 2 ft . shoulders. Several segments with elevated crash patterns. Dense wildlife crashes. Hazmat route. |
| Freight Asset Management | Two poor drivability life segments |
| Transit | SoCoCaa regional bus route |
| Resiliency | High criticality <br> Portions parallel the 100-year floodplain |
| Economics Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells |



Corridor Needs: US 550A: Between the New Mexico border and US 160

## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsAccommodate seasonal increases in truck activity and associated congestion

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491 | - | 1057 | (8) | $!$ |  | - |
| SoCoCaa Bustang bus Barn | Build Bus Barn to shelter Bustang/Outrider vehicles | 1360 | (9) | $3$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$6.10 |
| US 550 South: Sunnyside | Major reconstruction requiring widening to a four lane roadway, including earthwork, drainage, irrigation, utilities, HMA paving, pedestrian bridge, sound wall, small and large mammal crossings. | 1370 |  |  |  | \$32.62 |
| US 550 and US 160 <br> Connection <br> (Interchange <br> Completion) | This project, currently under construction eliminates the existing Farmington Hill signalized intersection by relocating US 550 to the gradeseparated Grandview Interchange. US 550 will be widened to four lanes with a new median and added shoulders. The project also improves the intersections of CR 219 and CR 220 with turn lanes. Wildlife fencing and underpasses will be installed along the corridor. | 74 | D |  |  | \$98.60 |
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Corridor Projects: US 550A: Between the New Mexico border and US

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 550 South: Gap | Reconstruction to four lanes, including drainage, utilities, large and small mammal crossings, and intersection improvements. | 1371 | $(3)$ | (1) 9 O |  | \$31.99 |
| US 550 Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Durango and New Mexico border | 1375 | (8) | (1) | ¢ 0 | \$5.00 |
| Dynamic route assignment for areas without a lot of connections | Dynamic Route Assignment | 1376 | (9) | (4) 5 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| Freight information system to direct vehicles | Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems (FRATIS) | 1377 | $\theta$ | (1) | (4) | - |
| Distracted Drivers on curvy roads | Curve Speed Warning | 1378 | (1) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ ¢ | - |
| Mitigate crashes (MP- $3.5-4,4.5-7.5,8.5-11)$ | - | 2115 | (1) | - | (1) | \$7.70 |
| US550 and CR213 Intersection Improvements | Accel and decel lanes. | 2118 | (1) ${ }^{8}$ | (8) 3 | $\theta$ (1) | \$1.50 |
| VMS Boards | Add VMS to address distracted driving | 2122 | (1) | - | (1) | - |
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Project Based Strategies: US 550A: Between the New Mexico border and

## (3) <br> Asset Management

- US 550 South: Sunnyside
- US 550 South: Gap


## Mobility

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491
- SoCoCaa Bustang bus Barn
- US 550 and US 160 Connection (Interchange Completion)
- Dynamic route assignment for areas without a lot of connections
- Distracted Drivers on curvy roads
- US 550 and CR 213 Intersection Improvements


## (!) Safety

- US 550 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure
- Freight information system to direct vehicles
- Mitigate crashes (MP- 3.5-4, 4.5-7.5, 8.5-11
- VMS Boards


US 550B: Between US 160 and the San J uan/ Ouray County Line


## Corridor Name

US 550B: Between US 160 in Durnago and the San J uan/ Ouray Country Line

## Corridor Vision

The Vision for the US 550 corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

US 550 is the primary route providing north-south connections to places within and outside the Southwestern Colorado region, specifically between Durnago and Silverton. This corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility and a Colorado Freight Corridor. The highway is part of the San J uan Skyway, which was one of the first six routes designated as an All-American Road Preserving the mountainous character of the corridor while supporting the movement of commuters, tourists, and freight along the corridor is important.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bike Corridor
- Scenic Byway
- National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 2 Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) and Electric Vehicle (EV) Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 103 comment specifically about this corridor (entirety of US 550)
- Desire for better bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and facilities, to access downtown and recreation
- Desire for a safer roadway design (shoulders, lower speed)
- Interest in more roadway capacity to support region's growth and the increasing congestion on the corridor
- Acknowledgement of the corridor's importance to the region's vitality
- Concerns about seasonal truck traffic congestion
- Desire for better transit options

Key Data Findings: US 550B: Between US 160 and the San Juan/ Ouray

## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ population |
| :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate congestion segments immediately north of <br> Durango in 2045 |
| Freight | Two segments with less than 2 ft . shoulders. Several <br> segments with elevated crash patterns. Dense <br> wildlife crashes. |
| Transit | Local transit operates on corridor in Durango. |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity from Durango to Silverton; <br> High bicycle activity from Silverton to San <br> Juan/ Ouray CL; Cluster of bike crashes in Durango; <br> High stress for biking north end; Medium-High stress <br> for biking Durango to Trimble. |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street through Durango. |
| Resiliency | High criticality from the New Mexico border to north <br> of Trimble; Portions of US 550 from the New Mexico <br> border to north of Trimble parallel the 100-year <br> floodplain; US 550 north and south of Silverton has <br> been impacted by avalanche paths. |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs Durango to Trimble. <br> Provides access to recreational areas. |
| Freight |  |



Corridor Needs: US 550B: Between US 160 and the San J uan/ Ouray

## Corridor Needs

Improve bicycle accommodationEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain, avalanche)Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationImprove parking and access to intercity transitAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops and downtown areas)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 550 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS devices between Montrose and Silverton | 1031 | (8) | - | - | \$30.00 |
| ITS/CAV: Statewide <br> Strategic Fiber <br> Network; add fiber on <br> US 160, US 550, SH <br> 145/184, and US 491 | - | 1057 | (8) | (1) | (1) | - |
| Durango Zone 6 <br> Transit Accessibility <br> Upgrades (ADA <br> Transition Plan) | Upgrade transit stops along Route 1 Main Avenue Trolley and along Route 4 Crestview/US Highway 160to include ADAcompliant curb ramps, sidewalk cross slopes, and landings. | 1059 | (-) |  | (1) | \$6.10 |
| Durango Zone 7 <br> Transit Expansion | Durango Transit route expansion from City limits to Durango/La Plata County Airport. Durango Transit route expansion from City limits to Hermosa, Durango West, Hesperus and Edgemont. | 1060 | (-) | $\text { (8) } \operatorname{cin}_{\rightarrow 0}$ | 5 | \$8.00 |
| Camino Crossing in Durango | Crossing of Camino del Rio to connect east and west sides of town | 1359 | (1) | - |  | \$4.00 |
| Durango Transit <br> Center Facility Access <br> Control/Generator | Access control, generator, access badges, safety/security enhancements, electronic farebox. | 1363 | (-) |  | $!$ | \$1.03 |
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Corridor Projects: US 550B: Between US 160 and the San Juan/ Ouray

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Durango Transit Center Expansion | Identified Durango Transit capital need | 1364 | (9) | $3$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.25 |
| Durango Zone 2 <br> Transit Accessibility <br> Upgrades (ADA <br> Transition Plan) | Upgrade transit stops along Route 1, 2 and 4 to include ADAcompliant curb ramps, sidewalk cross slopes, and landings | 1366 | (9) | (4) 0 | $\theta$ | \$1.20 |
| Durango Zone 3 <br> Transit Accessibility <br> Upgrades (ADA <br> Transition Plan) | Upgrade transit stops along Route 2 Fort Lewis College to include ADA-compliant curb ramps, sidewalk cross slopes, and landings | 1367 | (-) | (n) 0 | $\theta$ | \$1.20 |
| Durango Transit Fleet Replacement and/or Expansion | Fleet replacement and/or expansion | 1368 | (-) | (n) 0 | * | \$8.00 |
| Durango Transit Bus Barn | Identified Durango Transit capital need | 1369 | (9) |  | $\theta$ | \$4.25 |
| Dynamic route assignment for areas without a lot of connections | Dynamic Route Assignment | 1376 | (-) | (2) 0 | 5 | - |
| Freight information system to direct vehicles | Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems (FRATIS) | 1377 | (2) | (1) | \% 4 | - |

## Project Types
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Corridor Projects: US 550B: Between US 160 and the San Juan/ Ouray

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distracted Drivers on curvy roads | Curve Speed Warning | 1378 | (1) | - | 5 | - |
| US550 Wye Intersection in Silverton | Round About intersection improvement | 2113 | (1) | (i) 6 | H 4 | \$5.00 |
| US550 Passing Lane North of Durango | - | 2114 | $D$ | (5) 61 | \% | \$6.00 |
| US550/9th Street to 12th Street | Intersection and Ped improvements | 2119 | ( 1 | (n) $\rightarrow(-$ Si | H 4 | \$5.00 |
| US550 Red Mtn FLAP | Intersection, cribwall and parking improvements | 2120 | (1) | (-2) | $\Leftrightarrow$ \% | \$4.10 |
| Durango Transit ITS | Intelligent Transit System upgrades and enhancements electronic farebox, enhanced mobile ticketing, enhanced APC, AVA, GPS, app, etc.; Ongoing implementation of emerging transportation technology | 2473 | (8) | (1) | H 4 | \$1.00 |
| VMS Boards | Add VMS to address distracted driving | 2122 | (1) | - | (1) | - |
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## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- ITS/CAV: Statewide Strategic Fiber Network; add fiber on US 160, US 550, SH 145/184, and US 491
- Durango Zone 6 Transit Accessibility Upgrades (ADA Transition Plan)
- Durango Zone 7 Transit Expansion
- Camino Crossing in Durango
- Durango Transit Center Expansion
- Durango Zone 2 Transit Accessibility Upgrades (ADA Transition Plan)
- Durango Zone 3 Transit Accessibility Upgrades (ADA Transition Plan)
- Durango Transit Fleet Replacement and/or Expansion
- Durango Transit Bus Barn
- Dynamic route assignment for areas without a lot of connections
- US550/9th Street to 12th Street
- US550 Red Mtn FLAP


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 5 Shoulder Study (SWTPR) | Region will hire independent consultant to identify the best location for limited shouldering funds. | 1490 | $!$ |  | (\%) | - |

Project Types
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## (1) Asset <br> Management

- See corridor projects



## (!) Safety

- Region 5 Shoulder Study (SWTPR)


## CDOT Region 4

## Counties:

Larimer, Morgan, Weld

## $\|$ The Upper Front Range TPR mission statement is to promote economic vitality and mobility for all residents through strategic investments in s multimodal transportation system. I/



## Non-Corridor Specific Needs

- Provide additional travel options
- Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations
- Electrification
* Corridor needs are listed in order of importance based on TPR and public feedback


## What We've Heard about the Upper Front Range TPR

- 595 public and stakeholder comments specifically about the UFR TPR
- 299 surveys completed by residents with a zip code in the UFR TPR
- When asked, "What trends and issues do you think have the biggest impact on your daily life today and in the future?" public survey respondents in the UFR TPR, combined with stakeholder input, selected: Road condition and safety, Lack of travel options, Growth and congestion
- The highest frequency topics for location-specific comments in the UFR TPR (in order of frequency) include: Safety, Road Condition, Transit/ Bus Service, Bike Lanes, Congestion, Trucking/ Freight, Pedestrian Enhancements, Shoulders, Roadway Capacity, Lack of Travel Options


## Key Data Findings:

| Demographics | 2015 Population: 112,270 <br> 2045 Forecasted Population: 150,870 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Economics | 2015 J obs: 40,000 <br> 2045 Forecasted J obs: 49, 560 |
| Economics | Top Industries: Tourism, Energy Development, Agriculture |
| Growth | 2015 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 3. 6 Million <br> 2045 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT): 6.5 Million |
| Asset <br> Management | 153 Miles of highway with high drivability life <br> 358 Miles of highway with moderate drivability life <br> 175 Miles of highway with low drivability life |

State Highway 1: Between US 287 in Fort Collins and I-25 in Wellington


## Corridor Name

State Highway 1: Between US 287 in Fort Collins and $\mathrm{I}-25$ in Wellington

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 1 corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to increase mobility and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a local facility, provides commuter access, and makes north-south connections between Wellington and Fort Collins. The area served by this corridor is primarily residential, serving as a bedroom community to Fort Collins.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 11 comments specifically about this corridor
- Congestion during rush hour
- Frustration about road condition
- Desire for better pedestrian crosswalks through Wellington
- Concern about speeding traffic
- Desire for bicycle connection between

Wellington and Fort Collins

- Desire for transit service


|  | Key Data FindingS: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Moderate to high congestion (2030, 2045) |  | Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main street through Wellington (DOLA designated <br> Main Street) |
| Safety | One segment with shoulders less than 2' |  | Economics | High concentration of jobs in Wellington |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life |  | Freight | Agricultural corridor |
| Bicycling | High bicycle activity |  |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 1: Between US 287 in Fort Collins and I-25


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (downtown areas)Provide additional travel options

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 1 and LCR 62E Meyers Corner | Intersection improvements | 1379 | (1) | - | (1) | \$3.00 |
| SH 1 within Wellington Town Limits | multi-modal \& drainage improvements | 1381 | 1) 0 | (1) | (1) | \$4.00 |
| 125 \& SH1 Interchange | Interchange Reconstruction | 1395 | (8) | (1) | 13 | \$30.00 |
| SH 1 and LCR 9 | Intersection improvements for proposed PSD High School site | 1766 | ( 1 | (12) | (1) | \$3.50 |
| Regional fixed-route transit service from Wellington to Fort Collins | New regional fixed-route (or deviated fixed-route) transit service between Wellington and Fort Collins; One round trip, one day per week | 1768 | (-) | (1) 5 |  | \$0.84 |
| Region 4 Shoulder Study (UFR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2444 | $(1)$ | $60$ | ! | - |

## Project Types
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- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

- Regional fixed-route transit service from Wellington to Fort Collins
- 125 \& SH1 Interchange


## (1) Safety

- SH 1 and LCR 62E - Meyers Corner
- SH 1 within Wellington Town Limits
- SH 1 and LCR 9
- Region 4 Shoulder Study (UFR)



## Corridor Name

State Highway 7 (Mountain Section): Between Estes Park and Lyons

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 7 Mountain Section corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as the Peak-to-Peak Scenic Byway through southern Larimer County. It passes through mountainous terrain and small towns and offers northsouth connections for tourists including access to National Forest land.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R4-2)
- Scenic Byway (Peak to Peak)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 50 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor from flood recovery
- Speeding is a concern; traffic in Estes Park should be calmed and the corridor should be designed for all modes (complete streets design)
- Desire for enhanced crosswalks, roundabouts, bike lanes, and multi-use trails

Key Data Findings: State Highway 7 (Mountain Section): Between Estes
Park and Lyons (PUF7002)

## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate to high congestion approaching Estes Park <br> (2030, 2045) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | One segment with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4); Dense wildlife crashes |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life for most of the corridor |
| Transit <br> Pedestrian | Local transit operates on corridor in Estes Park |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+ population |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Estes Park <br> Provides access to recreational area |



## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations, and recreationMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Provide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops)Improve bicycle accommodationProvide additional travel optionsMitigate risk associated with natural disasters

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 7: Carriage Drive to Boulder County Line | Minor Widening | 1382 | (1) | (1) 50 | (1) | \$25.00 |
| SH7 in Estes Park | Minor Widening | 1383 | (1) | $\text { (r) } \because 0$ | ! | \$2.30 |
| SH 7 Operations \& Safety Study | Most frequent crash types: Fixed Objects, Wild Animals, Rear Ends | 2443 | (1) | - | (1) 0 | - |
| Region 4 Shoulder <br> Study (UFR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2444 | (1) |  | (1) | - |

## Project Types
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## © <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- SH 7: Carriage Drive to Boulder County Line
- SH7 in Estes Park




## Corridor Name

State Highway 14 (Mountain Section): Between Walden and US 287 (Ted's Place) north of Fort Collins

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 14 Mountain corridor is primarily to improve safety and maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor makes east-west connections within the Poudre Canyon area, offering access to National Forest land and recreational opportunities. The Cache La Poudre - North Park Byway is a state designated scenic byway which extends between Fort Collins and Walden along this corridor. Cameron Pass is one of the six major passes in Colorado that provide access over the continental divide.

## Corridor Designations

- Scenic Byway (between Cache la Poudre and North Park)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 13 comments specifically about this corridor
- Poor pavement condition
- Desire for wider shoulders for bicyclists and emergencies



## Key Data Findings:

| Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than | Economics | Provides access to recreational area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 '; Several segments with elevated crash patterns (LOSS 3 or 4); Dense wildlife crashes | Freight | High percentage of truck traffic (middle segment) |
| Asset <br> Management | Low drivability life (one short segment) |  |  |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |  |  |
| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of $65+$ and disabled populations |  |  |



| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 14 - US 287 to the western Larimer County Line | Passing lane and geometric improvements | 1384 | (1) | (I) | (1) | \$10.00 |
| SH 14 \& LCR 63E | Intersection Improvements | 1385 | (1) | - | ! 0 | \$2.00 |
| SH 14 at CR 27 - Stove Prairie Rd. | Intersection Improvements | 1386 | (1) | - | $!\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.50 |
| SH 14 Truck Parking | Truck Parking on Cameron Pass | 1772 | (2) | - | 3 | \$0.30 |

## Project Types
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- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

- SH 14 Truck Parking


## (1) Safety

- SH 14 - US 287 to the western Larimer County Line
- SH 14 \& LCR 63E
- SH 14 at CR 27 - Stove Prairie Rd.



## Corridor Name

State Highway 14 (Plains Section): Between I-25 (Fort Collins) and I-76 (Sterling); includes SH 392 between US 85 and SH 14

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 14 Plains corridor is to maintain system quality and increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor makes east-west connections in northern Weld County, supporting the moving of freight and farm-to-market products. The Pawnee Pioneer Trails Scenic/ Historic Byway extends along portions of this corridor, providing access to Pawnee National Grasslands.

## Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Scenic Byway (Pawnee Pioneer Trails)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 13 comments specifically about this corridor
- Poor pavement condition
- Desire for turn lanes and traffic signals at key intersections
- Desire for safe routes for walking to schools


|  | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Growth | High congestion west of US 85 (2045) | Economics Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells Agricultural corridor |
| Safety <br> Freight | Hazmat route | Economics | Provides access to recreational area |
| Asset |  | Freight | High percentage of truck traffic |
| Management Freight | Two segments of low drivability life | Resiliency | High criticality: I-25 to east of Ault, SH 52 to |
| Bicycling | High bicycle activity east of Raymer Medium high to high stress for bicycling |  |  |



| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 14 Intelligent <br> Transportation Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS Intelligent Transportation Systems devices between Fort Collins and Sterling | 1024 | (8) | -0, | ! $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$30.00 |
| SH 392 and WCR 43 | Intersection improvements | 1389 | (1) 8 | - | (1) | \$4.00 |
| SH 14 and WCR 390 | Intersection Improvement | 1391 | (1) | - | (1) | \$4.00 |
| SH 392 and WCR 55 | Intersection Improvement | 1392 | (1) | - | (1) | \$4.00 |
| CR 69/74/SH392 Cornish | Intersection Improvements | 1393 | (1) | - | $!\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.00 |
| SH 14 and SH 392 and WCR 77 | Intersection Improvement | 1783 | (1) 8 | (8) -2 | (1) | \$6.00 |
| SH 14 and SH 71 (east) | Intersection Improvement | 1784 | (1) 8 | (8) -6 | (1) | \$2.00 |

## Project Types
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 14 and SH 71 (west) | Intersection Improvement | 1785 | (1) | (8) -2 | (1) | \$2.00 |
| SH 14 and WCR 90 and WCR 57 | Intersection Improvement | 1786 | (1) | (3) -6 | 1) | \$6.50 |
| SH 14 and WCR 29 | Intersection Improvement | 1788 | (1) | (8) -2 | ! | \$4.00 |
| SH 14 and WCR 31 | Intersection Improvement | 1789 | (1) | (8) -2 | (1) | \$4.00 |
| SH 14 and WCR 89 | Intersection Improvement | 1790 | (1) 8 | (8) -2 | (1) | \$4.00 |
| SH 14 and WCR 93 | Intersection Improvement | 1791 | (1) | (3) -2 | (1) | \$4.00 |
| SH 14 and WCR 121 | Intersection Improvement | 1792 | (1) 8 | (8) -2 | (1) | \$4.00 |

## Project Types

Project Benefits
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Asset
Management
Freight
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| Description | Planning |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project ID |  |


| Primary | Additional | SWP |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project | Project | Goal |
| Types | Benefits | Areas |

Project Cost (In millions)

| SH 14 and WCR 129, New Raymer | Intersection Improvement | 1793 | (1) | (3) -2 | ! | \$4.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 392 and WCR 51 | Intersection Improvement | 1794 | (1) | - | (1) | \$4.00 |
| SH 392 east of US 85 | Access Control Plan | 1795 | (1) | - | (1) 5 | \$0.50 |
| SH 14 | Access Control Plan | 1796 | (1) 8 | (-1) | (1) | \$0.50 |
| SH 14 and US 85 through Ault | Pedestrian improvements | 1797 | ( | (2) | 1. | \$0.20 |
| Region 4 Shoulder <br> Study (UFR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2444 | 4 |  |  |  |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR) | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2445 |  | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ |  |

## Project Types
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Project Based Strategies: State Highway 14 (Plains Section): Between I-25


Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset
SH 14 Intelligent Transportation
Systems Infrastructure


## (1) Safety

- SH 392 and WCR 43
- SH 14 and WCR 390
- SH 392 and WCR 55
- CR 69/74/SH392 - Cornish
- SH 14 and SH 392 and WCR 77
- SH 14 and SH 71 (east)
- SH 14 and SH 71 (west)

Project Based Strategies: State Highway 14 (Plains Section): Between I-25


- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## $\Rightarrow$ Mobility

- SH 392 east of US 85
- SH 14
- Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR)
- SH 14 and US 85 through Ault Pedestrian Improvements


## ! Safety

- Region 4 Shoulder Study (UFR)
- SH 14 and WCR 90 and WCR 57
- SH 14 and WCR 29
- SH 14 and WCR 31
- SH 14 and WCR 89

Project Based Strategies: State Highway 14 (Plains Section): Between I-25


- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## (1) Safety

- SH 14 and WCR 93
- SH 14 and WCR 121
- SH 14 and WCR 129, New Raymer
- SH 392 and WCR 51



## Corridor Name

Interstate 25 (North Section): Between SH 14 (Fort Collins) and the Wyoming border

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the I- 25 North Section corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

$\mathrm{I}-25$ is an interstate facility on the National Highway System. This section of the interstate provides north-south connections within the Fort Collins to Cheyenne area. It is part of the national trade network and needs to support the movement of commuters, tourists and freight, and provide for long distance travel through the corridor.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- National Primary Freight System
- Fiber Priority 1 Corridor
- Tier 1 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 41 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for passenger rail
- Concern about safety and speeding, wildlife crossing the highway
- Desire for highway widening
- Desire for truck parking


## Key Data Findings:

| Freight <br> Safety | Hazmat route |
| :--- | :--- |
| Transit | Greyhound operates on the corridor |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Wellington |
| Economics <br> Freight | Agricultural corridor |
| Freight | High percentage and volume of truck traffic |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | High criticality; Parallels 100-year flood plain |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest stops/ truck parkingMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Provide additional travel options
(Fort Collins) to the Wyoming border (PUF7006)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I25 North border of region - tool for Virtual Weigh Station | Freight Advanced Traveler Information Systems (FRATIS) | 1394 | $(1)$ | (3) |  | - |
| Segment 9 within UFR <br> TPR (LCR 56 to SH 1) | Reconstruction of mainline, bridges and interchanges | 1800 | (8) | (8) -2 |  | \$109.70 |
| I-25 Truck Parking | Increase Truck Parking North of Wellington (MP 280) | 1801 | (-) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$1.48 |
| North I-25 Transit Service | Inter-regional bus service from Fort Collins to Cheyenne; 1 round trip per day 365 days/year, one new vehicle | 1802 | (9) | (12) 0 (iin | $\theta$ | \$1.55 |

## Project Types
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Freight
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## o

- Segment 9 within UFR TPR (LCR 56 to SH 1)


## Mobility

- 125 North border of region - tool for Virtual Weigh Station
- I-25 Truck Parking
- North I-25 Transit Service




## Corridor Name

US Highway 34 (RMNP/ Mountain Section): From Granby through Rocky Mountain National Park

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 34 RMNP/ Mountain Section corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor, which is commonly referred to as Trail Ridge Road, is designated as an All American Road and provides one of Colorado's six major mountain passes across the Continental Divide. Trail Ridge Road is closed in the winter. This corridor predominately serves tourist and recreational traffic within the Rocky Mountain National Park area.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R4-1)
- Scenic Byway (Trail Ridge Road)
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 9 comment specifically about this corridor
- Desire for bike lanes
- Heavy tourism season creates congestion



## Key Data Findings:

| Safety | Majority of corridor has shoulders less than 2' |  | Economics |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Transit | Local transit operates on the corridor in Estes <br> Park | Resiliency | High criticality |
| Bicycling | High to very high bicycle activity <br> High stress for bicycling |  |  |



## Corridor Needs

Address increasing congestion to improve access to tourist destinations and recreationImprove safetyEliminate shoulder deficienciesProvide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)Provide additional travel optionsMitigate risk associated with natural disastersImprove bicycle accommodation

Corridor Projects: US Highway 34 (RMNP/ Mountain Section): From Granby
through Rocky Mountain National Park (PUF7007)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 4 Shoulder Study (UFR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2444 | (1) | 6 6) -2 | 4 | - |

## Project Types



## Project Benefits
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## 0 <br> Asset <br> Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process



## (!) Safety

- Region 4 Shoulder Study (UFR)



## Corridor Name

US Highway 34 (Big Thompson Section): Between the Rocky Mountain National Park east entrance and the west side of Loveland

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 34 Big Thompson corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal National Highway System facility and makes east-west connections through the Big Thompson River Canyon and the Estes Valley. The corridor provides access for tourists and commuters from the Front Range to Estes Park and Rocky Mountain National Park.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R4-1)
- Tier 2 CNG and EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 56 comments specifically about this corridor
- Speeding is a concern; traffic in Estes Park should be calmed and the corridor should be designed for all modes (complete streets design)
- Desire for enhanced crosswalks, sidewalk connectivity, roundabouts, bike lanes, and multi-use trails in Estes Park
- Desire for bike lanes up the canyon
- Desire for transit service between Loveland and Estes Park
- Congestion issue between Estes Park and Rocky Mountain National Park, particularly during the summer
- Desire for better travel information and pulloffs for tourists



## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate Congestion (2045) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Two segments with shoulders less than 2' <br> Three segments of elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4); Dense wildlife crashes |
| Transit <br> Pedestrian | Local transit operates on the corridor in Estes <br> Park |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling |


| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main street through Estes Park |
| :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of $65+$ and disabled populations. |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Estes Park <br> Provides access to recreational area |
| Resiliency | High criticality |



## Corridor Needs

Address increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations and recreationImprove bicycle accommodationProvide additional travel optionsMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Provide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demandAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsCorridor Projects: US Highway 34 (Big Thompson Section): Between the Rocky
Mountain National Park east entrance and the west side of Loveland (PUF7008)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Inter-Regional <br> Service between <br> Estes Park and I-25 | Implement regional service along US 34 connecting Estes Park with I25. Estimated at 3 days per week (1,250 annual hours) | 1396 | (-) | (1) 0 | $\theta$ | \$1.08 |
| US 34/US 36 <br> Intersection in Estes Park | Intersection improvements. | 1397 | (1) | (8) 900 | ! 5 | \$6.00 |
| Estes Park | Safety and system preservation improvements in Estes Park | 1398 | 19 | (1) | 13 | \$10.00 |
| US34 / US36 | Western Bypass connection | 1399 | (8) | $\Leftrightarrow 60$ | $\theta$ | \$6.10 |
| US 34 \& Mall Road; US 36 \& Mall Road in Estes Park | Intersection Improvements | 1400 | (1) | $\Leftrightarrow$ | 4 | \$6.00 |
| US 34: Dry Gulch Road to Mall Road (Estes Park) | Major/Minor, widening/safety | 1401 | (1) | (a) 50 | (1) | \$4.50 |
| US34 \& LCR27 West of Loveland Masonville Rd. | Intersection Improvements | 1402 | (1) | - | 45 | \$4.00 |

## Project Types
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

Corridor Projects: US Highway 34 (Big Thompson Section): Between the Rocky

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primar <br> y <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 34 Multimodal Trail Connection | Mall Road to Rocky Mountain National Park | 1403 | $\text { d } 6$ |  |  | \$10.00 |
| Estes Park | Circulation Improvements in and around Estes Park including a one-way couplet | 1404 | (8) | $\Leftrightarrow(\square) \Leftrightarrow$ |  | \$47.20 |
| Estes Park Transit Stop Improvements | Since Estes Transit service began in 2006, stop signage has changed over time. However, one element that has stayed the same is the temporary nature of the stop signs. The Town would like to design, produce and install semipermanent stop signage and bus shelters, where stop geography allows. The reason for the "semi-permanent" wording is due to the fac that Estes Transit operates a seasonal shuttle program. While service expansion efforts are underway, bus stop infrastructure would need to be flexible enough to be partially removed and/transitioned into other uses during the off-season. Project costs include design and production of new stop signs (for approx. 55 stops) as well as temporary/semi-permanent stop shelters for 55 locations. | 2527 | (9) | $(4)(B) \approx i$ | $\theta$ | \$0.15 |

## Project Types

## Project Benefits



SWP Goal Area


Corridor Projects: US Highway 34 (Big Thompson Section): Between the Rocky

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transit Access Control Gates | In 2017, the Town tested a new "Green Route", which provided express service connecting three stops: 1) the parking structure, 2) Events Complex and 3) Bond Park. The Green Route offered 15-minute round-trip service from the Town's two largest parking facilities to downtown, with no transfer at the Visitor Center required. During the first week of service, the US Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) shut down the bus stop at the parking structure forcing the stop to relocate to the Visitor Center. This change significantly impact ridership on the route, however the Town was able to negotiate with the BOR to allow shuttle access if the Town installed access control gates and appropriate pedestrian safety measures. This project would include installation of BOR-required equipment and safety measures to allow reinstatement of the Green Route. The project cost includes design, material and construction costs. | 2528 | (9) | $\begin{gathered} x \rightarrow \pi \\ i=1 \end{gathered}$ | $40$ | \$0.06 |
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Corridor Projects: US Highway 34 (Big Thompson Section): Between the Rocky

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public Restroom <br> Facilities at Events Complex Park-N-Ride \& Transit Hub in Estes Park | Install public restroom facilities near the bus pull-out and shelter on Manford Avenue. The restrooms are a critical element to encouraging increased use of the Events Complex park-n-ride lot (454 parking spaces) located immediately adjacent to the Estes Transit stop. The lack of public restrooms is the second most frequent reason stated by riders as a reason that they do not park in this location (second only to shuttle frequency, which the Town is working to address in 2020). Project costs are based on an overall $\$ 450 /$ square foot construction cost with a proposed 600 square foot facility. Water is on site, but access to sanitary sewer will require crossing Manford Ave. | 2529 | (9) | $(9)$ | $\pi$ | \$0.40 |
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Corridor Projects: US Highway 34 (Big Thompson Section): Between the Rocky

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additiona I Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visitor Center \& Transit <br> Transfer Center in Estes <br> Park - Parking Lot <br> Reconfiguration | This project would include a new layout for the Visitor Center parking lot that emphasizes shuttle, car and pedestrian separation and safety. It would also include the addition of a frontage road connection to a signalized intersection that would alleviate the need for shuttles, buses and passenger cars to take an unprotected left onto US 34 across multiple lanes of traffic. During the summer, the Estes Park Visitor Center parking lot is one of the busiest parking lots in Town. With five Town shuttle routes stopping every 30 minutes from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. and several large Rocky Mountain National Park buses accessing the lot every 30 minutes daily, the 186 space surface parking lot is filled with cars, shuttles, buses and pedestrians from dawn to dusk. This lot is laid out in manner that underutilizes the space, confuses drivers due to adjacent drive aisles that are going in multiple directions and a one-way drive aisle that loops back into the main shuttle access lane. The project cost estimates is an "all-in" figure that includes, paving, striping, island reconfiguration, walkways, curb and gutter, some sidewalks and landscaping. | 2530 | (9) |  | 5 | \$2.07 |

## Project Types
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## SWP Goal Area



Project Based Strategies: US Highway 34 (Big Thompson Section): Between the


## (3) Asset Management

- Public Restroom Facilities at Events Complex Park-N-Ride \& Transit Hub in Estes Park


## 

- New Inter-Regional Service between Estes Park and I-25
- US34 / US36
- US 34 Multimodal Trail Connection


## (1) Safety

- US 34/US 36 Intersection in Estes Park
- Estes Park
- US 34 \& Mall Road; US 36 \& Mall Road in Estes Park

Project Based Strategies: US Highway 34 (Big Thompson Section): Between the


$\theta$<br>\section*{Asset<br><br>Management}

- See the previous page


## Mobility

- Estes Park
- Estes Park Transit Stop Improvements
- Transit Access Control Gates
- Visitor Center \& Transit Transfer Center in Estes Park - Parking Lot Reconfiguration


## ! Safety

- US 34: Dry Gulch Road to Mall Road (Estes Park)
- US34 \& LCR27 West of Loveland Masonville Rd.



## Corridor Name

US Highway 34 (Plains Section):
Between US 85 bypass east of Greeley and I-76 in Wiggins

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 34 Plains corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a National Highway System facility and makes eastwest connections within the central Weld County and western Morgan County area. The surrounding area depends on agriculture and oil and gas for economic activity, and the corridor supports the movement of freight and farm-to-market products.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 1 CNG and EV Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 20 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for bike lanes
- Desire for highway widening
- Concern about unsafe driver behavior including speeding
- Safety concerns around competing demands - agriculture and bicyclists

Key Data Findings: US Highway 34 (Plains Section): Between US 85


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Safety } \\ & \text { Freight } \end{aligned}$ | Key Data Findings: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hazmat Route; Portion of corridor with shoulders less than 2' | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Economics } \\ & \text { Freight } \end{aligned}$ | Concentration of oil and gas wells Agricultural corridor |
|  | Dense wildlife crashes on select segments of corridor | Freight | High percentage of truck traffic |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity: Medium high to high stress for bicycling | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Resiliency } \\ & \text { Freight } \end{aligned}$ | High criticality; Parallels 100-year flood plain |
| Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+and low-income populations. |  |  |

Corridor Needs: US Highway 34 (Plains Section): Between US 85 bypass
east of Greeley and I-76 in Wiggins (PUF7009)


## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Eliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight,Provide additional travel options and bicyclistsAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations| Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1019 | (2) | (4) 5 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.24 |
| 1406 | (1) | $8-1!$ | (!) | \$0.60 |
| 1812 | (1) 8 | $\text { (8) }-2$ |  | \$4.00 |
| 1813 | (1) | $\text { (i) }-6$ |  | \$6.00 |
| 1814 | (1) 8 | (3) -2 | ! 0 | \$4.00 |
| 1815 | (1) 8 | - | $!5$ | \$0.50 |
| 2444 | (1) | $60$ | $!\Rightarrow$ | - |
| 2445 | (-) | - | 5 | - |

## Project Types




Project Benefits




SWP Goal Area



## (1) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Sterling and Fort Morgan and Greeley (Proposed Outrider Service)US 34 east of Kersey
- Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR)


## ! Safety

- US 34 and WCR 53 - Kersey
- US 34 and WCR 47 - Kersey
- US 34 and WCR 50
- US 34 and WCR 386
- US 34 east of Kersey
- Region 4 Shoulder Study (UFR)

Brush to the Nebraska border (PUF7010)


## Corridor Name

US Highway 34 (Northeastern Plains Section): Between SH 71 in Brush to the Nebraska border

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 34 Northeastern Plains corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor makes east/ west connections within eastern Morgan County. The surrounding area primarily depends on agriculture for economic activity and the corridor supports the movement of farm-to-market products.

Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor

What we heard about the Corridor

- 2 comment specifically about this corridor
- Improve mobility; increasing congestion

Key Data Findings: US Highway 34 (Northeastern Plains Section):
Between SH 71 in Brush to the Nebraska border (PUF7010)


|  | Key Data FindingS: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety <br> Freight | Hazmat route |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+and disabled populations. |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | High criticality |

Corridor Needs: US Highway 34 (Northeastern Plains Section): Between


## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles$\leftrightarrow$ Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies
© Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 4 Shoulder <br> Study (UFR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2444 | (1) | 60-4 |  | - |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR) | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2445 | -2) | - | $\theta$ | - |

## Project Types



Project Benefits


Mobility Options
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Asset
Management Aviation
Freight
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SWP Goal Area



## (3) Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process




## Corridor Name

US Highway 36 (Mountain Section): Between US 34 in Estes Park and SH 7 on the north side of Boulder

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 36 Mountain corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides north-south connects between Boulder and the Estes Valley. It passes through mountainous terrain and small towns and offers access to Estes Park and Rocky Mountain National Park for tourists and recreationalists from the Front Range.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R4-5)
- Tier 1 EV Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 38 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for passing lanes and pull-outs
- Desire for shoulders for bicyclists
- Concern about traffic congestion, especially in the summer
- Desire for a multi-use path
- Safety concerns; desire to calm traffic in Estes Park
- Consider transit service to Estes Park from Front Range



## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate Congestion (2030, 2045) |  | Transit <br> Pedestrian | Local transit operates on corridor in Estes Park |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Safety | Two segments with shoulders less than 2' <br> One segment of elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4); Dense wildlife crashes |  | Economics <br> Pedestrian | Main Street through Estes Park |
| Bicycling | High stress for bicycling | Economics | High concentration of jobs in Estes Park |  |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of 65+and disabled population. | Resiliency | Provides access to recreational area |  |



## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs, tourist destinations and recreationMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate risk associated with natural disastersProvide tourism amenities (signage, pull-offs)Improve bicycle accommodationEnhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demandProvide additional travel options

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 36 Community Drive to Mary's Lake Road | Digital signage and smart parking technology for congestion and air quality mitigation | 1820 | (8) | (1) | $s$ | \$2.00 |
| US 36 at parking garage | Intersection improvements (roundabout or signalization) | 1821 | (1) | (8) | (1) | \$1.00 |
| US 36 and Spur 66 Intersection in Estes Park | Intersection improvements (roundabout) | 1822 | (1) 8 | $(1)$ | 4 | \$3.00 |
| Bustang Service from Boulder-Lyons-Estes Park | Need operating details from CDODT - number of operational days per year, hours of service, ops costs and vehicle needs | 1824 | (-) | (x) | * | - |
| Region 4 Shoulder <br> Study (UFR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2444 | (1) |  | (3) | - |

## Project Types



Safety
Freight
Operations
Bicycle
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SWP Goal Area


| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project <br> ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Electric Trolley / Bus Barn | Install a charging station, and metal storage building, for the electric trolley that will be received in January 2020, with plans for adding another electric trolley in fall/winter 2020. Cost is based on 1,200 square foot addition to the Water Shop/New Fleet Shop building at $\$ 200 /$ square foot construction costs. This project also assumes that this building will go within the Town owned Elm Road property, with no land acquisition costs. | 2525 | (9) | $3$ |  | \$0.32 |
| Charging Station for Battery-Electric Trolley | The Town has received two FTA grants for Electric Trolley vehicles (via 5339b and 5339b funding), and the first trolley vehicle will be received in January 2020. As part of these grant proposals, the Town only asked for one charging station, however two will be needed to adequately charge the vehicles for service (as part of the Estes Transit fleet). The first charging station has been received and is the process of being installed. This request is for a second charging station to serve the second vehicle, which should be delivered in late 2020. Project costs include the charging station and cost for installation (via local electrician/contractor). | 2526 | (-) | (1) |  | \$0.01 |

## Project Types



Project Benefits




Mobility

Management
Freight
Transit

## SWP Goal Area




- Electric Trolley / Bus Barn


## Mobility

- US 36: Estes Park to Boulder County Line
- US 36 Trail Project
- US 36 (Moraine Ave) Multimodal
- US 36 Community Drive to Mary's Lake Road


## ! Safety

- US36 Lake Estes Causeway
- US36 / Community Dr
- US 36/Mary's Lake Road/High Drive
- US 36 and Elm Road in Estes Park

- See the previous page


## Mobility

- Bustang Service from Boulder-LyonsEstes Park
- Charging Station for Battery-Electric Trolley


## (1) Safety

- US 36 and 4th Street in Estes Park
- US 36 at parking garage
- US 36 and Spur 66 Intersection in Estes Park
- Region 4 Shoulder Study (UFR)



## Corridor Name

State Highway 52 (Western Section): Between SH 119 (the Diagonal) and l-76 in Hudson

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 52 (Western Section) corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor provides east-west connections within southwest Weld County. The surrounding area depends on manufacturing, high-tech, commercial activity, oil and gas, and residential development for economic activity. The area is transitioning from rural to urban, and the corridor must support the movement of both commuters and freight.

Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 9 comments specifically about this corridor
- Safety concerns
- Traffic congestion and desire for widening
- Slow moving vehicles contribute to congestion; difficult/ unsafe to pass



## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate to high congestion west of US 85 <br> (2030, 2045) |  | Economics | High concentration of jobs in Fort Lupton |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Safety <br> Freight | Hazmat Route; Majority of corridor has <br> shoulders less than 2' |  | Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor |
| Asset <br> Management <br> Freight | Low drivability life for two short segments |  |  |  |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | High criticality; Crosses 100-year flood plain |  |  |  |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher <br> percentage of disabled and minority <br> populations |  |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 52 (Western Section): Between SH 119
(the Diagonal) and I-76 in Hudson (PUF7012)


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesEliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs and improve reliability for freight movementAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populations

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 52 Access Control Plan | Access control plan | 1061 | (1) 8 | - | 15 | \$0.20 |
| SH 52: CR 21 to US 85 <br> Corridor Improvements | Widening, safety, and intersection improvements. | 1413 | (1) 8 | (4) -2 |  | - |
| SH 52 and WCR 41 | Intersection Improvement | 1414 | (1) 8 | (3) -8 |  | \$0.60 |
| SH 52 and WCR 37 | Intersection Improvement | 1416 | (1) 8 | (c) -2 |  | \$3.00 |
| SH 52 north of Fort <br> Morgan (MP 92-100) <br> strategic shoulder and <br> super elevation <br> improvements | Super elevation correction or high friction surface treatment and wider shoulders on the outside of curves to correct the pattern of run off road crashes | 1829 |  | (8) -2 |  | \$2.00 |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR) | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2445 | (2) | - | $\theta$ | - |

## Project Types
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- SH 52 north of Fort Morgan (MP 92100) strategic shoulder and super elevation improvements

- SH 52 Access Control Plan
- Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR)

- SH 52: CR 21 to US 85 Corridor Improvements
- SH 52 and WCR 41
- SH 52 and WCR 37



## Corridor Name

State Highway 52 (Middle Section): Between I-76 in Hudson and US 34 in Wiggins

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 52 (Middle Section) corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a local facility, providing local access and making eastwest connections within the southeast Weld County and southwest Morgan County area. The surrounding area depends on agriculture and oil and gas for economic activity, and the corridor supports the movement of freight and farm-to-market products.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R4-11)


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 7 comments specifically about this corridor
- Suggestion to limit oversized loads during peak hours
- Desire for corridor upgrades for use as a bypass of Denver area
- Desire for shoulder improvements and repaving

Key Data Findings: State Highway 52 (Middle Section): Between I-76 in
Hudson and US 34 in Wiggins (PUF7013)


|  | Key Data FindingS: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Safety <br> Freight | Hazmat Route (I-76 to SH 79) <br> Nearly all of corridor has shoulders less <br> than 2' |  | Economics <br> Freight |  | | Concentration of oil and gas wells |
| :--- |
| Agricultural corridor |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 52 (Middle Section): Between I-76 in
Hudson and US 34 in Wiggins (PUF7013)


## Corridor Needs

(i) Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAccommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsEliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety, freight, and bicyclists

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 52 Access Control Plan | Access control plan | 1061 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.20 |
| SH 52 from NS split to Wiggins | Safety widening and shoulders | 1417 | (1) | (4) (-1 6 | (1) | \$12.00 |
| SH52 \& US6, Wiggins | Intersection Improvements | 1418 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.60 |
| SH 52 and WCR 59, Keenesburg | Intersection Improvement (Turn lanes) | 1833 | (1) | - | (1) | \$2.00 |
| Prospect Valley from MP 54.58 to MP $60.753$ | Rural Road Surface Treatment | 67 |  | (1) | 9 | \$5.10 |

Project Types
!
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## (3) Asset Management

- Prospect Valley from MP 54.58 to MP 60.753
- SH 52 Access Control Plan

- SH 52 from NS split to Wiggins
- SH52 \& US6, Wiggins
- SH 52 and WCR 59, Keenesburg

State Highway 66: Between US 36 in Lyons and US 85 in Platteville


## Corridor Name

State Highway 66: Between US 36 in Lyons and US 85 in Platteville

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 66 corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a multimodal local facility, providing local access and making east-west connections within the southwest Weld County area including access to St. Vrain State Park. The surrounding areas depend on manufacturing, high-tech, and commercial activity for economic activity. The area is transitioning from rural to urban, and the corridor must support the movement of commuters and freight.

## Corridor Designations

- None


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 1 comment specifically about this corridor
- Separate cars from bicyclists and pedestrians to make it safer


|  | Key Data FindingS: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Growth | High congestion (2030, 2045) |  | Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor |
| Safety | Dense wildlife crashes |  | Resiliency | High criticality; Crosses 100-year flood plain |
| Freight <br> Asset <br> Management Low drivability life |  |  |  |  |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Platteville |  |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 66: Between US 36 in Lyons and US 85 in
Platteville (PUF7014)


## Corridor Needs

Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobsMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)
$\triangle$ Eliminate shoulder deficiencies

Corridor Projects: State Highway 66: Between US 36 in Lyons and US 85 in

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 66 and WCR 21 | Intersection Improvement | 1421 | (1) 8 | - | ! $\%$ | \$1.80 |

Project Types


## Project Benefits
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- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process




## Corridor Name

State Highway 71 (Northeastern Plains Section): Between I-70 in Limon to the Nebraska border; includes SH 52 between I-76 and SH 14

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 71 Northeastern Plains corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to maintain system quality and to increase safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor includes SH 71, which is on the National Highway System, and a portion of SH 52, which is designated as a local highway. The Pawnee Pioneer Trails Scenic/ Historic Byway extends along the SH 52 portion of the corridor. Together, they comprise a corridor that provides north-south continuity throughout eastern Morgan and Weld Counties, supporting the agricultural character through movement of farm-tomarket products

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Scenic Byway (Pawnee Pioneer Trails, SH 52 between l-76 and SH 14)

What we heard about the Corridor

- 26 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concern about poor pavement condition
- Desire for highway widening to accommodate trucks
- Safety concerns
- Desire for shoulder improvements

Key Data Findings: State Highway 71 (Northeastern Plains Section): Between I-70 in

## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate Congestion on short section of SH 52 north <br> of I-76 (2045) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety <br> Freight | Hazmat Route; Nearly all of corridor has shoulders <br> less than 2'; One segment with elevated crash <br> pattern (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| Asset <br> Management <br> Freight | Low drivability life for most of the corridor |
| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main street through Brush (DOLA designated Main <br> Street) |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65t, disabled and minority populations |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor |
| Economics | Provides access to recreational area |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic |
| Resiliency | Crosses 100-year flood plain |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poorEliminate shoulder deficienciesAddress increasing congestion to improve reliability for freight movementMitigate elevated crash patternsMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand (bus stops, downtown areas)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 71 (Northeastern Plains Section): Between I-70 in

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional Project Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 71 Super 2 | Reconstruction of corridor, safety, operational and Intelligent Transportation Systems components to Super 2 configuration from Limon to Nebraska state line. | 1023 |  | (3) -3 |  | \$200.00 |
| Dynamic Curve Warning | Curve Speed Warning | 1422 | (1) |  |  | - |
| US 34-176, Fort Morgan | ADA/PED Improvements | 1423 |  | (x) 0 (1il | (1) | \$2.00 |
| North of South Platte River, North side of Rainbow Bridge Park Entrance, Trail, Fort Morgan | Parking Improvements, Beautification Landscaping | 1425 |  | - |  | \$1.00 |
| I76 to CR V, Fort Morgan | Ped/Safety Improvements | 1424 | ( | (1) |  | \$1.50 |
| SH 71 Stoneham to <br> Kimball (Nebraska) Truck Parking | No spaces exist on the southern portion of this segment. Parking could be added through private investment in Kimball. | 1837 | (-) | - | $\theta$ | \$0.41 |

## Project Types
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Corridor Projects: State Highway 71 (Northeastern Plains Section): Between I-70 in

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Beaver Creek | Bridge structure | 2681 | $3$ | (1) | 3 | \$4.78 |
| SH71- Stoneham | Bridge BMPs | 2682 | 3 | (1) | 3 | \$0.14 |
| SH71-SH14 South | Major Pavement Rehabilitation | 2688 | $B$ | (1) | $3$ | \$24.13 |
| SH71- Brush North | Minor Pavement Rehabilitation | 2689 |  | (1) | 18 | \$3.48 |

## Project Types
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Project Based Strategies: State Highway 71 (Northeastern Plains Section):
Between I-70 in Limon to the Nebraska border; includes SH 52 between I-76 and SH 14

## Asset Management

- North of South Platte River, North side of Rainbow Bridge Park Entrance, Trail, Fort Morgan
- Big Beaver Creek
- SH71-Stoneham
- SH71- SH14 South
- SH71- Brush North


## Mobility

- US 34-I76, Fort Morgan
- SH 71 Stoneham to Kimball (Nebraska) Truck Parking


## Safety

- SH 71 Super 2
- Dynamic Curve Warning
- I76 to CR V, Fort Morgan




## Corridor Name

Interstate 76 (Denver East Section): Between US 85 in Commerce City and the Nebraska border; includes US 34 between Fort Morgan and Brush

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the I-76, Denver East corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor includes I-76, an interstate facility on the National Highway System through southeast Weld County and central Morgan County, and parts of US 6, and US 34 that parallel I-76 in Morgan County. The BNSF Railroad runs parallel to I-76 through the corridor and provides both freight and passenger rail movement. The corridor must support the movement of freight and commuters, while also providing for long distance travel.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 1 CNG and EV Corridor
- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R4-18) between Fort Morgan and Brush


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 76 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement condition is poor
- Desire for transit service; Amtrak is not reliable/ frequent enough; aging population needs to get to medical appointments
- Safety concerns
- Speeding is a problem on both I-76 and US 34
- Important to address resiliency at river crossings
- Want more walking and biking opportunities (on US 34 through Fort Morgan and Brush)
- Increasing truck traffic; desire for truck parking/ rest areas



## Key Data Findings:

| Safety <br> Freight | Hazmat Route; Two segments with elevated crash <br> patterns (LOSS 3 or 4); Dense wildlife crashes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asset <br> Management <br> Freight | Low drivability for a short segment of I-76 and on <br> US 6 northeast of Brush; One bridge in poor <br> condition in Roggen |
| Transit <br> Mobility Hub <br> Pedestrian | Burlington Trailways and Black Hills Stage Lines <br> operate on corridor; intercity bus stations in Fort <br> Morgan and Brush |
| Bicycling | High to very high bicycle activity between Fort <br> Morgan and Brush; High stress for bicycling |


| Pedestrian <br> Economics | Main Street (US 34) through Fort Morgan and Brush <br> (DOLA designated Main Street) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of <br> $65+$, disabled, low income, and minority populations |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Fort Morgan and Brush |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor |
| Freight | High percentage and volume of truck traffic |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | High criticality <br> Crosses 100-year flood plain |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehicles, rest areas/ truck parkingIncrease connectivity and improve reliability to intermodal facility (mobility hub)Address pavement condition where drivability life is poorAddress bridge in poor conditionMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)


Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)

Corridor Projects: Interstate 76 (Denver East Section): Between US 85 in Commerce

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Essential Bus Service between Sterling and Fort Morgan and Greeley (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Sterling-Fort Morgan-Greeley. Assumes one roundtrip per day 365 days/year, purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 1019 |  | (1) | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.24 |
| I-76 Intelligent <br> Transportation <br> Systems Infrastructure | Installation of fiber-optics and ITS Intelligent Transportation Systems devices between Hudson and State Line | 1021 | (8) | -4 |  | \$40.00 |
| New Local Fixed Route Service in Fort Morgan | Shuttle Fixed Route within Ft. Morgan; two vehicles; 6 days/week, 6:30-6:30pm | 1426 | (9) | (n) 0 | $s$ | \$1.55 |
| New Regional Transit Service between Brush-Fort Morgan-Log Lane-Wiggins-Snyder (Morgan County) | Shuttle, Fixed Route / Brush Ft. <br> Morgan, Log Lane, Wiggins, Snyder; 8-5pm, 5 days/week; one vehicle | 1427 |  | (n) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$2.06 |
| I-76: Brush to Morgan/Washington County Line | Reconstruct I-76 east of Brush in Morgan County with the reconstruction of both lanes of eastbound and westbound I-76, the interchange at US 6 and two I-76 bridges (spanning the BNSF Railroad and Bijou Creek), that are functionally obsolete. | 1428 |  |  |  | \$41.20 |

## Project Types
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Corridor Projects: Interstate 76 (Denver East Section): Between US 85 in Commerce

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-76: Fort Morgan to Brush | Reconstruction of I-76 through Fort Morgan. The project will reconstruct both lanes of the interstate in the eastbound and westbound directions, reconstruct interchanges at CO 144, CO 52 (Main Street in Fort Morgan) and the Barlow Road interchange with new structures. | 1430 | 3 | (3) 1 |  | \$125.00 |
| US 34 and CR 16, Morgan County | Intersection improvements | 1431 | (1) | - | (1) | \$0.60 |
| US 34 and CR 24 | Intersection improvements | 1432 | (1) | - | 40 | \$0.60 |
| I-76 at WCR 49 | Interchange improvements at WCR 49 in Hudson | 1433 | (1) | (1) | ! 0 | \$25.00 |
| Exit 80, Fort Morgan | Stormwater, Ped Improvement, Landscaping | 1434 | 0.8 | $\begin{gathered} (1)-20 \\ 60! \end{gathered}$ | $4 \pi$ | \$1.00 |
| Exit 82, Fort Morgan | Stormwater, Ped Improvement, Landscaping | 1435 | d ${ }^{3}$ | $\begin{gathered} n \rightarrow 0 \\ 60! \end{gathered}$ |  | \$1.00 |
| I-76 and WCR 8 Interchange | Construct a new interchange at I76 and Weld County Road 8 (spanning the BNSF) | 2745 | (8) | (5) | (1) 0 | \$25.00 |

## Project Types
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Corridor Projects: Interstate 76 (Denver East Section): Between US 85 in Commerce

| Name | Description | Planning <br> Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Through Fort Morgan | Ped Crossings (x6) | 1437 | ( | (x) | (1) | \$0.20 |
| Turner Street to Hospital Road in Fort Morgan | Bike/Pedestrian - Study for US34 Corridor | 1438 | - 6 | (x) | (1) | \$0.30 |
| US34 \& Mosley Road, Fort Morgan | Intersection Improvements Signals | 1439 | (1) | (5) | (1) | \$1.00 |
| US34 \& Saunders Road, Fort Morgan | Intersection Improvements and Signal | 1440 | (1) 8 | (3) -2 | (1) | \$1.00 |
| US34 Through Fort Morgan | Restriping and Signage to Control Package | 1442 | $(1)$ | $8-6$ | $!\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| I-76 Truck Parking | Increase Truck Parking between Denver and Keenesburg. A new facility in Brighton requires additional spaces. The closed Pilot Center could be an adequate location. | 1849 |  | (1) | (1) | \$0.63 |
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Corridor Projects: Interstate 76 (Denver East Section): Between US 85 in Commerce

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-76 at WCR 386 | Interchange improvements | 1852 | (8) | (8.) 00 ! ! | (1) | \$4.00 |
| Essential Bus Service between Sterling and Denver (Proposed Outrider Service) | Outrider bus service between Denver and Sterling. Assumes one roundtrip 5 days per week 52 weeks per year. Purchase of 2 vehicles. Cost based on $\$ 4.20$ per mile. | 2465 |  | (n) 0 | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$3.62 |
| Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements | Stops and shelter improvements at 4 locations; Brush!, Fort Morgan, Lochbuie, and Hudson | 2490 | (9) | (4) | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.30 |
| NECALG Facilities Needs Study | Determine needs, site location and identify alternatives for bus storage and admin facility for NECALG transit. | 2543 | (-) | $8$ |  | \$0.05 |
| NECALG Bus Storage and Admin Building (Design and Construction) | Based on outcome of facility needs planning study, design and construct bus storage and admin building to support NECALG transit operations. | 2544 |  | $8$ |  | \$5.00 |
| SH 144 West, Westbound Diamond Grind \& Slabs MP 55.1 to MP 61.9 | Rural Road Surface Treatment | 69 | 3 | (1) | $3$ | \$8.00 |
| US 34 East, Slabs and Diamond Grind Both Directions from MP 66 to MP 73.9 | Rural Road Surface Treatment | 70 |  | $(1)$ | $8$ | \$11.50 |
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Project Based Strategies: Interstate 76 (Denver East Section): Between US 85


## (3) Asset Management

- I-76: Brush to Morgan/Washington County Line
- Exit 80, Fort Morgan
- Exit 82, Fort Morgan
- I-76: Fort Morgan to Brush
- SH 144 West, Westbound Diamond Grind \& Slabs MP 55.1 to MP 61.9
- US 34 East, Slabs and Diamond Grind Both Directions from MP 66 to MP 73.9


## Mobility

- Essential Bus Service between Sterling and Fort Morgan and Greeley (Proposed Outrider Service)
- I-76 Intelligent Transportation Systems Infrastructure
- New Local Fixed Route Service in Fort Morgan


## (1) Safety

- US 34 and CR 16, Morgan County
- US 34 and CR 24
- I-76 at WCR 49
- Through Fort Morgan
- I-76 and WCR 8 Interchange

Project Based Strategies: Interstate 76 (Denver East Section): Between US 85


## (3) Asset Management

- NECALG Facilities Needs Study
- NECALG Bus Storage and Admin Building (Design and Construction)


## Mobility

- New Regional Transit Service between Brush-Fort Morgan-Log Lane-WigginsSnyder (Morgan County)
- I-76 Truck Parking
- I-76 at WCR 386
- Essential Bus Service between Sterling and Denver (Proposed Outrider Service)
- Outrider Stop/Shelter Improvements


## (!) Safety

- Turner Street to Hospital Road in Fort Morgan
- US34 \& Mosley Road, Fort Morgan
- US34 \& Saunders Road, Fort Morgan
- US34 Through Fort Morgan



## Corridor Name

US Highway 85 (Urban Section): Between I-76 and SH 14 in Ault

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 85 Urban corridor is primarily to increase mobility as well as to improve safety and to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor is on the National Highway System and provides north-south connections within the central Weld County area. The Union Pacific Railroad runs parallel to US 85 through the corridor. The surrounding area depends on manufacturing, agriculture, commercial activity, residential development, and oil and gas for economic activity. The area is transitioning from an agricultural area to a more urban area, and the corridor must support the movement of commuters, freight, and farm-to-market products

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System (US 34 South)
- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 1 CNG Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 28 comments specifically about this corridor
- Concern about combination of heavy truck traffic and high speeds
- Desire for transit service along corridor
- Desire for safety improvements at intersections
- Consideration for upgrade to freeway

Key Data Findings: US Highway 85 (Urban Section): Between I-76 and

## Key Data Findings:

| Growth | Moderate Congestion (2030) and high congestion <br> (2045) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Safety <br> Freight | Hazmat Route; Several sections with shoulders less <br> than 2'; Two segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4); Dense wildlife crashes |
| Transit | Black Hills Stage Lines operates on corridor |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of disabled and minority populations |
| Economics | High concentration of jobs in Fort Lupton and <br> Platteville |
| Economics <br> Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells <br> Agricultural corridor |
| Freight | High volume of truck traffic |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | High criticality; Parallels 100-year flood plains |



## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesAddress increasing congestion to improve access to jobs and improve reliability for freight movementEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wildlife crashes)Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsProvide additional travel optionsMitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 85 Freight Mobility Commercial Vehicle Signal Priority (CVSP) | Implementing Commercial Vehicle Signal Priority (CVSP) at 21 intersections along U.S. Highway 85 (US 85) from I-76 to Weld County Road 100 to improve transportation safety, efficiency, and mobility/reliability by detecting and prioritizing commercial vehicles | 1063 | $\theta$ | (1) | $\theta$ | \$1.50 |
| US 85 Frontage Road | Relocation/realignment improvements in Platteville and Gilcrest | 1443 | (1) | (5) | 10 | \$10.00 |
| US 85 and SH 60 | Diamond Interchange | 1444 | (8) | (-) | (1) 5 | \$38.50 |
| US 85 and WCR 16 | Intersection Improvement | 1445 | (1) 8 | $\text { (i) }-2$ |  | \$0.60 |
| US 85 and WCR 28 | Intersection Improvements (SPUI) | 1446 | (1) | (5) -6 | (1) | \$27.50 |
| US 85 and WCR 36 | Intersection Improvements/Realignment | 1447 | (1) | (5) 6 | (1) | \$1.10 |
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 85 and WCR 38 | Intersection Improvements/Realignment | 1448 | (1) 8 | (3) -2 | (1) | \$1.50 |
| US 85 and WCR 40 | Intersection Improvements (Frontage Road Realignment) | 1449 | (1) 8 | $\Leftrightarrow=$ |  | \$1.20 |
| US 85 and WCR 80 | Intersection Improvements | 1450 | (1) 8 | (8) -2 |  | \$0.70 |
| Bustang Bus Service between Greeley and Denver | Bustang bus service between Greeley (GET Transit Center) and Denver (Union Station). Assumes 10 roundtrips per weekday and 2 roundtrips on weekends and major holidays, purchase of 4 vehicles. | 1461 |  | (r) 0 |  | \$16.99 |
| US 85 and WCR 14.5/14th Street, Fort Lupton | New parallel roads | 1858 | (1) | (8) $-5!$ |  | \$36.60 |
| Roads parallel to US 85 | Right-in/right-out | 1859 | (1) ${ }^{3}$ | - | $13$ | \$0.20 |
| US 85 and WCR 20 | Intersection Improvement (Diamond Interchange) | 1860 | $48$ | (3) -2 | $!\Leftrightarrow$ | \$32.00 |

## Project Types




Project Benefits




SWP Goal Area


Corridor Projects: US Highway 85 (Urban Section): Between I-76 and SH 14

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 85 and WCR 22 | Right-in/right-out (west side) and closure (east) | 1861 | (1) | (-) | ! 5 | \$0.40 |
| US 85 and WCR 24.5 | Right-in/right-out | 1862 | (1) 8 | (-) | (1) | \$0.80 |
| US 85 and WCR 26 | Intersection Improvement (SPUI) | 1863 | (1) | $8=$ | (1) | \$37.90 |
| US 85 and WCR 30, Platteville | Closure with new parallel road connecting to WCR 32 | 1864 | (8) | (-) | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$3.00 |
| US 85 and SH 66, Platteville | Intersection Improvement (Channelized-T w/ SB grade separation) | 1865 | (1) | (8) 6 | (1) | \$16.50 |
| US 85 and Marion Ave., Platteville | 3/4 movement | 1866 | (8) | -2) |  | \$0.20 |
| US 85 and WCR 32, Platteville | Close frontage roads and add auxiliary lanes as needed | 1867 | (1) | (8) -2 | $4$ | \$0.40 |
| US 85 and WCR 34, Platteville | Intersection Improvement (Diamond Interchange) Includes closing WCR 36. | 1868 | (1) | (8) -2 | ! 5 | \$38.70 |
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Corridor Projects: US Highway 85 (Urban Section): Between I-76 and SH 14

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 85 and WCR 40, Gilcrest | Frontage road realignment | 1869 | (1) | (-2) | (1) | \$1.20 |
| US 85 and Elm, Gilcrest | $3 / 4$ movement, close frontage road | 1870 | (8) | (-) | $\theta$ | \$0.30 |
| US 85 and Main, Gilcrest | Channelized-T | 1871 | (8) | -2) | 3 | \$0.80 |
| US 85 and WCR 33/44 (Interim) | Intersection Improvement (Interim improvements) | 1872 | (1) | (3) | (1) | \$4.20 |
| US 85 and WCR 33/44 (Ultimate) | Intersection Improvement (TUDI) | 1873 | (1) | (3) -2 | (1) 0 | \$30.60 |
| US 85 and WCR 35/46 | Intersection Improvement (Channelized-T) | 1874 | (1) | (3) 3 | (1) 0 | \$1.40 |
| US 85 and SH 52, Fort Lupton | Pedestrian improvements | 1875 | ( | (12) $\overbrace{0}$ | (1) $0^{2}$ | \$0.20 |
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| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary Project Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR) | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2445 | (-) | - | $\Leftrightarrow$ | - |
| US 85E Fort Lupton Devolution | Devolution of US 85E (Denver Avenue) through Fort Lupton | 2698 | (3) | - | $8$ | - |
| US 85F Platteville Devolution | Devolution of US 85F (Main Street) through Platteville | 2699 | $3$ | - | $3$ | - |

## Project Types
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## $\Leftrightarrow$ <br> Asset Management

- US 85E Fort Lupton Devolution
- US 85F Platteville Devolution


## Mobility

- US 85 Freight Mobility Commercial Vehicle Signal Priority (CVSP)
- US 85 and SH 60
- Bustang Bus Service between Greeley and Denver
- US 85 and WCR 14.5/14th Street, Fort Lupton
- Roads parallel to US 85


## (!) Safety

- US 85 Frontage Road
- US 85 and WCR 16
- US 85 and WCR 28
- US 85 and WCR 36
- US 85 and WCR 38
- US 85 and WCR 40
- US 85 and WCR 80


UFR 102

## 0 <br> Asset Management

- See the previous page


## Mobility

- US 85 and WCR 22
- US 85 and WCR 24.5
- US 85 and WCR 30, Platteville
- US 85 and Marion Ave., Platteville
- US 85 and WCR 32, Platteville
- US 85 and Elm, Gilcrest
- US 85 and Main, Gilcrest
- Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR)


## (!) Safety

- US 85 and WCR 20
- US 85 and WCR 26
- US 85 and SH 66, Platteville
- US 85 and WCR 34, Platteville
- US 85 and WCR 40, Gilcrest
- US 85 and WCR 33/44 (Interim)
- US 85 and WCR 33/44 (Ultimate)
- US 85 and WCR 35/46
- US 85 and SH 52, Fort Lupton




## Corridor Name

US Highway 85 (Rural Section): Between SH 14 in Ault and the Wyoming border

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 85 Rural corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality and to increase mobility.

## Corridor Description

This corridor makes north-south connections through northern Weld County. The Union Pacific Railroad runs parallel to US 85 through the corridor. The surrounding area depends on manufacturing, agriculture, and commercial activity for economic activity. The corridor must support the agricultural character of the area by facilitating the movement of freight and farm-to-market products.

## Corridor Designations

- Colorado Freight Corridor
- Tier 1 CNG Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 6 comments specifically about this corridor
- Pavement in poor condition
- Desire for transit service
- Desire for off-street trail

Key Data Findings: US Highway 85 (Rural Section): Between SH 14 in Ault

## Key Data Findings:

| Safety <br> Freight | Hazmat Route; Two sections with shoulders less than <br> 2'; Two segments with elevated crash patterns <br> (LOSS 3 or 4) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Transit | Black Hills Stage Lines operates on corridor |
| Economics <br> Freight | Agricultural corridor <br> Provides access to recreational area |
| Freight | High percentage and volume of truck traffic |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | High criticality |



## Corridor Needs: US Highway 85 (Rural Section): Between SH 14 in Ault

## Corridor Needs

Improve travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patternsEliminate shoulder deficienciesMitigate risk associated with natural disasters

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 85 Freight Mobility Commercial Vehicle Signal Priority (CVSP) | Implementing Commercial Vehicle Signal Priority (CVSP) at 21 intersections along U.S. Highway 85 (US 85) from I-76 to Weld County Road 100 to improve transportation safety, efficiency, and mobility/reliability by detecting and prioritizing commercial vehicles | 1063 | $\theta$ | ! | $\theta$ | \$1.50 |
| US 85 and Main Street/WCR 90, Pierce | Intersection Improvement (Traffic Signal) | 1878 | (1) | (4) (-1) | ! $\leftrightarrows$ | \$0.50 |
| US 85 and Main <br> Street/WCR 100, Nunn | Intersection Improvement (Traffic Signal) - Includes closing east side. | 1879 | (1) | (i) -2 |  | \$0.40 |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR) | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2445 | (-2) | - | $\theta$ | - |
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in Ault and the Wyoming border (PUF7018)

## ( Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- US 85 Freight Mobility Commercial Vehicle Signal Priority (CVSP)
- Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR)


## (1) Safety

- US 85 and Main Street/WCR 90, Pierce
- US 85 and Main Street/WCR 100, Nunn



# State Highway 144 (Plains Section): Between I-76 west of Wiggins and SH 52 in Fort Morgan and SH 39 from I- 76 to SH 144 (PUF7019) 



## Corridor Name

State Highway 144 (Plains Section): Between I-76 west of Wiggins and SH 52 in Fort Morgan and SH 39 from I-76 to SH 144

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the SH 144 Plains corridor is primarily to maintain system quality as well as to improve safety.

## Corridor Description

This corridor serves as a local facility, providing local access and making connections within west-central Morgan County. The surrounding area depends on agriculture for economic activity. The corridor must preserve the agricultural character of the area by facilitating the movement of farm-to-market products.

## Corridor Designations

- High Demand Bicycle Corridor (R4-17) between Fort Morgan and Weldona


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 4 comments specifically about this corridor
- Need safer places for kids to walk and bike
- Farm to market road; difficult for agricultural vehicles
- Pavement and structures are in poor condition


| Safety Freight | Key Data Findings: | Economics Freight | Concentration of oil and gas wells Agricultural corridor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Nearly all of corridor has shoulders less than $2^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| Asset <br> Management <br> Freight | Low drivability life for most of the corridor | Demographics Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage of 65+and minority populations |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity | Freight | Sections of high percentage of truck traffic |
|  | High stress for bicycling | Resiliency | Parallels 100-year flood plain |
| Pedestrian Economics | Main street through Weldona |  |  |

Corridor Needs: State Highway 144 (Plains Section): Between I-76 west of


## Corridor Needs

Eliminate shoulder deficiencies for safety and bicyclistsAddress pavement condition where drivability life is poor$\rightarrow$ Enhance walkability in areas with high pedestrian demand
(downtown areas)Mitigate risk associated with natural disasters (floodplain)

Corridor Projects: State Highway 144 (Plains Section): Between I-76 west

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SH 39 north of Wiggins | Safety widening and shoulders | 1451 | (1) | (4) 6 | ! $\leftrightarrows$ | \$7.00 |
| Hwy 144/Hwy 52 , Fort Morgan | Intersection Improvements ADA Updates | 1453 | ( | (a) 5 (in)! | ! | \$0.60 |

## Project Types
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- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process

- Hwy 144/Hwy 52 , Fort Morgan

- SH 39 north of Wiggins



## Corridor Name

US Highway 287 (North Rural Section): Between SH 14 (Ted's Place) to Laramie, Wyoming

## Corridor Vision

The vision for the US 287 North Rural corridor is primarily to improve safety as well as to maintain system quality.

## Corridor Description

This corridor is on the National Highway System and provides a north-south connection between Fort Collins and Laramie, Wyoming. The surrounding area is rural, and the corridor must support the movement of both freight and tourists.

## Corridor Designations

- On National Highway System
- Colorado Freight Corridor


## What we heard about the Corridor

- 19 comments specifically about this corridor
- Desire for safety improvements for cars and trucks
- Desire for a truck bypass of Fort Collins
- Desire for longer passing lanes and shoulders
- Better messaging about what safety warnings mean


## Key Data Findings:

| Safety <br> Freight | One segment with elevated crash pattern (LOSS 3 or <br> 4); Dense wildlife crashes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bicycling | Very high bicycle activity (Poudre Park to <br> Livermore); Medium high stress for bicycling |
| Demographics <br> Transit | Passes through census tract with higher percentage <br> of 65+ and disabled population. |
| Freight | High percentage of truck traffic |
| Resiliency <br> Freight | High criticality |



## Corridor Needs

Accommodate travel needs of vulnerable populationsImprove travel conditions for trucks and heavy vehiclesMitigate elevated crash patterns (including wild life crashes)Improve bicycle accommodationMitigate risk associated with natural disasters

| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| US 287: CR 72 (Owl Canyon Road) | Intersection improvements. | 1454 | (1) | (-) | (1) | \$2.00 |
| US 287: LCR 80C (West) | Intersection improvements. | 1455 | (1) | (2) | (1) | \$0.60 |
| US 287: Ted's Place to Wyoming Border | Construction of passing lanes and other safety improvements. | 1456 | (1) | (5) -2 |  | \$20.00 |
| US 287 \& LCR 80 (East) | Intersection Improvements (Aux turn lanes on 287) | 1457 | (1) | (8) -2 | (1) | \$0.60 |
| US 287, extend climbing lane west bound LaPorte Bypass | Widening | 1458 | (I) | (3) -2 | (1) 5 | \$10.00 |
| US 287 at CR 37 | Intersection Improvements | 1459 | (1) 8 | (3) -6 | $4 \Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.60 |
| Region 4 Shoulder <br> Study (UFR) | Region will identify the best locations for limited shouldering funds. | 2444 | (1) |  |  | - |
| Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR) | Assess the feasibility of additional truck parking | 2445 | (-) | - | $\leftrightarrow$ | - |

## Project Types
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## 0 <br> Asset Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- US 287, extend climbing lane west bound LaPorte Bypass
- Region 4 Truck Parking Study (UFR)


## (!) Safety

- US 287: CR 72 (Owl Canyon Road)
- US 287: LCR 80C (West)
- US 287: Ted's Place to Wyoming Border
- US 287 \& LCR 80 (East)
- US 287 at CR 37
- Region 4 Shoulder Study (UFR)


| Name | Description | Planning Project ID | Primary <br> Project <br> Types | Additional <br> Project <br> Benefits | SWP <br> Goal <br> Areas | Project Cost (In millions) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal improvements and dilemma zone det. | - | 2274 | (1) | $\theta$ | $4 \Leftrightarrow$ | \$0.50 |
| One Call/One Click Center | Operate a call center in Larimer and Weld counties at the North Front Range MPO coordinating rides for human service and transit agencies, provide local and technical assistance for the purchase of vehicles and expansion of services, and provide staff support for increased partnerships and relationships through local coordinating councils | 2700 | (-) | $(x) \Rightarrow \text { iil }$ | $\Leftrightarrow$ | \$4.73 |
| Expansion of NECALG's County Express Demand Response to Connect to Outrider | Additional operating dollars and vehicles to expand County Express Demand Reposes service to provider "first and last mile" connections to Outrider (project costs include annual operating at $\$ 20,000 /$ year and 2 cutaway vehicles at \$80,000 each) | 1460 | (5) | (x) $\Rightarrow$ (iil) |  | \$0.36 |

## Project Types
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Asset Management
Mobility
Safety


## (a) Asset <br> Management

- While no major asset management projects were identified for this goal area during the long-range planning process, CDOT routinely identifies asset treatments through a separate datadriven asset management process


## Mobility

- One Call/One Click Center
- Expansion of NECALG's County Express zone det.
- Signal improvements and dilemma


## ! Safety

 Demand Response to Connect to Outrider
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